

superstition and so characterised by love of the marvellous. Religious excitement could not, under such circumstances and in such an age, have escaped this exaggeration. How few men in more enlightened times have been able soberly to appreciate, and accurately to record, exciting experiences, where feeling and religious emotion have been concerned. Prosaic accuracy of observation and of language, at all times rare, are the last qualities we could expect to find in the early ages of Christianity. In the certain fact that disputes arose among the Apostles themselves so shortly after the death of their great Master, we have one proof that even amongst them there was no accurate appreciation of the teaching of Jesus,<sup>1</sup> and the frequent instances of their misunderstanding of very simple matters, and of their want of enlightenment, which occur throughout the Gospels are certainly not calculated to inspire much confidence in their intelligence and accuracy of observation.

Now it is apparent that the evidence for miracles requires to embrace two distinct points: the reality of the alleged facts, and the accuracy of the inference that the phenomena were produced by supernatural agency. The task would even then remain of demonstrating the particular supernatural Being by whom the miracles were performed, which is admitted to be impossible. We have hitherto chiefly confined ourselves to a consideration of the antecedent credibility of such events, and of the fitness of those who are supposed to have witnessed them to draw accurate inferences from the alleged phenomena. Those who have formed any adequate conception of the amount of testimony which would be requisite in order to establish the reality of occurrences in violation of an order of nature, which is based upon universal and invariable experience, must recognise that, even if the earliest asserted origin of our four Gospels could be established upon the most irrefragable grounds, the testimony of the writers—men of like ignorance with their contemporaries, men of like passions with ourselves—would be utterly incompetent to prove the reality of miracles. We have already sufficiently discussed this point, more especially in connection with Hume's argument, and need not here resume it. Every consideration, historical and philosophical, has hitherto discredited the whole theory of miracles, and further inquiry might be abandoned as unnecessary. In order, however, to render our conclusion complete, it remains for us to see whether, as affirmed, there be any special evidence regarding the alleged facts entitling the Gospel miracles to exceptional attention. If, instead of being clear and direct, the undoubted testimony of known eye-witnesses free from superstition,

<sup>1</sup> *E.g.*, Gal. ii. 11 ff.

and capable, through adequate knowledge, rightly to estimate the alleged phenomena, we find that the actual accounts have none of these qualifications, the final decision with regard to miracles and the reality of Divine revelation will be easy and conclusive.

## PART II.

---

### THE SYNOPTIC GOSPELS

#### INTRODUCTION

BEFORE commencing our examination of the evidence as to the date, authorship, and character of the Gospels, it may be well to make a few preliminary remarks, and clearly state certain canons of criticism. We shall make no attempt to establish any theory as to the date at which any of the Gospels was actually written, but simply examine all the testimony which is extant, with the view of ascertaining what is known of these works and their authors, certainly and distinctly, as distinguished from what is merely conjectured or inferred. Modern opinion in an Inquiry like ours must not be taken for ancient evidence. We propose, therefore, as exhaustively as possible to search all the writings of the early Church for information regarding the Gospels, and to examine even the alleged indications of their use.

It is very important, however, that the silence of early writers should receive as much attention as any supposed allusions to the Gospels. When such writers, quoting largely from the Old Testament and other sources, deal with subjects which would naturally be assisted by reference to our Gospels, and still more so by quoting such works as authoritative; and yet we find that not only they do not show any knowledge of those Gospels, but actually quote passages from unknown sources, or sayings of Jesus derived from tradition; the inference must be that our Gospels were either unknown or not recognised as works of authority at the time.

It is still more important that we should constantly bear in mind that a great number of Gospels existed in the early Church which are no longer extant, and of most of which even the names are lost. We need not here do more than refer, in corroboration of this remark, to the preliminary statement of the author of the third Gospel: "Forasmuch as many ( $\pi\omicron\lambda\lambda\omicron\iota$ ) took in hand to set forth in order a declaration of the things which have been accomplished

among us," etc.<sup>1</sup> It is, therefore, evident that before our third Synoptic was written many similar works were already in circulation. Looking at the close similarity of large portions of the three Synoptics, it is almost certain that many of the writings here mentioned bore a close analogy to each other and to our Gospels, and this is known to have been the case, for instance, amongst the various forms of the "Gospel according to the Hebrews." When, therefore, in early writings we meet with quotations closely resembling, or, we may add, even identical with, passages which are found in our Gospels, the source of which, however, is not mentioned, nor is any author's name indicated, the similarity, or even identity, cannot by any means be admitted as proof that the quotation is necessarily from our Gospels, and not from some other similar work now no longer extant, and more especially not when, in the same writings, there are other quotations from sources different from our Gospels. Whether regarded as historical records or as writings embodying the mere tradition of the early Christians, our Gospels cannot be recognised as the exclusive depositories of the genuine sayings and doings of Jesus. So far from the common possession by many works in early times of sayings of Jesus in closely similar form being either strange or improbable, the really remarkable phenomenon is that such material variation in the report of the more important historical teaching should exist amongst them. But whilst similarity to our Gospels in passages quoted by early writers from unknown sources cannot prove the use of our Gospels, variation from them would suggest or prove a different origin, and, at least, it is obvious that anonymous quotations which do not agree with our Gospels cannot, in any case, necessarily indicate their existence. It may be well, before proceeding further, to illustrate and justify the canons of criticism which we have laid down by examples in our three Synoptics themselves.

Let us for a moment suppose the "Gospel according to Luke" to have been lost like the "Gospel according to the Hebrews," and so many others. In the works of one of the Fathers we discover the following quotation from an unnamed evangelical work: "And he said unto them (ἔλεγεν δὲ πρὸς αὐτούς): The harvest truly is great, but the labourers are few: pray ye therefore the Lord of the harvest that he would send forth labourers into his harvest. Go your ways: (ὑπάγετε) behold I send you forth as lambs (ἄρνας) in the midst of wolves." Apologetic critics would probably maintain that this was a compilation from memory of passages quoted freely from our first Gospel, that is to say Matt. ix. 37: "Then saith he unto his disciples (τότε λέγει

<sup>1</sup> Luke i. 1.

τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ) the harvest," etc., and Matt. x. 16: "Behold I (ἐγὼ) send you forth as sheep (πρόβατα) in the midst of wolves: be ye therefore," etc., which, with the differences which we have indicated, agree. It would probably be in vain to argue that the quotation indicated a continuous order, and the variations combined to confirm the probability of a different source; and still more so to point out that, although parts of the quotation separated from their context might, to a certain extent, correspond with scattered verses in the first Gospel, such a circumstance was no proof that the quotation was taken from that and from no other Gospel. The passage, however, is a literal quotation from Luke x. 2, 3, which, as we have assumed, had been lost.

Again, still supposing the third Gospel no longer extant, we might find the following quotation in a work of the Fathers: "Take heed to yourselves (ἐαυτοῖς) of the leaven of the Pharisees, which is hypocrisy (ἣτις ἐστὶν ὑπόκρισις). For there is nothing covered up (συγκεκαλυμμένον) which shall not be revealed, and hid which shall not be known." It would, of course, be affirmed that this was evidently a combination of two verses of our first Gospel, quoted almost literally, with merely a few very immaterial slips of memory in the parts we note, and the explanatory words "which is hypocrisy" introduced by the Father, and not a part of the quotation at all. The two verses are Matt. xvi. 6: "Beware and (ὁρᾶτε καὶ) take heed of the leaven of the Pharisees and Sadducees" (καὶ Σαδδουκαίων), and Matt. x. 26..... "For (γάρ) there is nothing covered (κεκαλυμμένον) that shall not be revealed, and hid that shall not be known." It would probably be argued that the sentence should be divided, and each part would then have its parallel in separate portions of the Gospel. That such a system is mistaken is clearly established by the fact that the quotation, instead of being such a combination, is simply taken as it stands from the Gospel according to Luke xii. 1, 2.

To give another example, and such might easily be multiplied, if our second Gospel had been lost and the following passage were met with in one of the Fathers without its source being indicated, what would be the argument of those who insist that quotations, though differing from our Gospels, were yet taken from them? "If any one have (εἴ τις ἔχει) ears to hear, let him hear. And he said unto them: Take heed what (τί) ye hear; with what measure ye mete it shall be measured to you: and more shall be given unto you. For he (ὁς) that hath to him shall be given, and he (καὶ ὁς) that hath not from him shall be taken even that which he hath." Upon the principle on which patristic quotations are treated, it would probably be positively affirmed that this passage was a quotation from our first and third Gospels

combined and made from memory. The exigencies of the occasion might probably lead to the assertion that the words, "And he said to them," really indicated a separation of the latter part of the quotation from the preceding, and that the Father thus showed that the passage was not consecutive; and as to the phrase, "and more shall be given unto you," that it was evidently an addition of the Father. The passage would be dissected, and its different members compared with scattered sentences, and declared almost literal quotations from the Canonical Gospels. Matt. xiii. 9: "He that hath (ὁ ἔχων) ears to hear, let him hear."<sup>1</sup> Luke viii. 18: "Take heed, therefore, how (οὖν πῶς) ye hear." Matt. vii. 2: ".....with what measure ye mete it shall be measured to you."<sup>2</sup> Matt. xiii. 12: "For whosoever (ὅστις) hath, to him shall be given (and he shall have abundance); but whosoever (ὅστις δὲ) hath not from him shall betaken even that which he hath."<sup>3</sup> In spite of these ingenious assertions, however, the quotation in reality is literally and consecutively taken from Mark iv. 23-25.

These examples may suffice to show that any argument which commences by the assumption that the order of a passage quoted may be entirely disregarded, and that it is sufficient to find parallels scattered irregularly up and down the Gospels to warrant the conclusion that the passage is compiled from them, and is not a consecutive quotation from some other source, is utterly unfounded and untenable. The supposition of a lost Gospel which has just been made to illustrate this argument is, however, not a mere supposition, but a fact; for we no longer have the Gospel according to Peter, nor that according to the Hebrews, not to mention the numerous other works in use in the early Church. The instances we have given show the importance of the order, as well as the language, of quotations, and while they prove the impossibility of demonstrating that a consecutive passage which differs not only in language, but in order, from the parallels in our Gospels must be derived from them, they likewise attest the probability that such passages are actually quoted from a different source.

If we examine further, however, in the same way, quotations which differ merely in language, we arrive at the very same conclusion. Supposing the third Gospel to be lost, what would be the source assigned to the following quotation from an unnamed Gospel in the work of one of the Fathers? "No servant (οὐδεὶς οἰκέτης) can serve two lords, for either he will hate the one and love the other, or else he will hold to the one and despise the other. Ye cannot serve God and Mammon." Of course the

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Matt. xi. 15; Luke viii. 8.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Luke vi. 38.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Matt. xxv. 29; Luke viii. 18, xix. 26.

passage would be claimed as a quotation from memory of Matt. vi. 24, with which it perfectly corresponds, with the exception of the addition of the second word *οἰκέτης*, which, it would no doubt be argued, is an evident and very natural amplification of the simple *οὐδείς* of the first Gospel. Yet this passage, only differing by the single word from Matthew, is a literal quotation from the Gospel according to Luke xvi. 13. Or, to take another instance, supposing the third Gospel to be lost, and the following passage quoted, from an unnamed source, by one of the Fathers: "Beware (*προσέχετε*) of the Scribes which desire to walk in long robes, and love (*φιλούντων*) greetings in the markets, and chief seats in the synagogues and uppermost places at feasts; which devour widows' houses, and for a pretence make long prayers: these shall receive greater damnation." This would, without hesitation, be declared a quotation from memory of Mark xii. 38-40: ".....Beware (*βλέπετε*) of the Scribes which desire to walk in long robes and greetings in the markets, and chief seats in the synagogues and uppermost places at feasts; which devour widows' houses, and for a pretence make long prayers: these shall receive," etc. It is, however, a literal quotation of Luke xx. 46, 47; yet, probably, it would be in vain to submit to apologetic critics that the passage was not derived from Mark, but from a lost Gospel. To quote one more instance, let us suppose the "Gospel according to Mark" no longer extant, and that in some early work there existed the following quotation: "It is easier for a camel to go through the eye (*τρυμαλιᾶς*) of a needle than for a rich man to enter into the Kingdom of God." This would, of course, be claimed as a quotation from memory of Matt. xix. 24,<sup>1</sup> with which it agrees, with the exception of the substitution of *τρυπήματος* for the *τρυμαλιᾶς*. It would not the less have been an exact quotation from Mark x. 25.<sup>2</sup>

The actual agreement of any saying of Jesus, quoted by one of the early Fathers from an unnamed source, with a passage in our Gospels is by no means conclusive evidence that the quotation was actually derived from that Gospel. It must be apparent that

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Luke xviii. 25.

<sup>2</sup> For further instances compare—

Luke	xiv.	11	with	Matt.	xxiii.	12	and	Luke	xviii.	14.
,,	xvii.	37	,,	,,	xxiv.	28.				
,,	vi.	41	,,	,,	vii.	3.				
Mark	vi.	4	,,	,,	xiii.	57.				
,,	viii.	34	,,	Luke	ix.	23.				
Matt.	xviii.	11	,,	,,	xix.	10.				
,,	xxiv.	37	,,	,,	xiii.	34.				
,,	xxiv.	34-36	with	Mark	xiii.	30-32	and	Luke	xxi.	32-33.

literal agreement in reporting short and important sayings is not in itself so surprising as to constitute proof that, occurring in two histories, the one must have copied from the other. The only thing which is surprising is that such frequent inaccuracy should exist. When we add, however, the fact that most of the larger early evangelical works, including our Synoptic Gospels, must have been compiled out of the same original sources, and have been largely indebted to each other, the common possession of such sayings becomes a matter of natural occurrence. Moreover, it must be admitted even by apologetic critics that, in a case of such vast importance as the report of sayings of Jesus, upon the verbal accuracy of which the most essential doctrines of Christianity depend, it cannot be a wonder, to the extent of proving plagiarism so to say, if various Gospels report the same saying of Jesus in the same words. Practically the Synoptic Gospels differ in their reports a great deal more than is right or desirable; but we may take them as an illustration of the fact that identity of passages, where the source is unnamed, by no means proves that such passages in a work of the early Fathers were derived from one Gospel, and not from any other. Let us suppose our first Gospel to have been lost, and the following quotation from an unnamed source to be found in an early work: "Every tree that bringeth not forth good fruit is hewn down, and cast into the fire." This, being in literal agreement with Luke iii. 9, would certainly be declared by modern apologists conclusive proof that the Father was acquainted with that Gospel; and although the context in the work of the Father might, for instance, be: "Ye shall know them from their works, and every tree," etc., and yet, in the third Gospel, the context is: "And now also, the axe is laid unto the root of the trees: and every tree," etc., that would by no means give them pause. The explanation of combination of texts, and quotation from memory, is sufficiently elastic for every emergency. Now, the words in question might in reality be a quotation from the lost Gospel according to Matthew, in which they twice occur; so that here is a passage which is literally repeated three times—Matt. iii. 10, vii. 19, and Luke iii. 9. In Matt. iii. 10, and in the third Gospel, the words are part of a saying of John the Baptist; whilst in Matt. vii. 19 they are given as part of the Sermon on the Mount, with a different context.

Another illustration of this may be given, by supposing the Gospel of Luke to be no longer extant, and the following sentence in one of the Fathers: "And ye shall be hated by all men, for my name's sake." These very words occur both in Matt. x. 22 and Mark xiii. 13, in both of which places there follow the words: "but he that endureth to the end, the same shall be saved."



There might here have been a doubt as to whether the Father derived the words from the first or second Gospel, but they would have been ascribed either to the one or to the other, whilst in reality they were taken from a different work altogether—Luke xxi. 17. Here again we have the same words in three Gospels. In how many more of them may not the same passage have been found? One more instance to conclude. The following passage might be quoted from an unnamed source by one of the Fathers: "Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my words shall not pass away." If the Gospel according to Mark were no longer extant, this would be claimed as a quotation either from Matt. xxiv. 35 or Luke xxi. 33, in both of which it occurs; but, notwithstanding, the Father might not have been acquainted with either of them, and simply have quoted from Mark xiii. 31.<sup>1</sup> And here again the three Gospels contain the same passage without variation.

Now, in all these cases not only is the selection of the Gospel from which the quotation was actually taken completely an open question, since they all have it, but still more is the point uncertain, when it is considered that many other works may also have contained it, historical sayings being naturally common property. Does the agreement of the quotation with a passage which is equally found in the three Gospels prove the existence of all of them? and if not, how is the Gospel from which it was actually taken to be distinguished? If it be difficult to do so, how much more when the possibility and probability, demonstrated by the agreement of the three extant, that it might have formed part of a dozen other works is taken into account.

It is unnecessary to add that, in proportion as we remove from apostolic times without positive evidence of the existence and authenticity of our Gospels, so does the value of their testimony dwindle away. Indeed, requiring as we do clear, direct, and irrefragable evidence of the integrity, authenticity, and historical character of these Gospels, doubt or obscurity on these points must inevitably be fatal to them as sufficient testimony—if they could, under any circumstances, be considered sufficient testimony—for miracles and a direct Divine revelation like ecclesiastical Christianity.

We propose to examine, first, the evidence for the three Synoptics, and then, separately, the testimony regarding the fourth Gospel.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Matt. vii. 7-8 with Luke xi. 9-10; Matt. xi. 25 with Luke x. 21.

## CHAPTER I.

### CLEMENT OF ROME—THE EPISTLE OF BARNABAS— THE PASTOR OF HERMAS

THE first work which presents itself for examination is the so-called first Epistle of Clement to the Corinthians, which, together with a second Epistle to the same community, likewise attributed to Clement, is preserved to us in the *Codex Alexandrinus*, a MS. assigned by the most competent judges to the second half of the fifth or beginning of the sixth century, in which these Epistles follow the books of the New Testament. The second Epistle, which is evidently not epistolary, but the fragment of a Homily, although it thus shares with the first the honour of a canonical position in one of the most ancient codices of the New Testament, is not mentioned at all by the earlier Fathers who refer to the first;<sup>1</sup> and Eusebius, who is the first writer who mentions it, expresses doubt regarding it, while Jerome and Photius state that it was rejected by the ancients. It is now universally regarded as spurious, and dated about the end of the second century, or later. We shall hereafter see that many other pseudographs were circulated in the name of Clement, to which, however, we need not further allude at present.

Second  
epistle  
spurious.

There has been much controversy as to the identity of the Clement to whom the first Epistle is attributed. In early days he was supposed to be the Clement mentioned in the Epistle to the Philippians (iv. 3),<sup>2</sup> but this is now generally doubted or denied, and the authenticity of the Epistle has, indeed, been called in question both by earlier and later critics. It is unnecessary to detail the various traditions regarding the supposed writer, but we must point out that the Epistle itself makes no mention of the author's name. It merely purports to be addressed by "The Church of God which sojourns at Rome to the Church of God sojourning at Corinth"; but in the *Codex Alexandrinus* the title of "The First Epistle of Clement to the Corinthians" is added at

<sup>1</sup> Dionysius, Cor. in Euseb., *H. E.*, iv. 23; Irenæus, *Adv. Hær.*, iii. 3; Clemens Al., *Stromata*, iv. 17, § 107, i. 7, § 38, v. 12, § 81, vi. 8, § 65; Origen, *De Princip.*, ii. 3, 6; in *Ezech.* 8; Epiphanius, *Hær.*, xxvii. 6. Cf. Cyril, Hieros., *Catech.*, xviii. 8.

<sup>2</sup> Eusebius, *H. E.*, iii. 15, 16; Hieron., *de Vir. Ill.*, 15; Photius, *Bibl. Cod.*

the end. Clement of Alexandria calls the supposed writer the "Apostle Clement";<sup>1</sup> Origen reports that many also ascribed to him the authorship of the Epistle to the Hebrews;<sup>2</sup> and Photius mentions that he was likewise said to be the writer of the Acts of the Apostles.<sup>3</sup> We know that, until a comparatively late date, this Epistle was quoted as Holy Scripture,<sup>4</sup> and was publicly read in the churches at the Sunday meetings of Christians.<sup>5</sup> It has, as we have seen, a place amongst the canonical books of the New Testament in the *Codex Alexandrinus*, but it did not long retain that position in the canon, for, although in the *Apostolic Canons*<sup>6</sup> of the sixth or seventh century both Epistles appear, yet in the *Stichometry* of Nicephorus, a work of the ninth century, derived, however, as Credner<sup>7</sup> has demonstrated, from a Syrian catalogue of the fifth century, both Epistles are classed among the Apocrypha.<sup>8</sup>

Great uncertainty prevails as to the date at which the Epistle was written. Reference is supposed to be made to it by the so-called Epistle of Polycarp, but, owing to the probable inauthenticity of that work itself, no weight can be attached to this circumstance. The first certain reference to it is by Hegesippus, in the second half of the second century, mentioned by Eusebius.<sup>9</sup> Dionysius of Corinth, in a letter ascribed to him, addressed to Soter, Bishop of Rome, is the first who distinctly mentions the name of Clement as the author of the Epistle.<sup>10</sup> There is some difference of opinion as to the order of his succession to the Bishopric of Rome. Irenæus<sup>11</sup> and Eusebius<sup>12</sup> say that he followed Anacletus, and the latter adds the date of the twelfth year of the reign of Domitian (A.D. 91-92), and that he died nine years after, in the third year of Trajan's reign (A.D. 100).<sup>13</sup> Internal evidence<sup>14</sup> shows that the Epistle was written after some persecution of the Roman Church, and the selection lies between the persecution under Nero, which would suggest the date A.D. 64-70, or that under Domitian, which would assign the letter to the end of the first century, or to the beginning of the second. Those who adhere to the view that the Clement mentioned in the Epistle to the Philippians is the author maintain that the Epistle was written under Nero. One of their principal arguments for this

<sup>1</sup> *Strom.* iv. 17, § 107.

<sup>2</sup> Eusebius, *H. E.*, vi. 25.

<sup>3</sup> *Quæst. Amphil.*, Gallandi, *Bibl. Patr.*, 1765, xiii., p. 722.

<sup>4</sup> Irenæus, *Adv. Hær.*, iv. 3; Clemens Al., *Strom.*, l.c.

<sup>5</sup> Dion., *Cor.* in Euseb. *H. E.*, iv. 23, iii. 16; Epiphanius, *Hær.*, xxx. 15; Hieron., *de Vir. Ill.*, 15.

<sup>6</sup> *Can.* 76 (85).

<sup>7</sup> *Zur Gesch. des Kanons*, 1847, p. 97 ff.

<sup>8</sup> Credner, *ib.*, p. 122. <sup>9</sup> *H. E.*, iii. 16, iv. 22. <sup>10</sup> Euseb., *H. E.*, iv. 23.

<sup>11</sup> *Adv. Hær.*, iii. 3, § 3; Euseb., *H. E.*, v. 6.

<sup>12</sup> *H. E.*, iii. 15, cf. 4.

<sup>13</sup> *H. E.*, iii. 15, 34.

<sup>14</sup> Ch. i.

conclusion is a remark occurring in chapter xli.: "Not everywhere, brethren, are the daily sacrifices offered up, or the votive offerings, or the sin-offerings and the trespass-offerings, but only in Jerusalem. But even there they are not offered in every place, but only at the altar before the Sanctuary, examination of the sacrifice offered being first made by the High Priest and the ministers already mentioned." From this it is concluded that the Epistle was written before the destruction of the Temple. It has, however, been shown that Josephus,<sup>1</sup> the author of the "Epistle to Diognetus" (c. 3), and others, long after the Jewish worship of the Temple was at an end, continually speak in the present tense of the Temple worship in Jerusalem; and it is evident, as Cotelier long ago remarked, that this may be done with propriety even in the present day. The argument is therefore recognised to be without value. Tischendorf, who systematically adopts the earliest possible or impossible dates for all the writings of the first two centuries, decides, without stating his reasons, that the grounds for the earlier date, about A.D. 69, as well as for the episcopate of Clement from A.D. 68-77,<sup>2</sup> are conclusive; but he betrays his more correct impression by classing Clement, in his index, along with Ignatius and Polycarp as representatives of the period, "First and second quarters of the second century";<sup>3</sup> and in the Prolegomena to his New Testament he dates the episcopate of Clement "*ab anno 92 usque 102.*"<sup>4</sup> The earlier episcopate assigned to him by Hefele upon most insufficient grounds is contradicted by the direct statements of Iræneus, Eusebius, Jerome, and others who give the earliest lists of Roman Bishops,<sup>5</sup> as well as by the internal evidence of the Epistle itself. In chapter xlv. the writer speaks of those appointed by the apostles to the oversight of the Church, "or afterwards by other notable men, the whole Church consenting .....who have for a long time been commended by all, etc.," which indicates successions of Bishops since apostolic days. In another place (chap. xlvii.) he refers the Corinthians to the Epistle addressed to them by Paul "in the beginning of the Gospel," and speaks of "the most stedfast and ancient Church of the Corinthians," which would be absurd in an Epistle written about A.D. 69. Moreover, an advanced episcopal form of Church government is indicated throughout the letter, which is quite

<sup>1</sup> *Antiq.*, iii. 6, 12; *Contra Apion.*, i. 7, ii. 23.

<sup>2</sup> He refers in a note particularly to Hefele, *Patr. Ap.*, 1855, p. 33 ff.

<sup>3</sup> "*Erstes und zweites Viertel des 2 Jahrh. Clemens v. Rom. Ignatius und Polycarp.*" *Wann wurden uns. Evangelien verfasst?* 4th Aufl., 1866, p. 20, cf. *Uebersicht des Inhalts.*

<sup>4</sup> *Nov. Test. Graece, Lips. Sumpt. Ad. Winter, Ed. septima Crit. min. Proleg.*, p. cxxix.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. Lipsius, *Chronologie der röm. Bischöfe*, 1869.

Note  
note also

inconsistent with such a date. The great mass of critics, therefore, have decided against the earlier date of the episcopate of Clement, and assign the composition of the Epistle to the end of the first century (A.D. 95-100). Others, however, date it still later. There is no doubt that the great number of Epistles and other writings falsely circulated in the name of Clement may well excite suspicion as to the authenticity of this Epistle also, which is far from unsupported by internal proofs. Of these, however, we shall only mention one. We have already incidentally remarked that the writer mentions the Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians, the only instance in which any New Testament writing is referred to by name; but along with the Epistle of the "blessed Paul" the author also speaks of the "blessed Judith," and this leads to the inquiry: When was the Book of Judith written? Hitzig, Volkmar, and others, contend that it must be dated A.D. 117-118,<sup>1</sup> and if this be admitted, it follows, of course, that an Epistle which already shows acquaintance with the Book of Judith cannot have been written before A.D. 120-125 at the earliest, which many, for this and other reasons, affirm to be the case with the Epistle of pseudo-Clement. Whatever date be assigned to it, however, it is probable that the Epistle is interpolated, although it must be added that this is not the view of the majority of critics.

It is important to ascertain whether or not this ancient Christian Epistle affords any evidence of the existence of our Synoptic Gospels at the time when it was written. Tischendorf, who is ever ready to claim the slightest resemblance in language as a reference to New Testament writings, states that, although this Epistle is rich in quotations from the Old Testament, and that Clement here and there also makes use of passages from Pauline Epistles, he nowhere refers to the Gospels.<sup>2</sup> This is perfectly true, but several passages occur in this Epistle which are either quotations from Evangelical works different from ours, or derived from tradition, and in either case they have a very important bearing upon our inquiry.

The first of these passages occurs in ch. xiii., and for greater facility of comparison we shall at once place it both in the Greek and in translation, in juxta-position with the nearest parallel readings in our Synoptic Gospels; and, as far as may be, we shall in the English version indicate differences existing in the original texts. The passage is introduced thus: "Especially remembering

<sup>1</sup> Hitzig, *Zur Kritik d. apokr. Bücher d. A. T.*, *Zeitschr. f. wiss. Theol.*, 1860, p. 240 ff.; Volkmar, *Theol. Jahrb.*, 1856, p. 362 ff., 1857, p. 441 ff. *H'buch. Einl. in d. Apokr.*, 1860, i. p. 268; Baur, *Lehrb. chr. Dogmengeschichte*, 1858, p. 82 anm.; Gröetz, *Gesch. d. Juden vom Unterg. d. jüd. Staates u. s. w.*, 1866, p. 132 ff.

<sup>2</sup> "Aber nirgends auf die Evangelien." *Wann wurden u. s. w.*, p. 20 f.

the words of the Lord Jesus, which he spake teaching gentleness and long-suffering. For thus he said " :—

EPISTLE, XIII.	MATTHEW.	LUKE.
(α) Be pitiful, that ye may be pitied ;	v. 7. Blessed are the pitiful, for they shall obtain pity.	vi. 36. Be ye therefore merciful, as your Father also is merciful.
(β) forgive, that it may be forgiven to you ;	vi. 14. For if ye forgive men their trespasses, &c.	vi. 37.....pardon <sup>1</sup> and ye shall be pardoned,
(γ) as ye do, so shall it be done to you ;	vii. 12. Therefore all things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them.	vi. 31. And as ye would that men should do to you, do ye also to them likewise.
(δ) as ye give, so shall it be given to you ;		vi. 38.....give, and it shall be given to you.
(ε) as ye judge, so shall it be judged to you ;	vii. 2. For with what judgment ye judge, ye shall be judged,	vi. 37. Judge not, and ye shall not be judged.
(ζ) as ye show kindness shall kindness be shown to you ;	and	
(η) with what measure ye mete, with the same shall it be measured to you.	with what measure ye mete, it shall be measured to you.	vi. 38. For with the same measure that ye mete withal, it shall be measured to you again.
(α) Ἐλεᾶτε, ἵνα ἐλεηθῆτε.	v. 7 Μακάριοι οἱ ἐλεήμονες, ὅτι αὐτοὶ ἐλεηθήσονται.	vi. 36 γίνεσθε οὖν οἰκτίρμονες, κ.τ.λ.
(β) ἀφίετε, ἵνα ἀφεθῆ ὑμῖν.	vi. 14 Ἐὰν γὰρ ἀφῆτε τοῖς ἀνθρώποις τὰ παραπτώματα αὐτῶν, κ.τ.λ.	vi. 37 ἀπολύετε, καὶ ἀπολυθήσεσθε.
(γ) ὡς ποιεῖτε, οὕτω ποιηθήσεται ὑμῖν.	vii. 12 Πάντα οὖν ὅσα ἂν θέλητε ἵνα ποιῶσιν ὑμῖν οἱ ἄνθρωποι, οὕτως καὶ ὑμεῖς ποιεῖτε αὐτοῖς.	vi. 31 καὶ καθὼς θέλετε ἵνα ποιῶσιν ὑμῖν οἱ ἄνθρωποι, καὶ ὑμεῖς ποιεῖτε αὐτοῖς ὁμοίως.
(δ) ὡς δίδοτε, οὕτως δοθήσεται ὑμῖν.		vi. 38 δίδοτε, καὶ δοθήσεται ὑμῖν.
(ε) ὡς κρίνετε, οὕτως κριθήσεσθε ὑμῖν.	vii. 2 ἐν ᾧ γὰρ κρίματι κρίνετε κριθήσεσθε,	vi. 37 καὶ μὴ κρίνετε καὶ οὐ μὴ κριθῆτε.
(ζ) ὡς χρηστεύεσθε, οὕτως χρηστευθήσεται ὑμῖν.		
(η) ᾧ μέτρῳ μετρεῖτε, ἐν αὐτῷ μετρηθήσεται ὑμῖν. <sup>2</sup>	καὶ ἐν ᾧ μέτρῳ μετρεῖτε μετρηθήσεται ὑμῖν.	vi. 38 τῷ γὰρ αὐτῷ μέτρῳ ᾧ μετρεῖτε ἀντιμετρηθήσεται ὑμῖν.

<sup>1</sup> We use this word not as the best equivalent of ἀπολύετε, but merely to indicate to readers unacquainted with Greek the use of a different word from the ἀφῆτε of the first Gospel, and from the ἀφίετε of the Epistle ; and this system we shall adopt as much as possible throughout.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Mark iv. 24. Cf. *Hom. Clem.* xviii. 16.

Of course, it is understood that, although for convenience of comparison we have broken up this quotation into these phrases, it is quite continuous in the Epistle. It must be evident to anyone who carefully examines the parallel passages that "the words of the Lord Jesus" in the Epistle cannot have been derived from our Gospels. *Note* Not only is there no similar consecutive discourse in them, but the scattered phrases which are pointed out as presenting superficial similarity with the quotation are markedly different both in thought and language. In it, as in the "beatitudes" of the "Sermon on the Mount" in the first Gospel, the construction is peculiar and continuous: "Do this..... in order that (*ἵνα*)....."; or, "As (*ὡς*) ye do.....so (*οὕτως*)....." The theory of a combination of passages from memory, which is usually advanced to explain such quotations, cannot serve here, for thoughts and expressions occur in the passage in the Epistle which have no parallel at all in our Gospels, and such dismembered phrases as can be collected from our first and third Synoptics, for comparison with it, follow the course of the quotation in the ensuing order: Matt. v. 7, vi. 14, part of vii. 12, phrase without parallel, first part of vii. 2, phrase without parallel, last part of vii. 2; or Luke vi. 36, last phrase of vi. 37, vi. 31, first phrase of vi. 38, first phrase of vi. 37, phrase without parallel, last phrase of vi. 38.

The only question with regard to this passage, therefore, is whether the writer quotes from an unknown written source or from tradition. He certainly merely professes to repeat "words of the Lord Jesus," and does not definitely indicate a written record; but it is much more probable, from the context, that he quotes from a gospel now no longer extant than that he derives this teaching from oral tradition. He introduces the quotation not only with a remark implying a well-known record: "Remembering the words of the Lord Jesus which he spake, teaching," etc.; but he reiterates: "For *thus* he said," in a way suggesting careful and precise quotation of the very words; and he adds at the end: "By this injunction and by these instructions let us establish ourselves, that we may walk in obedience to his holy words, thinking humbly of ourselves."<sup>1</sup> It seems improbable that the writer would so markedly have indicated a precise quotation of words of Jesus, and would so emphatically have commended them as the rule of life to the Corinthians, had these precepts been mere floating tradition, until then unstamped with written permanence. The phrase, "As ye show kindness (*χρηστεύεσθε*)," etc., which is

<sup>1</sup> Ταύτη τῇ ἐντολῇ καὶ τοῖς παραγγέλμασι τούτοις στηρίζωμεν ἑαυτοὺς εἰς τὸ πορεύεσθαι ὑπηκόους ὄντας τοῖς ἀγιοπρεπέσι λόγοις αὐτοῦ, ταπεινοφρονοῦντες.  
c. xiii.

nowhere found in our Gospels, recalls an expression quoted by Justin Martyr, apparently from a Gospel different from ours, and frequently repeated by him in the same form: "Be ye kind and merciful (*χρηστοὶ καὶ οἰκτίρμονες*) as your Father also is kind (*χρηστός*) and merciful."<sup>1</sup> In the very next chapter of the Epistle a similar reference again occurs: "Let us be kind to each other (*χρηστευσώμεθα αὐτοῖς*), according to the mercy and benignity of our Creator."<sup>2</sup> Without, however, going more minutely into this question, it is certain, from its essential variations in language, thought, and order, that the passage in the Epistle cannot be claimed as a compilation from our Gospels; and we shall presently see that some of the expressions in it which are foreign to our Gospels are elsewhere quoted by other Fathers, and there is reason to believe that these "words of the Lord Jesus" were not derived from tradition, but from a written source different from our Gospels. When the great difference which exists between the parallel passages in the first and third Synoptics, and still more between these and the second, is considered, it is easy to understand that other Gospels may have contained a version differing as much from them as they do from each other.

We likewise subjoin the next passage to which we must refer with the nearest parallels in our Synoptics. We may explain that the writer of the Epistle is rebuking the Corinthians for strifes and divisions amongst them, and for forgetting that they "are members one of another," and he continues (c. xlvi.): "Remember the words of our Lord Jesus; for he said:—"

EPISTLE, XLVI.	MATTHEW.	LUKE.
Woe to that man ;	xxvi. 24. Woe to that man by whom the Son of Man is delivered up ; (it were) well for him if that man had not been born.	xvii. 1...but woe... through whom they (offences) come.
(it were) well for him if he had not been born (rather) than that he should offend one of my elect ;	xviii. 6. But whoso shall offend one of these little ones which believe in me, it were profitable for him that a great millstone were suspended upon his neck, and that he were drowned in the depth of the sea.	xvii. 2. It were advantageous for him that a great millstone were hanged about his neck, and he cast in the sea, (rather) than that he offend one of these little ones.
it were) better for him (that) a millstone should be attached (to him) and he should be drowned in the sea, (rather) than that he should pervert one of my elect.		

Mark xiv. 21.....but woe to that man by whom the Son of Man is delivered

<sup>1</sup> *Apol.*, i. 15, and again twice in *Dial.* 96.

<sup>2</sup> c. xiv.



up, (it were) well for him if that man had not been born.....ix. 42. And whosoever shall offend one of these little ones which believe in me, it is well for him rather that a great millstone were hanged about his neck, and he thrown in the sea.

ΕΠΙΣΤΟΛΗ, XLVI.	ΜΑΤΘΑΙΟΥ.	ΛΟΥΚΑ.
Οὐαὶ τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ ἐκείνῳ·	XXVI. 24 οὐαὶ δὲ τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ ἐκείνῳ διὸ οὗ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου παραδίδοται·	XVII. 1 οὐαὶ δὲ δι' οὗ ἔρχεται. (τὰ σκάνδαλα) <sup>1</sup>
καλὸν ἦν αὐτῷ εἰ οὐκ ἐγεννήθη	καλὸν ἦν αὐτῷ εἰ οὐκ ἐγεννήθη ὁ ἄνθρωπος ἐκεῖνος. XVIII. 6 ὁ δὲ δ' ἂν	XVII. 2
ἢ ἕνα τῶν ἐκλεκτῶν μου σκανδαλίσαι·	σκανδαλίση ἕνα τῶν μικρῶν τούτων τῶν πιστευόντων εἰς ἐμέ,	λυσίτελεῖ αὐτῷ εἰ
κρεῖττον ἦν αὐτῷ περιτεθῆναι μύλον,	συμφέρει αὐτῷ ἵνα κρεμασθῇ μύλος ὄνικος περὶ τὸν τράχηλον αὐτοῦ	μύλος ὄνικος <sup>2</sup> περίκειται περὶ τὸν τράχηλον αὐτοῦ καὶ ἔρριπται
καὶ καταποντισθῆναι	καὶ καταποντισθῆναι ἐν τῷ πελάγει	καὶ ἔρριπται
εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν, ἢ ἕνα τῶν ἐκλεκτῶν μου διαστρέψαι.	τῆς θαλάσσης.	εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν, ἢ ἵνα σκανδαλίση ἕνα <sup>3</sup> τῶν μικρῶν τούτων.

This quotation is clearly not from our Gospels, but must be assigned to a different written source. The writer would scarcely refer the Corinthians to such words of Jesus if they were merely traditional. It is neither a combination of texts nor a quotation from memory. The language throughout is markedly different from any passage in the Synoptics, and to present even a superficial parallel it is necessary to take a fragment of the discourse of Jesus at the Last Supper regarding the traitor who should deliver him up (Matt. xxvi. 24), and join it to a fragment of his remarks in connection with the little child whom he set in the midst (xviii. 6). The parallel passage in Luke has not the opening words of the passage in the Epistle at all, and the portion which it contains (xvii. 2) is separated from the context in which it stands in the first Gospel, and which explains its meaning. If we contrast the parallel passages in the three Synoptics, their differences of context are very suggestive; and, without referring to their numerous and important variations in detail, the confusion amongst them is evidence of very varying tradition.<sup>4</sup> This alone would make the existence of another form like that quoted in the Epistle before us more than probable.

Tischendorf, in a note to his statement that Clement nowhere

<sup>1</sup> *The Cod. Sin.* and *Cod. D.* (Bezae), insert *πλὴν* before *οὐαὶ*.

<sup>2</sup> *Cod. Sin.* and *D.* read *λίθος μυλικὸς* instead of *μύλος*.

<sup>3</sup> The Vatican (B.) and Sinaitic, as well as most of the other Codices, put *ἕνα* at the end of the phrase.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Matt. xviii. 1-8; Mark ix. 33-43; Luke ix. 46-48, 49-50, xvii. 1-3.

refers to the Gospels, quotes the passage we are now considering, the only one to which he alludes, and says: "These words are expressly cited as 'words of Jesus our Lord,' but they denote much more oral apostolic tradition than a use of the parallel passages in Matt. (xxvi. 24; xviii. 6) and Luke (xvii. 2)."<sup>1</sup> It is now, of course, impossible to determine finally whether the passage was actually derived from tradition or from a written source different from our Gospels; but, in either case, the fact is that the Epistle not only does not afford the slightest evidence for the existence of any of our Gospels, but, from only making use of tradition or an apocryphal work as the source of information regarding words of Jesus, it is decidedly opposed to the pretensions made on behalf of the Synoptics.

Before passing on, we may, in the briefest way possible, refer to one or two other passages, with the view of further illustrating the character of the quotations in this Epistle. There are many passages cited which are not found in the Old Testament, and others which have no parallels in the New. At the beginning of the very chapter in which the words which we have just been considering occur there is the following quotation: "It is written: Cleave to the holy, for they who cleave to them shall be made holy,"<sup>2</sup> the source of which is unknown. In a previous chapter the writer says: "And our Apostles knew, through our Lord Jesus Christ, that there will be contention regarding the name (*ὀνόματος*, office, dignity) of the episcopate."<sup>3</sup> What was the writer's authority for this statement? We find Justin Martyr quoting, as an express prediction of Jesus: "There shall be schisms and heresies,"<sup>4</sup> which is not contained in our Gospels, but evidently derived from an uncanonical source—a fact rendered more apparent by the occurrence of a similar passage in the *Clementine Homilies*, still more closely bearing upon our Epistle: "For there shall be, as the Lord said, false apostles, false prophets, heresies, desires for supremacy."<sup>5</sup> Hegesippus also speaks in a similar way: "From these came the false Christs, false prophets, false apostles who divided the unity of the Church."<sup>6</sup> As

<sup>1</sup> *Wann wurden, u. s. w.*, p. 21, anm. 2. Cf. Lightfoot, *Apost. Fathers*, ii. *Clement of Rome*, 1890, p. 141.

<sup>2</sup> Γέγαπται γάρ: "Κολλᾶσθε τοῖς ἁγίοις, ὅτι οἱ κολλώμενοι αὐτοῖς ἁγιασθήσονται. c. xlv., cf. c. xxx. A similar expression occurs in *Clement of Alexandria*. *Strom.* v. 8, § 53.

<sup>3</sup> Καὶ οἱ ἀπόστολοι ἡμῶν ἐγνώσαν διὰ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὅτι ἔρις ἔσται ἐπὶ τοῦ ὀνόματος τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς. C. xlv., cf. xlv., xlv.

<sup>4</sup> Ἔσονται σχίσματα καὶ αἵρέσεις. *Dial. c. Tryph.* 35, cf. 51.

<sup>5</sup> Ἔσονται γάρ, ὡς ὁ κύριος εἶπεν, ψευδαπόστολοι, ψευδεῖς προφήται, αἵρέσεις, φιλαρχίαι. *Clem. Hom.*, xvi. 21; cf. *Constit. Apost.*, vi. 13; *Clem. Recog.*, iv. 34.

<sup>6</sup> Ἀπὸ τούτων ψευδόχριστοι ψευδοπροφήται, ψευδαπόστολοι, οἵτινες ἐμέρισαν τὴν ἑνωσιν τῆς ἐκκλησίας, κ, τ. λ. Eusebius, *H. E.*, iv. 22.

Note  
all this.

Note.

Note

Hegesippus, and in all probability Justin Martyr and the author of the *Clementines*, made use of the Gospel according to the Hebrews, or to Peter, it is probable that these Gospels contained passages to which the words of the Epistle may refer.<sup>1</sup> It may be well to point out that the author also cites a passage from the fourth Book of Ezra, ii. 16 :<sup>2</sup> "And I shall remember the good day, and I shall raise you from your tombs."<sup>3</sup> Ezra reads : "*Et resuscitabo mortuos de locis suis et de monumentis educam illos,*" etc. The first part of the quotation in the Epistle, of which we have only given the latter clause above, is taken from Isaiah xxvi. 20 ; but there can be no doubt that the above is from this apocryphal book, which, as we shall see, was much used in the early Church.

We now turn to the so-called "Epistle of Barnabas," another interesting relic of the early Church, many points in whose history have considerable analogy with that of the Epistle of pseudo-Clement. The letter itself bears no author's name, is not dated from any place, and is not addressed to any special community. Towards the end of the second century, however, tradition began to ascribe it to Barnabas, the companion of Paul.<sup>4</sup> The first writer who mentions it is Clement of Alexandria, who calls its author several times the "Apostle Barnabas";<sup>5</sup> and Eusebius says that he gave an account of it in one of his works now no longer extant.<sup>6</sup> Origen also refers to it, calling it a "Catholic Epistle," and quoting it as Scripture.<sup>7</sup> We have already seen in the case of the Epistles ascribed to Clement of Rome—and, as we proceed, we shall become only too familiar with the fact—the singular facility with which, in the total absence of critical discrimination, spurious writings were ascribed by the Fathers to Apostles and their followers. In many cases such writings were deliberately inscribed with names well known in the Church ; but both in the case of the two Epistles to the Corinthians and the letter we are now considering no such pious fraud was attempted, nor was it necessary. Credulous piety, which attributed writings to every Apostle, and even to Jesus himself, soon found authors for each anonymous work of an edifying character. To Barnabas, the

<sup>1</sup> See other instances in chapters xvii., xxiii., xxvi., xxvii., xxx., xlii., xlvii., etc.

<sup>2</sup> 2 *Esdras* of the English authorised *Apocrypha*.

<sup>3</sup> καὶ μνησθήσομαι ἡμέρας ἀγαθῆς, καὶ ἀναστήσω ὑμᾶς ἐκ τῶν θηκῶν ὑμῶν. c. l.

<sup>4</sup> Acts iv. 36, xi. 22 f., 30, xii. 25, etc.

<sup>5</sup> *Stromata* ii., 6, § 31, 7, § 35, 20, § 116, v. 10, § 64, cf. 15, § 67, 18, § 84, v. § 52.

<sup>6</sup> *H. E.*, vi. 14, cf. 13.

<sup>7</sup> γέγραπται δὲ ἐν τῇ Βαρνάβα καθολικῇ ἐπιστολῇ, κ. τ. λ. *Contra Cels.*, i. 63, cf. *De Princip.*, iii. 2, § 4.

"Catholic" //

friend of Paul, not only this Epistle was referred, but he was also reported by Tertullian and others to be the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews;<sup>1</sup> and an apocryphal "Gospel according to Barnabas," said to have had close affinity with our first Synoptic, is condemned, along with many others, in the decretal of Gelasius.<sup>2</sup> Eusebius, however, classes the so-called "Epistle of Barnabas" amongst the spurious books (ἐν τοῖς νόθοις),<sup>3</sup> and elsewhere also speaks of it as uncanonical.<sup>4</sup> Jerome mentions it as read amongst apocryphal writings.<sup>5</sup> Had the Epistle been seriously regarded as a work of the "Apostle" Barnabas, it could scarcely have failed to attain canonical rank. That it was highly valued by the early Church is shown by the fact that it stands, along with the Shepherd of Hermas, after the canonical books of the New Testament in the *Codex Sinaiticus*, which is probably the most ancient MS. of them now known. In the earlier days of criticism some writers, without much question, adopted the traditional view as to the authorship of the Epistle; but the great mass of critics are now agreed in asserting that the composition, which itself is perfectly anonymous, cannot be attributed to Barnabas, the friend and fellow-worker of Paul. Those who maintain the former opinion date the Epistle about A.D. 70-73, or even earlier; but this is scarcely the view of any living critic. There are many indications in the Epistle which render such a date impossible; but we do not propose to go into the argument minutely, for it is generally admitted that, whilst there is a clear limit further back than which the Epistle cannot be set, there is little or no certainty how far into the second century its composition may not reasonably be advanced. Critics are divided upon the point; a few are disposed to date the Epistle about the end of the first or beginning of the second century, while a still greater number assign it to the reign of Hadrian (A.D. 117-138); and others, not without reason, consider that it exhibits marks of a still later period. It is probable that it is more or less interpolated. Until the discovery of the Sinaitic MS. a portion of the "Epistle of Barnabas" was only known through an ancient Latin version, the first four and a half chapters of the Greek having been lost. The Greek text,

Note

<sup>1</sup> *De Pudic.*, § 20; Hieron., *De vir. ill.* 5. Many modern writers have supported the tradition. Cf. Credner, *Gesch. N. T. Kanon*, p. 175 ff.; Thiersch, *Die Kirche im ap. Zeit.*, p. 199 ff.; Ullmann, *Theol. Stud. u. Krit.*, 1828, p. 377 ff.; Wieseler, *Unters. üb. d. Hebräerbrief*, 1861, i., p. 32 ff.

<sup>2</sup> *Decretum de libris recipiendis et non recipiendis*, in Credner, *Zur Gesch. des Kanons*, 1847, p. 215. Cf. Fabricius, *Cod. Apocr. N. T.*, i., p. 341; Grabe, *Spicil. Patr.*, i., p. 303.

<sup>3</sup> *H. E.*, iii. 25.

<sup>4</sup> *H. E.*, vi. 14, cf. 13.

<sup>5</sup> Hieron, *De vir. ill.* 6, *Comment.* in *Ezech.*, xliii. 19.

however, is now complete, although often very corrupt. The author quotes largely from the Old Testament, and also from apocryphal works. He nowhere mentions any book or writer of the New Testament, and, with one asserted exception, which we shall presently examine, he quotes no passage agreeing with our Gospels. We shall refer to these, commencing at once with the most important.

In the ancient Latin translation of the Epistle the only form, as we have just said, in which, until the discovery of the *Codex Sinaiticus*, the first four and a half chapters were extant, the following passage occurs: "*Adtendamus ergo, ne forte, sicut scriptum est, multi vocati pauci electi inveniamur.*"<sup>1</sup> "Let us, therefore beware lest, as it is written: Many are called, few are chosen." These words are found in our first Gospel (xxii. 14), and, as the formula by which they are here introduced—"it is written"—is generally understood to indicate a quotation from Holy Scripture, it was, and is, argued by some that here we have a passage from one of our Gospels quoted in a manner which shows that, at the time the Epistle of Barnabas was written, the "Gospel according to Matthew was already considered Holy Scripture."<sup>2</sup> Whilst this portion of the text existed only in the Latin version, it was argued that the "*sicut scriptum est,*" at least, must be an interpolation, and in any case that it could not be deliberately applied, at that date, to a passage in any writings of the New Testament. On the discovery of the Sinaitic MS., however, the words were found in the Greek text in that Codex: προσέχωμεν, μήποτε, ὡς γέγραπται, πολλοὶ κλητοί, ὀλίγοι δὲ ἐκλεκτοὶ εὑρεθῶμεν. The question, therefore, is so far modified that, however much we may suspect the Greek text of interpolation, it must be accepted as the basis of discussion that this passage, whatever its value, exists in the oldest, and indeed only (and this point must not be forgotten), complete MS. of the Greek Epistle.

Now, with regard to the value of the expression "it is written," it may be remarked that in no case could its use in the Epistle of Barnabas indicate more than individual opinion, and it could not, for reasons to be presently given, be considered to represent the decision of the Church. In the very same chapter in which the formula is used in connection with the passage we are considering, it is also employed to introduce a quotation from the Book of Enoch,<sup>3</sup> *περὶ οὗ γέγραπται, ὡς Ἐνώχ λέγει*, and elsewhere (c. xii.) he quotes from another apocryphal book<sup>4</sup> as one of the prophets. "Again, he refers to the Cross of Christ in another prophet,

<sup>1</sup> Ch. iv.

<sup>2</sup> Tischendorf, *Wann wurden, u. s. w.*, p. 92 ff.

<sup>3</sup> Enoch lxxxix. 61 f., xc. 17. This book is again quoted in ch. xvi.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. 4 Ezra iv. 33, v. 5.

saying: 'And when shall these things come to pass?' and the Lord saith: When,' etc.....*ἐν ἄλλῳ προφήτῃ λέγοντι.....λέγει Κύριος· κ.τ.λ.*" He also quotes (ch. vi.) the apocryphal "Book of Wisdom" as Holy Scripture, and in like manner several other unknown works. When it is remembered that the Epistle of Clement to the Corinthians, the Shepherd of Hermas, the Epistle of Barnabas itself, and many other apocryphal works, have been quoted by the Fathers as Holy Scripture, the distinctive value of such an expression may be understood.

With this passing remark, however, we proceed to say that this supposed quotation from Matthew as Holy Scripture, by proving too much, destroys its own value as evidence. The generality of competent and impartial critics are agreed that it is impossible to entertain the idea that one of our Gospels could have held the rank of Holy Scripture at the date of this Epistle, seeing that, for more than half a century after, the sharpest line was drawn between the writings of the Old Testament and of the New, and the former alone quoted as, or accorded the consideration of, Holy Scripture. If this were actually a quotation from our first Gospel, already in the position of Holy Scripture, it would, indeed, be astonishing that the Epistle, putting out of the question other Christian writings for half a century after it, teeming, as it does, with extracts from the Old Testament, and from known and unknown apocryphal works, should thus limit its use of the Gospel to a few words, totally neglecting the rich store which it contains, and quoting, on the other hand, sayings of Jesus not recorded at all in any of our Synoptics. It is most improbable that, if the author of the "Epistle of Barnabas" was acquainted with any one of our Gospels, and considered it an inspired and canonical work, he could have neglected it in such a manner. The peculiarity of the quotation which he is supposed to make, which we shall presently point out, renders such limitation to it doubly singular upon any such hypothesis. The unreasonable nature of the assertion, however, will become more apparent as we proceed with our examination, and perceive that none of the early writers quote our Gospels, if they knew them at all, but, on the other hand, make use of other works, and that the inference that Matthew was considered Holy Scripture, therefore, rests solely upon this quotation of half-a-dozen words.

The application of such a formula to a supposed quotation from one of our Gospels, in so isolated an instance, led to the belief that, even if the passage were taken from our first Synoptic, the author of the Epistle, in quoting it, laboured under the impression that it was derived from some prophetic book. We daily see how difficult it is to trace the source even of the most familiar quotations. Instances of such confusion of memory are frequent

in the writings of the Fathers, and many can be pointed out in the New Testament itself. For instance, in Matt. xxvii. 9 f. the passage from Zechariah xi. 12, 13, is attributed to Jeremiah; in Mark i. 2 a quotation from Malachi iii. 1 is ascribed to Isaiah. In 1 Corinthians ii. 9 a passage is quoted as Holy Scripture which is not found in the Old Testament at all, but which is taken, as Origen and Jerome state, from an apocryphal work, "The Revelation of Elias";<sup>1</sup> and the passage is similarly quoted by the so-called Epistle of Clement to the Corinthians (xxxiv.). Then in what prophet did the author of the first Gospel find the words (xiii. 35): "That it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophet,<sup>2</sup> saying, I will open my mouth in parables; I will utter things which have been kept secret from the foundation of the world"?

Orelli,<sup>3</sup> afterwards followed by many others, suggested that the quotation was probably intended for one in 4 Ezra viii. 3: "*Nam multi creati sunt, pauci autem salvabuntur.*"<sup>4</sup> "For many are created, but few shall be saved." Bretschneider proposed, as an emendation of the passage in Ezra, the substitution of "*vocati*" for "*creati*"; but, however plausible, his argument did not meet with much favour. Along with this passage was also suggested a similar expression in 4 Ezra ix. 15: "*Plures sunt qui pereunt, quam qui salvabuntur.*" "There are more who perish than who shall be saved."<sup>5</sup> The Greek of the three passages may read as follows:—

Mt. xxii. 14.	Πολλοὶ γὰρ εἰσιν, κλητοί, ὀλίγοι δὲ ἐκλεκτοί.
Ep. Bar. iv.	Πολλοὶ κλητοί, ὀλίγοι δὲ ἐκλεκτοί.
4 Ezra, viii. 3	Πολλοὶ γὰρ ἐγεννήθησαν, ὀλίγοι δὲ σωθήσονται.

There can be no doubt that the sense of the reading in 4 Ezra is exactly that of the Epistle, but the language is somewhat different. We must not forget, however, that the original Greek of 4 Ezra is lost, and that we are wholly dependent on the versions and MSS. extant, regarding whose numerous variations and great corruption there are no differences of opinion. Orelli's theory, moreover, is supported by the fact that the Epistle, elsewhere (c. xii.), quotes from 4 Ezra (iv. 33; v. 5).

On examining the passage as it occurs in our first Synoptic, we are, at the very outset, struck by the singular fact that this short

<sup>1</sup> Origen, *Tract.*, xxxv., § 17 *Matt.*; Hieron. *ad Isaiaē*, lxiv., *Epist.* ci.; cf. Fabricius, *Cod. Apocr.*, N. T., i., p. 342.

<sup>2</sup> In the *Cod. Sinaiticus* a later hand has here inserted "Isaiah."

<sup>3</sup> *Selecta Patr.*, p. 5. <sup>4</sup> Cf. Volkmar, *H buch Einl. Apocr.* ii., p. 105.

<sup>5</sup> We might also point to the verse x. 97, "For thou art blessed above many, and art called near to the Most High, and so are but few." "*Tu enim beatus es præ multis, et vocatus es apud Altissimum, sicut et pauci.*"

saying appears twice in that Gospel with a different context, and in each case without any propriety of application to what precedes it, whilst it is not found at all in either of the other two Synoptics. The first time we meet with it is at the close of the parable of the labourers in the vineyard.<sup>1</sup> The householder engages the labourers at different hours of the day, and pays those who had worked but one hour the same wages as those who had borne the burden and heat of the day, and the reflection at the close is (xx. 16): "Thus the last shall be first, and the first last; for many are called, but few chosen." It is perfectly evident that neither of these sayings, but especially not that with which we are concerned, has any connection with the parable at all. There is no question of many or few, or of selection or rejection; all the labourers are engaged and paid alike. If there be a moral at all to the parable, it is the justification of the master: "Is it not lawful for me to do what I will with mine own?" It is impossible to imagine a saying more irrelevant to its context than "many are called, but few chosen," in such a place. The passage occurs again (xxii. 14) in connection with the parable of the king who made a marriage for his son. The guests who are at first invited refuse to come, and are destroyed by the king's armies; but the wedding is, nevertheless, "furnished with guests" by gathering together as many as are found in the highways. A new episode commences when the king comes in to see the guests (v. 11). He observes a man there who has not on a wedding garment, and he desires the servants to (v. 13) "Bind him hand and foot, and cast him into the darkness without," where "there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth";<sup>2</sup> and then comes our passage (v. 14), "For many are called, but few chosen." Now, whether applied to the first or to the latter part of the parable, the saying is irrelevant. The guests first called were in fact chosen as much as the last, but themselves refused to come, and of all those who, being "called" from the highways and byways, ultimately furnished the wedding with guests in their stead, only one was rejected. It is clear that the facts here distinctly contradict the moral that "few are chosen." In both places the saying is, as it were, "dragged in by the hair." On examination, however, we find that the oldest MSS. of the New Testament omit the sentence from Matthew xx. 16. It is neither found in the Sinaitic nor Vatican codices, and whilst it has not the support of the *Codex Alexandrinus*, which is defective at the

<sup>1</sup> Matt. xx. 1-16.

<sup>2</sup> This is not the place to criticise the expectation of finding a wedding garment on a guest hurried in from highways and byways, or the punishment inflicted for such an offence, as questions affecting the character of the parable.



part, nor of the Dublin rescript (z), which omits it, many other MSS. are also without it. The total irrelevancy of the saying to its context, its omission by the oldest authorities from Matt. xx. 16, where it appears in later MSS., and its total absence from both of the other Gospels, must at once strike everyone as peculiar, and as very unfortunate, to say the least of it, for those who make extreme assertions with regard to its supposed quotation by the Epistle of Barnabas. Weizsäcker, with great probability, suggests that in this passage we have merely a well-known proverb,<sup>1</sup> which the author of the first Gospel has introduced into his work from some uncanonical or other source, and placed in the mouth of Jesus.<sup>2</sup> Certainly, under the circumstances, it can scarcely be maintained in its present context as a historical saying of Jesus. Ewald, who naturally omits it from Matthew xx. 16, ascribes the parable: xx. 1-16, as well as that: xxii. 1-14, in which it stands, originally to the *Spruchsammlung*<sup>3</sup> or collection of discourses, out of which, with intermediate works, he considers that our first Gospel was composed.<sup>4</sup> However this may be, there is, it seems to us, good reason for believing that it was not originally a part of these parables, and that it is not in that sense historical; and there is, therefore, no ground for asserting that it may not have been derived by the author of the Gospel from some older work, from which also it may have come into the "Epistle of Barnabas."<sup>5</sup>

*Note* There is, however, another passage which deserves to be mentioned. The Epistle has the following quotation: "Again, I will show thee how, in regard to us, the Lord saith, He made a new creation in the last times. The Lord saith, Behold I make the first as the last."<sup>6</sup> Even Tischendorf does not claim this as a

*n.* <sup>1</sup> An illustration of such proverbial sayings is found in the *Phaedo* of Plato: *εἰσὶ γὰρ δὴ, φασὶν οἱ περὶ τὰς τελετὰς, ναρθηκοφόροι μὲν πολλοί, βάκχοι δὲ τε παῦροι*, *ed Steph.*, i., p. 69, "For many, as they say in the Mysteries, are the thyrsus-bearers, but few are the mystics." Cf. Jowett, *Plato*, i., p. 441, p. 381.

<sup>2</sup> *Zur Kr. des Barnabasbr.*, p. 34 f. [In the fourth edition of his work on the Canon, Dr. Westcott very fairly states in a note: "On the other hand, it is just to add that the proverbial form of the saying ('Many are called, but few chosen') is such as to admit of the supposition that it may have been derived by Barnabas from some older book than St. Matthew," p. 51, note 2.]

<sup>3</sup> *Die drei ersten Euv.*, 1850. <sup>4</sup> *Jahrb. bibl. Wiss.*, ii., 1849, p. 191 ff.

*ok* <sup>5</sup> Professor A. D. Loman, who impartially and ably discusses this quotation, is unable to admit that the passage is taken from our first Synoptic; and he conjectures that the common source from which both the Synoptist and the author of the Epistle may have derived the saying may be a work which he supposes to be referred to in Luke xi. 49, *Theol. Tijdschrift*, 1872, p. 196 f.; cf. 1867, p. 553, p. 559.

<sup>6</sup> Πάλιν σοι ἐπιδείξω, πῶς πρὸς ἡμᾶς λέγει κύριος· δεύτεραν πλάσιν ἐπ' ἐσχάτων ἐποίησεν. λέγει κύριος· Ἴδου, ποιῶ τὰ ἔσχατα ὡς τὰ πρῶτα. c. vi.

quotation of Matt. xx. 16,<sup>1</sup> "Thus the last shall be first and the first last" (οὕτως ἔσονται οἱ ἔσχατοι πρῶτοι καὶ οἱ πρῶτοι ἔσχατοι), the sense of which is quite different. The application of the saying in this place in the first, and, indeed, in the other, Synoptic Gospels is evidently quite false, and depends merely on the ring of words and not of ideas. In xix. 30 it is quoted a second time, quite irrelevantly, with some variation: "But many first shall be last, and last first" (πολλοὶ δὲ ἔσονται πρῶτοι ἔσχατοι καὶ ἔσχατοι πρῶτοι). Now, it will be remembered that at xx. 16 it occurs in several MSS. in connection with "Many are called, but few are chosen," although the oldest codices omit the latter passage, and most critics consider it interpolated. The separate quotation of these two passages by the author of the Epistle, with so marked a variation in the second, renders it most probable that he found both in the source from which he quotes. We have, however, more than sufficiently discussed this passage. The author of the Epistle does not indicate any source from which he makes his quotation; and the mere existence in the first Synoptic of a proverbial saying like this does not in the least involve the conclusion that it is necessarily the writing from which the quotation was derived, more especially as apocryphal works are repeatedly cited in the Epistle. If it be maintained that the saying is really historical, it is obvious that the prescriptive right of our Synoptic is at once excluded, and it may have been the common property of a score of evangelical works.

There can be no doubt that many Scriptural texts have crept into early Christian writings which originally had no place there; and where attendant circumstances are suspicious, it is always well to remember the fact. An instance of the interpolation of which we speak is found in the "Epistle of Barnabas." In one place, the phrase, "Give to everyone that asketh of thee" (παντὶ τῷ αἰτοῦντί σε δίδου),<sup>2</sup> occurs, not as a quotation, but merely woven into the Greek text as it existed before the discovery of the Sinaitic MS. This phrase is the same as the precept in Luke vi. 30, although it was argued by some that, as no other trace of the third Gospel existed in the Epistle, it was more probably an alteration of the text of Matt. v. 42. Omitting the phrase from the passage in the Epistle, the text read as follows: "Thou shalt not hesitate to give, neither shalt thou murmur when thou givest.....so shalt thou know who is the good Recompenser of the reward." The supposed quotation, inserted where we have left a

<sup>1</sup> Dr. Westcott does not make any reference to it either. [In the 4th ed. of his work on the Canon (p. 62) he expresses an opinion that it is a reference "to some passage of the O. T.," and suggests Ezek. xxxvi. 11.]

<sup>2</sup> Ch. xix.

blank, really interrupted the sense, and repeated the previous injunction. The oldest MS., the *Codex Sinaiticus*, omits the quotation, and so ends the question, but it is afterwards inserted by another hand. Some pious scribe, in fact, seeing the relation of the passage to the Gospel, had added the words in the margin as a gloss, and they afterwards found their way into the text. In this manner very many similar glosses have crept into texts which they were originally intended to illustrate.<sup>1</sup>

Tischendorf, who does not allude to this, lays much stress upon the following passage: "But when he selected His own apostles, who should preach His Gospel, who were sinners above all sin, in order that he might show that He came not to call the righteous, but sinners, then He manifested Himself to be the Son of God."<sup>2</sup>

*Note* | We may remark that in the common Greek text the words "to repentance" were inserted after "sinners," but they are not found in the Sinaitic MS. In like manner many Codices insert them in Matt. ix. 13 and Mark ii. 17, but they are not found in some of the oldest MSS., and are generally rejected. Tischendorf considers them a later addition both to the text of the Gospel and of the Epistle.<sup>3</sup> But this very fact is suggestive. It is clear that a supposed quotation has been deliberately adjusted to what was considered to be the text of the Gospel. Why should the whole phrase not be equally an interpolation? We shall presently see that there is reason to think that it is so. Although there is no quotation in the passage, who, asks Tischendorf,<sup>4</sup> could mistake the words as they stand in Matt. ix. 13, "For I came not to call the righteous, but sinners"? This passage is referred to by Origen in his work against Celsus, in a way which indicates that the supposed quotation did not exist in his copy. Origen says: "And as Celsus has called the Apostles of Jesus infamous men, saying that they were tax-gatherers and worthless sailors, we have to remark on this, that, etc.....Now, in the Catholic Epistle of Barnabas, from which, perhaps, Celsus derived the statement that the Apostles were infamous and wicked men, it is written that 'Jesus selected his own Apostles, who were sinners above all sin,'"<sup>5</sup> and then he goes on to quote the expression of Peter to Jesus (Luke v. 8), and then 1 Timothy i. 15; but he nowhere

*Note.* | <sup>1</sup> The phrase, "Give to everyone that asketh of thee," occurs also in the "Teaching of the Twelve Apostles," i., § 5, with which little treatise, published since the complete edition of this work was issued, several other passages in the Epistle agree—cf. p. 149 ff.

<sup>2</sup> "Ὅτε δὲ τοὺς ἰδίους ἀποστόλους τοὺς μέλλοντας κηρύσσειν τὸ εὐαγγέλιον αὐτοῦ ἐξελέξατο, ὄντας ὑπὲρ πᾶσαν ἀμαρτίαν ἀνομωτέρους, ἵνα δείξῃ, ὅτι οὐκ ἤλθεν καλέσαι δικαίους, ἀλλὰ ἀμαρτωλοὺς, τότε ἐφάνέρωσεν ἑαυτὸν εἶναι υἱὸν θεοῦ. c. v.

<sup>3</sup> *Wann wurden*, u. s. w., p. 96, anm. 1.

<sup>4</sup> *Ib.*, p. 96.

<sup>5</sup> *Contra Cels.*, i. 63.

refers to the supposed quotation in the Epistle. Now, if we read the passage without the quotation, we have: "But when he selected his own Apostles who should preach his Gospel, who were sinners above all sin.....then he manifested himself to be the Son of God." Here a pious scribe very probably added in the margin the gloss, "in order that he might show that he came not to call the righteous, but sinners," to explain the passage; and, as in the case of the phrase, "Give to every one that asketh of thee," the gloss became subsequently incorporated with the text. The Epistle, however, goes on to give the only explanation which the author intended, and which clashes with that of the scribe. "For, if he had not come in the flesh, how could men have been saved by beholding him? Seeing that looking on the sun that shall cease to be, the work of his hands, they have not even power to endure his rays. Accordingly, the Son of Man came in the flesh for this, that he might bring to a head the number of their sins who had persecuted to death his prophets."<sup>1</sup> The argument of Origen bears out this view, for he does not at all take the explanation of the gloss as to why Jesus chose his disciples from such a class, but he reasons: "What is there strange, therefore, that Jesus, being minded to manifest to the race of men his power to heal souls, should have selected infamous and wicked men, and should have elevated them so far that they became a pattern of the purest virtue to those who were brought by their persuasion to the Gospel of Christ?"<sup>2</sup> The argument, both of the author of the Epistle and of Origen, is different from that suggested by the phrase under examination, and we consider it a mere gloss introduced into the text; which, as the *εἰς μετάνοιαν* shows, has, in the estimation of Tischendorf himself, been deliberately altered. Even if it originally formed part of the text, however, it would be wrong to affirm that it affords proof of the use or existence of the first Gospel. The words of Jesus in Matt. ix. 12-14 evidently belong to the oldest tradition of the Gospel, and, in fact, Ewald ascribes them, apart from the remainder of the chapter, originally to the Spruchsammlung, from which, with two intermediate books, he considers that our present Matthew was composed.<sup>3</sup> Nothing can be more certain than that such sayings, if they be admitted to be historical at all, must have existed in many other works, and the mere fact of their happening to be also in one of the Gospels which has survived cannot prove its use, or even its existence at the time the Epistle of Barnabas was written, more especially as the phrase does not occur as a quotation, and there is no indication of the source from which it was derived.

Tischendorf, however, finds a further analogy between the

<sup>1</sup> c. v.

<sup>2</sup> *Contra Cels.*, i. 63.

<sup>3</sup> *Die drei ersten Evv.*, p. 15, p. 1.

Epistle and the Gospel of Matthew, in ch. xii. "Since, therefore, in the future they were to say that Christ is the son of David, fearing and perceiving clearly the error of the wicked, David himself prophesies: 'The Lord said unto my Lord, sit at my right hand until I make thine enemies thy footstool.'" Tischendorf, upon this, inquires, "Could Barnabas so write without the supposition that his readers had Matt. xxii. 41 ff. before them, and does not such a supposition likewise infer the actual authority of Matthew's Gospel?"<sup>1</sup> Such rapid argument and extreme conclusions are startling indeed; but, in his haste, our critic has forgotten to state the whole case. The author of the Epistle has been elaborately showing that the Cross of Christ is repeatedly typified in the Old Testament, and at the commencement of the chapter, after quoting the passage from 4 Ezra iv. 33, v. 5, he points to the case of Moses, to whose heart "the spirit speaks that he should make a form of the cross," by stretching forth his arms in supplication, and so long as he did so Israel prevailed over their enemies; and again he typified the cross when he set up the brazen serpent upon which the people might look and be healed. Then, that which Moses as a prophet said to Joshua (Jesus), the son of Nave, when he gave him that name, was solely for the purpose that all the people might hear that the Father would reveal all things regarding his Son to the son of Nave. This name being given to him when he was sent to spy out the land, Moses said: "Take a book in thy hands, and write what the Lord saith, that the Son of God will in the last days cut off by the roots all the house of Amelek." This, of course, is a falsification of the passage, Exodus xvii. 14, for the purpose of making it declare Jesus to be the "Son of God." Then, proceeding in the same strain, he says: "Behold again, Jesus is not the son of Man, but the Son of God, manifested in the type and in the flesh. Since, therefore, in the future, they were to say that Christ is the son of David" (and here follows the passage we are discussing) "fearing and perceiving clearly the error of the wicked, David himself prophesied: 'The Lord said unto my Lord, sit at my right hand until I make thine enemies thy footstool.'" And again, thus speaks Isaiah: 'The Lord said to Christ my Lord, whose right hand I have held, that the nations may obey Him, and I will break in pieces the strength of kings.' Behold how David calleth Him Lord, and the Son of God." And here end the chapter and the subject. Now it is quite clear that the passage occurs, not as a reference to any such dilemma as that in Matt. xxii. 41 ff., but simply as one of many passages which, at the commencement of our era, were considered prophetic declarations of the divinity of

<sup>1</sup> *Wann wurden, u. s. w.*, p. 96.

Christ, in opposition to the expectation of the Jews that the Messiah was to be the son of David;<sup>1</sup> and, as we have seen, in order to prove his point, the author alters the text. To argue that such a passage of a Psalm, quoted in such a manner in this Epistle, proves the use of our first Synoptic is in the highest degree arbitrary.

We have already pointed out that the author quotes apocryphal works as Holy Scripture, and we may now add that he likewise cites words of Jesus which are nowhere found in our Gospels. For instance, in ch. vii. we meet with the following expressions directly attributed to Jesus. "Thus he says: 'Those who desire to behold me and to attain my kingdom must through tribulation and suffering receive me.'" Hilgenfeld<sup>2</sup> compares this with another passage, similar in sense, in 4 Ezra vii. 14; but in any case it is not a quotation from our Gospels; and, with so many passages in them suitable to his purpose, it would be amazing if he knew and held Matthew in the consideration which Tischendorf asserts, that he should neglect their stores, and go elsewhere for such quotations. There is nothing in this Epistle worthy of the name of evidence even of the existence of our Gospels.

The "Shepherd" of Hermas is another work which very nearly secured permanent canonical rank with the writings of the New Testament. It was quoted as Holy Scripture by the Fathers, and held to be divinely inspired, and it was publicly read in the churches.<sup>3</sup> It has a place with the "Epistle of Barnabas," in the *Sinaitic Codex* after the canonical books. In early times it was attributed to the Hermas who is mentioned in the Epistle to the Romans xiv. 14, in consequence of a mere conjecture to that effect by Origen;<sup>4</sup> but the Canon of Muratori<sup>5</sup> confidently ascribes it to a brother of Pius, Bishop of Rome, and, at least, there does not seem any ground for the statement of Origen. It may have been written about the middle of the second century or a little earlier.

Tischendorf dismisses this important memorial of the early Christian Church with a note of two lines, for it has no quota-

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Gfrörer, *Das Jahrh. des Heils*, ii., p. 219 ff., 258 ff., 292 ff.

<sup>2</sup> *Die Proph. Ezra u. Daniel*, p. 70.

<sup>3</sup> Irenæus, *Adv. Hær.*, iv. 20, § 2; Clemens Al., *Strom.*, i. 29, § 181, ii. 1, § 3, vi. 15, § 131; Tertullian, *De Orat.*, 12. He rejected it later. *De Pudic.*, 10; Origen, *Comm. in Rom.*, lib. x. 31, *Hom.*, viii. in Num., *Hom.* i. in Psalm 37, *De Princip.*, ii. 1, § 3, iii. 2, § 4; cf. Eusebius, *H. E.*, iii. 3, v. 8; iii. 25; Cotelier, *Patr. Ap.*, i. 68 f.

<sup>4</sup> *Puto autem quod Hermas iste sit scriptor libelli illius qui Pastor appellatur, quæ scriptura valde mihi utilis videtur, et ut puto divinitus inspirata.* In *Rom.* lib. x. 31.

<sup>5</sup> Routh, *Reliq. Sacræ*, i., p. 396; Tregelles, *Canon Murat.*, p. 20.

tions either from the Old or New Testament.<sup>1</sup> He does not even suggest that it contains any indications of acquaintance with our Gospels. The only direct quotation in the "Shepherd" is from an apocryphal work which is cited as Holy Scripture: "The Lord is nigh unto them who return to him, as it is written in Eldad and Modat, who prophesied to the people in the wilderness."<sup>2</sup> This work, which appears in the Stichometry of Nicephorus amongst the apocrypha of the Old Testament, is no longer extant.

#### THE TEACHING OF THE TWELVE APOSTLES.

In 1873, Bryennius, then Metropolitan of Serræ, and now Patriarch of Nicomedia, discovered an interesting MS. volume in the library of the Jerusalem Monastery of the Most Holy Sepulchre at Constantinople. It contained seven Greek documents, amongst which may be mentioned the Epistle of Barnabas, the first Epistle of Clement in the only complete form known, the spurious second Epistle of Clement, Epistle of Mary of Cassoboli to Ignatius the Martyr of Antioch, twelve Epistles of pseudo-Ignatius, and the "Teaching of the Twelve Apostles," with which we are now concerned. At the end of the MS. volume is the signature of the copyist, "Leon, notary and sinner," with a date which corresponds with A.D. 1056. In 1875, Bryennius published the two Epistles of Clement; but it was not until the close of 1883 that he was able to lay before the world the Greek text of the short treatise in which we are now interested,<sup>3</sup> and, as an able writer has truly remarked, it has ever since been "the spoiled child of criticism."<sup>4</sup> Bryennius himself assigns the "Teaching" to a date between A.D. 120-160.

Several ancient writers mention a work with a similar, yet different, title. The first of these is Eusebius. After speaking of the "Shepherd" of Hermas, the Apocalypse of Peter, and the Epistle of Barnabas, he adds: "the so-called 'Teachings of the Apostles'" (τῶν ἀποστόλων αἱ λεγόμεναι διδαχαί).<sup>5</sup> Somewhat later Athanasius<sup>6</sup> mentions "the so-called Teaching of the Apostles" (Διδαχὴ καλουμένη τῶν ἀποστόλων), along with other uncanonical works, such as the Wisdom of Solomon, the Wisdom of Sirach, Esther, Judith, Tobit, and the "Shepherd." Twenty years after Athanasius, Rufinus<sup>7</sup> substantially repeats his state-

<sup>1</sup> *Wann wurden, u. s. w.*, p. 182; Westcott, *On the Canon*, p. 175; Reuss, *Hist. du Canon*, p. 48 f.

<sup>2</sup> *Vis.* ii. 3; cf. Numbers xi. 26 f., Sept. Vers.

<sup>3</sup> The complete edition of this work had been published some years earlier, so that we now deal with the Didache for the first time.

<sup>4</sup> Charles Bigg, D.D., *The Doctrine of the Twelve Apostles*, 1898, p. 21.

<sup>5</sup> *Hist. Eccl.*, iii. 25. <sup>6</sup> *Ep. Fest.*, 39. <sup>7</sup> *Comm. in Symb. Apost.*, § 38.

ments; but, in regard to the apocrypha of the New Testament, for the so-called "Teaching of the Apostles" he substitutes "that which is called 'The Two Ways, or Judgment of Peter'" (*qui appellatur Duæ Viæ vel Judicium Petri*). We shall have more to say presently regarding this work. Our tract bears the title of "The Teaching of the Twelve Apostles" (*Διδαχὴ τῶν δώδεκα ἀποστόλων*), and this is confirmed and enlarged by a sub-title: "The Teaching of the Lord, by the Twelve Apostles, to the Gentiles" (*Διδαχὴ κυρίου διὰ τῶν δώδεκα ἀποστόλων τοῖς ἔθνεσιν*). Dr. Lightfoot and many other writers prefer to call it simply "The Teaching of the Apostles," in spite of this double heading, because that "is the designation in several ancient writers who refer to it,"<sup>1</sup> thus calmly assuming the identity of the two works; but we must protest against so unwarrantable an alteration of the title of a MS. to make it more closely agree with supposed references in the Fathers, for which no other justification is advanced.

In connection with this, we may point out that we have some very instructive testimony concerning the "Teaching of the Apostles" to which probably Eusebius and Athanasius refer in the Stichometry of Nicephorus. He gives a list of apocryphal books, amongst which he mentions the "Teaching of the Apostles" as containing 200 lines (*στίχοι*). Does this at all confirm the supposed application of these references to our "Teaching of the Twelve Apostles" in its present form? Unfortunately it does not, but quite the contrary, for Harnack has calculated that our little work extends to 300 *στίχοι*.<sup>2</sup> It could not, therefore, as we now have it, have been the "Teaching of the Apostles" to which reference has been made.

It may be well here to refer to the contents of our Didache. It commences with a dissertation on the "Two Ways." "There are two ways—one of life and one of death, and there is a great difference between the two ways." This text is expounded throughout the first six divisions of the work; the sixth, however, being very brief, and evidently added to lead up to the remainder of the "Teaching," which deals (vii.–x.) with Baptism, Fasting, Prayer, and the Eucharist; whilst the third (xi.–xvi.) is devoted to later orders in the Church—apostles, prophets, bishops, and deacons—and lays down rules for their conduct and treatment. The first theme of the "Two Ways" has evidently been suggested by Jeremiah xxi. 8: "Behold, I set before you the way of life and the way of death"; which may also be connected with Deut. xxx. 19: "I have set before you life and death, blessing and

<sup>1</sup> Lightfoot, *The Apost. Fathers*, 1898, p. 215.

<sup>2</sup> Harnack, *Die Apostellehre*, 1886, p. 35, ed. of 1896, p. 41 f.



cursing; therefore choose life." The same texts are very probably the basis of the saying in Matt. vii. 13, 14; which shows how much the idea had influenced thought amongst the Jews. The "Teaching" is written, or rather adapted, by the compiler himself, and no attempt is made to connect it with the Apostles; whilst the section i. 3-6 is manifestly of a much later date than the rest of the dissertation on the "Two Ways," and consists of reminiscences of the "Sermon on the Mount" introduced by the compiler. With that exception, probably the whole of the first and second divisions (i.-vi., vii.-x.) are of Jewish origin.<sup>1</sup> Dr. Lightfoot says of our little treatise: "The manual consists of two parts: (1) a moral treatise founded on an ancient work called 'The Two Ways,' and setting forth the paths of righteousness and unrighteousness, of life and death, respectively. This first part is not necessarily altogether of Christian origin; indeed, there is reason to believe that some portions of it were known to the Jews, and perhaps also to the Greeks, though it has undoubtedly gathered by accretions."<sup>2</sup> It is interesting to note, however, that, notwithstanding the Hebraistic character of the ancient work embodied in the "Teaching," the compiler represents a time when a complete breach between Jew and Christian had been accomplished in the Church. The Jews to him are simply "the hypocrites"<sup>3</sup> (viii. 1): "Let not your fastings be with the hypocrites"; "Neither pray ye as the hypocrites"; and, still more strongly to point his meaning and mark the difference between Jew and Christian, the fasts kept by the former on the second and fifth days of the week are to be abandoned, and kept by Christians on the fourth and sixth days.

But the substance of the treatise on the "Two Ways" is far from being confined to the "Teaching of the Twelve Apostles." It is also found more or less fully set forth in the Epistle of Barnabas, and the "Shepherd" of Hermas, and a large part of the critical battle regarding the date of our Didache has been fought round the connection of the three works to each other; one section of critics asserting the priority of the "Teaching," another the dependence of the tract on the Epistle and the "Shepherd," and a third maintaining that all three drew their material from an earlier work, whilst a fourth dates the "Teaching" very much later and

<sup>1</sup> Dr. Taylor gives interesting illustrations of this by comparison with the Talmud and Talmudic writings (*The Teaching of the Twelve Apostles*, 1886). Mr. Rendel Harris even says: "The teaching is Hebraistic from cover to cover" (*The Teaching of the Apostles*, 1887, p. 78).

<sup>2</sup> *Apost. Fathers*, p. 215. The idea of the "Two Ways" is found in classical works as early as Hesiod (*Op. et Dies*, 285). It is used in "The Choice of Hercules," which is usually ascribed to Prodicus the Sophist (Zenophont. *Mem.*, ii. 1-21).

<sup>3</sup> Harnack, *Chron. altchristl. Lit.*, 1897, i., p. 428.

considers that the author derived his matter from works of the third or fourth century. But the subject of the "Two Ways" is not limited to these writings, but is found embodied in much later works. In 1843, Bickell<sup>1</sup> published a Greek tract from a Vienna MS. which is generally known as the "Ecclesiastical Canons," or the Epitome of the Holy Apostles. Hilgenfeld conjectures this tract to be the work referred to by Rufinus under the name of "*Duæ Viæ vel Judicium Petri*," and in this he is supported by many able scholars. In this work, which contains a large part of the "Two Ways" as it exists in our "Teaching" and in the "Epistle of Barnabas," the doctrine is divided into twelve parts, each of which is put into the mouth of an apostle, the opening being enunciated by John in identically the same words as our Didache. This tract is generally dated at least in the third century. In the same way the dissertation on the "Two Ways" is practically embodied in the seventh book of the Apostolic Constitutions, which is usually assigned to a still later date. In the Epistle of Barnabas, the "Shepherd" of Hermas, the Epitome and the Apostolic Constitutions, therefore, nearly the whole treatise of the "Two Ways" is included, and the only question is as to the chronological order of these various forms of the doctrine. That our Didache was not the original source, as we have already pointed out, is certain, and it may, on the other hand, have been the last, collecting from the foregoing what may have seemed to the compiler the most striking passages.

This is not all, however, for in 1884, after the publication of our Didache by Bryennius, von Gebhardt brought to light the short fragment of a Latin translation of the "Two Ways," with which he had met some years before, and which approximates to the form of our "Teaching," with the important difference that it omits all the references to the Sermon on the Mount, which, taken in connection with the similar omission elsewhere,<sup>2</sup> are thus shown to be the later amplification of the compiler.

Not only is it maintained by many that, in spite of its different title, our Didache is the work referred to by Eusebius and Athanasius, but it is asserted to be the work from which Clement of Alexandria quoted as "Scripture." Clement says: "Such an

<sup>1</sup> Gesch. d. Kirchenrechts, 1843. It bears the title *Αἱ διαταγαὶ αἱ διὰ Κλήμεντος καὶ κανόνες ἐκκλησιαστικοὶ τῶν ἁγίων ἀποστόλων*. Cardinal Pitra found the same tract in a MS. in the Ottobonian library bearing the title *Ἐπιτομὴ ὄρων τῶν ἁγίων ἀποστόλων καθολικῆς παραδόσεως*. It is also given by Hilgenfeld in his *N. T. extra Can. Recept.*, 1884, Fasc. iv. Codices in Syriac, Coptic, and Ethiopic have since been discovered.

<sup>2</sup> Lactantius, *Epit. div. Instit.*, c. lix, for instance, and in writings of pseudo-Athanasius, but still more markedly in the Epistle of Barnabas, the writer of which could have no reason for omitting them if they had stood in the original treatise of which he made use.

one is called a thief by the Scripture; at least, it says, 'Son (Υιέ), become not a liar, for (γὰρ) lying leads to (πρὸς) theft.'" In the "Teaching" these words occur (iii. 5): "My child (Τέκνον μου), become not a liar, since (ἐπειδὴ) lying leads to (εἰς) theft." Now, it is remarkable that the quotation in Clement begins with "Son"; but if there be anything more characteristic of the Didache than another, it is the use of the phrase "My child" as the precursor of such admonitions. In the first six chapters, devoted to the "Two Ways," it is used six times, and "Son" is never introduced. No one reading this form of the "Two Ways," and even quoting from memory, would be in the least likely to couple with these admonitions any other style of address, and when we bear in mind the numerous works in which the ancient text of the "Two Ways" has been incorporated, of which we have already mentioned five, it is evidently extremely hazardous to affirm that the few works used by Clement identify this particular tract. The phrase, in fact, is found in the Epitome (ii.), "Child, become not a liar, since lying leads unto (ἐπὶ) theft," which may, with equal reason, be identified as the source of Clement's quotation.

No work has recently received more keen attention from critics of all schools than the "Teaching of the Twelve Apostles," and few have excited deeper interest or received more divergent judgments. Whilst many have pronounced it to be one of the earliest Christian writings extant, emanating even from about the middle of the first century, others have assigned it to the fourth century.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Middle of the first century—Sabatier *La Didachè*, 1885, p. 159.

Second half first century—Bestmann, *Gesch. christl. Sitte*, 1885, ii., p. 136 ff.; Jacquier, *La Doctrine d. douze Ap.*, 1891, p. 97; Majocchi, *La Dottrina dei dod. Ap.*, 1886, p. 71; Petersen, *Lehre d. zwölf Ap.*, 1884, p. 12; H. de Romestin, *Teaching of Twelve Aps.*, 1884, p. 6, 1885 Pref. 2nd ed.; Spence, *Teaching of the Aps.*, 1885, p. 98; Wünsche, *Lehre d. zw. Ap.*, 1884, p. 6.

End first century or beginning of second—Binnie, *Br. and Foreign Ev. Rev.*, Oct., 1885, p. 640 ff.; Farrar, *Contemp. Rev.*, 1884, p. 698 ff.; *Expositor*, 1884, p. 380 ff.; Funk, *Theol. Quartalschrift*, 1884, p. 401; *Doctrina duodecim Apost.*, 1887, p. xxxii.; Heron, *Church of Sub-ap. Age*, 1888, p. 83; Hitchcock and Brown, *Teaching of Twelve Aps.*, 1885, p. xc. f. Lightfoot, *Apost. Fathers*, 1898, p. 216; *Expositor*, 1885, p. 6; Lechler, *Urkundenfunde Gesch. christl. Altertums*, 1886, p. 75; Massebieau, *L'Enseignement des douze Ap.*, 1884, p. 35; E. von Renesse, *Die Lehre zwölf Ap.*, 1897, p. 85; Schaff, *Oldest Church Manual*, 1885, p. 119 ff.; Taylor, *Teaching Twelve Aps.*, 1886, p. 118; Venables, *Brit. Quarterly Rev.*, 1885, p. 333 ff.; Warfield, *Bibl. Sacra*, 1886, p. 100 ff.; Wordsworth, *Guardian*, Mar. 19th, 1884; Zahn, *Theol. Literaturblatt*, June 27th, July 11th, 1884; *Forsch. Gesch. N. T. Kanons*, 1884, iii., p. 318 f.

First half second century—Baltzer, *Wiedergef. Zwölfapostellehre*, 1886, p. 13. A.D. 110–130 Robinson, *Encyclop. Bibl.*, 1899, i., p. 676. A.D. 120 too

It only remains for us now briefly to examine the supposed references to our Gospels in the "Teaching of the Twelve Apostles." The compiler does not in the least endeavour to associate the Apostles directly with his dissertation, nor does he even mention the name of any one of them. He does not, of course, indicate the title of any work in the New Testament. For him, apparently, the Old Testament books are the only holy "Scripture," and to these he twice refers. Harnack has counted some twenty-three Gospel expressions which are considered more or less like some in our Synoptics; but of these seventeen are said more nearly to approximate to passages in Matthew, and he regards one of these at least as a mixture of the first and third of our Gospels, though he is in doubt whether the compiler may not have used Tatian's *Diatessaron*, or even the Gospel of Peter.<sup>1</sup>

All of these passages are more or less near coincidences with expressions in the "Sermon on the Mount," and it is argued that it is not possible they could be derived from oral tradition, and that consequently they indicate a "written Gospel." As these expressions have closer similarity to our first Synoptic than to any of the others, it is at once claimed by eager critics that they prove the use of that Gospel. A circumstance which, in most cases, strengthens this view is the fact that in several instances these expressions are said by the writer to come "in the Gospel." This form occurs in the following cases (viii. 2): "As the Lord commanded in his Gospel" (ὡς ἐκέλευσεν ὁ κύριος ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ αὐτοῦ); xi. 3: "But regarding the apostles and prophets, according to the decree of the Gospel (κατὰ τὸ δόγμα τοῦ εὐαγγελίου οὕτως), so do ye"; xv. 3: "But reprove one another, not in anger, but in peace, as ye find in the Gospel" (ὡς ἔχετε ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ); and in xv. 4: "But your prayers and alms and all your deeds do as ye find in the Gospel of our Lord" (ὡς ἔχετε ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν). We may simply make the remark that only in the first of these—which we shall presently

early, A.D. 160, too late for parts, Gordon, *Modern Rev.*, 1884, p. 457. A.D. 133-135 Volkmar, *Die Lehre d. z. Ap.*, 1885, p. 44.

Later than A.D. 130-140—Van Manen, *Encyclop. Bibl.*, iii., 1902, p. 3,484. A.D. 131-160, Harnack, *Chronol. althristl. Lit.*, 1897, i., p. 438; *Die Apostellehre*, 1896, p. 20 f.; Bryennius, *Διδαχὴ τῶν δώδεκα Ἀποστόλων*, 1883, p. 20. After middle of second century, Hilgenfeld, *Zeitschr. wiss. Theol.*, 1885, p. 100. A.D. 140-165, Lipsius, *Lit. Centralblatt*, Jan., 1885, cf. *Deutsche Literaturzeit.*, 1884, p. 1,449 ff. Before A.D. 140—Addis, *Dublin Rev.*, Oct., 1884, p. 442 ff. A.D. 140-165, Meyboom, *Theol. Tijdschr.*, 1885, p. 628 ff. A.D. 160-190 Bonet-Maury, *La Doctrine des douze Ap.*, 1884, p. 34 ff. A.D. 200 Krawutzcky, *Theol. Quartalschr.*, 1884, p. 585 ff.

Fourth century—Bigg, *Doctrine of Twelve Ap.*, 1898, p. 23; Cotterill, *Scottish Church Rev.* 1884, July and Sept.; Hoole, *The Didache*, 1894, p. 45 f.; Long, *Baptist Quarterly*, 1884, July and September.

<sup>1</sup> Harnack, *Die Apostellehre*, 1896, p. 8 ff.

discuss—is there any direct reference to any passage resembling our Gospels; though the last, with its admonition regarding prayers, alms, and actions, may be taken as a general reference to the teaching of Jesus. Now, though no one would maintain that, at the time when this Didache was compiled, there was no written “Gospel,” too much stress must not be laid upon these expressions. It is certain that, to the majority of Christians in early times, oral tradition must have been the means of rendering familiar the more remarkable sayings of Jesus much more than written documents, which could only be in limited circulation, and to the mass of these converts his teaching must therefore have been more a spoken than a written Gospel. If we look in the New Testament itself, we find similar words used, which no one will assert to refer to a written Gospel. For instance (Matt. iv. 23): “And he went about in all Galilee, teaching in their synagogues, and preaching the Gospel of the kingdom” (τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τῆς βασιλείας); cf. ix. 35, xxvi. 13. In Mark viii. 35 there is a similar expression: “Whosoever shall lose his life for my sake and the Gospel’s (καὶ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου) will save it.” In 1 Cor. iv. 15, again, we read: “For in Christ Jesus I begot you through the Gospel” (διὰ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου)—cf. ix. 14; and in Gal. ii. 2: “And communicated to them the Gospel [τὸ εὐαγγέλιον] which I preach among the Gentiles.”

We may now consider the first of the above passages, which contains the principal of the supposed references. Matt. viii. 2: “Neither pray ye as the hypocrites, but as the Lord commanded in his Gospel, thus pray ye”; and then follows what is known as the Lord’s Prayer. The prayer is given as it appears in our first Synoptic (vi. 9–13), but with some noteworthy alterations. “Our Father which art in heaven” (ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ) is used instead of “in the heavens” (ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς); and “forgive us our debt” (τὴν ὀφειλὴν ἡμῶν) instead of “our debts” (τὰ ὀφειλήματα ἡμῶν). A still more important divergence occurs in the doxology, which in the Didache is given: “For thine is the power, and the glory for ever,” omitting both “the kingdom” and the final “amen.”<sup>1</sup> Of course, it may be noted that the oldest and best texts of Matt. vi. 13 omit the doxology altogether, and it has now disappeared even from the Revised Version; but the variation we point out makes the Didache differ even from the Codices which contain it. That the omission of “kingdom” is not accidental is proved by the fact that the very same peculiar doxology is again used in the “Teaching” in connection with another prayer (x. 5). Probably no part of the so-called Sermon on the Mount was more

<sup>1</sup> We do not mention the substitution of ἐλθέτω for ἐλθάτω and ἀφίεμεν for ἀφήκαμεν, for this is supported by some of our oldest texts.

spread abroad in oral tradition than this prayer, and to suppose that this faulty agreement is evidence of the use specially of the first Synoptic is not permissible.

The same remark applies to all the reminiscences of the "Sermon" in this tract, and we do not consider it necessary further to examine them here. Nothing is more remarkable than the habit, even of able critics when examining supposed quotations in early writings, boldly to ascribe them to our Synoptics, however much they differ from our texts, in total forgetfulness of the fact that many records of doings and sayings of Jesus, which are no longer extant, existed before our Gospels were composed, and circulated with them. Many of these, subsequently absorbed by our Gospels, or displaced by them, undoubtedly contained the best passages in the teaching of Jesus in very similar shape, and were long very widely read. More especially does this remark apply to reminiscences of the "Sermon on the Mount," to which the expressions in the Didache are confined. We have even in our first and third Synoptics an illustration of this statement. In the first Gospel we have the "Sermon on the Mount" with all these passages joined together in one long discourse. In the third Synoptic we find no "Sermon on the Mount" at all, but part of that long discourse is given as a "Sermon on the Plain," whilst other portions are scattered throughout the Gospel. In the second Synoptic we have neither a "Sermon on the Mount" nor on the plain, but many fragments are separately introduced. In all three the various passages are put in a context which is often contradictory of each other. Who can doubt that the *Logia* and the documents which lie behind the three Synoptics contained them in one shape or another, and that it is impossible to claim the use in any ancient work of such sayings from unnamed sources as proof of the existence of any particular Gospel?

There is one further passage to which we may refer. In his first chapter, § 6, the compiler of our Didache says: "But regarding this it is also said: 'Let thine alms sweat into thy hands until thou knowest to whom to give.'"<sup>1</sup> This saying, which is quoted in some way as Scripture, "it is also said" (*εἴρηται*), is not found in our Synoptics, and is referred to an apocryphal Gospel. It is in immediate sequence to admonitions, in which are incorporated reminiscences of the "Sermon on the Mount," which wind up with words like those in Matt. v. 26, "He shall not come out thence till he hath given back the last farthing." Then at once follow the words just discussed. If these words were "also said" in the work in which the expression like Matt. v. 26 was

<sup>1</sup> ἀλλὰ καὶ περὶ τούτου δὲ εἴρηται ἰδρωτάτω ἢ ἐλεημοσύνη σου εἰς τὰς χεῖράς σου μέχρις ἂν γνῶς τίνι δῶς.

found, why should all the reminiscences from the "Sermon on the Mount" not have been derived from the same apocryphal source?

We have, however, devoted more space to this little book than may seem necessary, for in so far as our particular purpose is concerned a decision is perfectly certain and easy. The "Teaching of the Twelve Apostles" is anonymous, and nothing is either known or surmised as to its compiler. He does not mention any of the Apostles, and gives no indication whatever of the writer of any work in our New Testament. He does not afford the slightest evidence, therefore, even of the existence of any of our Gospels, and in no way bears testimony to their credibility as witnesses for miracles and the reality of Divine revelation.

## CHAPTER II.

### THE EPISTLES OF IGNATIUS—THE EPISTLE OF POLYCARP

ALTHOUGH in reality appertaining to a very much later period, we shall here refer to the so-called "Epistles of Ignatius," and examine any testimony which they afford regarding the date and authenticity of our Gospels. There are in all fifteen Epistles bearing the name of Ignatius; three of these, addressed to the Virgin Mary and the Apostle John (2), exist only in a Latin version, and these, together with five others directed to Mary of Cassobola, to the Tarsians, to the Antiochans, to Hero of Antioch, and to the Philippians, of which there are versions both in Greek and Latin, are universally admitted to be spurious, and may, so far as their contents are concerned, be at once dismissed from all consideration. They are not mentioned by Eusebius, nor does any early writer refer to them. Of the remaining seven Epistles, addressed to the Ephesians, Magnesians, Trallians, Romans, Philadelphians, Smyrnæans, and to Polycarp, there are two distinct versions extant: one long version, of which there are both Greek and Latin texts; and another much shorter, and presenting considerable variations, of which there are also both Greek and Latin texts. After a couple of centuries of discussion, critics, almost without exception, have finally agreed that the longer version is nothing more than an interpolated version of the shorter and more ancient form of the Epistles. The question regarding the authenticity of the Ignatian Epistles, however, was re-opened and complicated by the publication in 1845, by Dr. Cureton, of a Syriac version of three Epistles only—to Polycarp, to the Ephesians, and to the Romans—in a still shorter form, discovered amongst a large number of MSS. purchased by Dr. Tattam from the monks of the Desert of Nitria. These three Syriac Epistles have been subjected to the severest scrutiny, and many of the ablest critics have pronounced them to be the only authentic Epistles of Ignatius, whilst others, who do not admit that even these are genuine letters emanating from Ignatius, still prefer them to the version of seven Greek Epistles, and consider them the most ancient form of the letters which we possess. As early as the sixteenth century, however, the strongest doubts were expressed regarding the authenticity of any of the Epistles ascribed to Ignatius. The Magdeburg Centuriators first attacked them, and Calvin declared them to be spurious, an



opinion fully shared by Daillé and others; Chemnitz regarded them with suspicion; and similar doubts, more or less definite, were expressed throughout the seventeenth century, and onward to comparatively recent times, although the means of forming a judgment were not then so complete as now. That the Epistles were interpolated there was no doubt. Fuller examination and more comprehensive knowledge of the subject have confirmed earlier doubts, and a large mass of critics has either recognised that the authenticity of none of these Epistles can be established, or that they can only be considered later and spurious compositions.

Omitting for the present the so-called Epistle of Polycarp to the Philippians, the earliest reference to any of these Epistles, or to Ignatius himself, is made by Irenæus, who quotes a passage which is found in the Epistle to the Romans (ch. iv.), without, however, any mention of name, introduced by the following words: "As a certain man of ours said, being condemned to the wild beasts on account of his testimony to God: 'I am the wheat of God, and by the teeth of beasts I am ground, that I may be found pure bread.'"<sup>1</sup> Origen likewise quotes two brief sentences which he refers to Ignatius. The first is merely: "But my love is crucified,"<sup>2</sup> which is likewise found in the Epistle to the Romans (ch. vii.); and the other quoted as "out of one of the Epistles" of the martyr Ignatius: "From the Prince of this world was concealed the virginity of Mary,"<sup>3</sup> which is found in the Epistle to the Ephesians (ch. xix.). Eusebius mentions seven Epistles,<sup>4</sup> and quotes one passage from the Epistle to the Romans (ch. v.), and a few words from an apocryphal Gospel contained in the Epistle to the Smyrnæans (ch. iii.), the source of which he says that he does not know, and he cites from Irenæus the brief quotation given above, and refers to the mention of the Epistles in the letter of Polycarp, which we reserve. Elsewhere<sup>5</sup> he further quotes a short sentence found in the Epistle to the Ephesians (ch. xix.), part of which had previously been cited by Origen. It will be observed that all these quotations, with the exception of that from Irenæus, are taken from the three Epistles which exist in the Syriac translation, and they are found in that version; and the first occasion on which any passage attributed to Ignatius is quoted which is not in the Syriac version of the three Epistles occurs in the second half of the fourth century, when Athanasius, in his

<sup>1</sup> Irenæus, *Adv. Hær.*, v. 28, § 4; Eusebius, *H. E.*, iii. 36. Lardner expresses a doubt whether this is a quotation at all.

<sup>2</sup> *Prolog. in Cantic. Cantico.*

<sup>3</sup> *Hom. vi. in Lucam.*

<sup>4</sup> *H. E.*, iii. 36.

<sup>5</sup> *Quæst. ad Steph.*; cf. Cureton, *Corp. Ign.*, p. 164.

Epistle regarding the Synods of Ariminum and Selucia,<sup>1</sup> quotes a few words from the Epistle to the Ephesians (ch. vii.); but, although foreign to the Syriac text, it is to be noted that the words are at least from a form of one of the three Epistles which exist in that version. It is a fact, therefore, that up to the second half of the fourth century no quotation ascribed to Ignatius, except one by Eusebius, exists, which is not found in the three short Syriac letters.

As we have already remarked, the Syriac version of the three Epistles is very much shorter than the shorter Greek version; the Epistle to the Ephesians, for instance, being only about one-third of the length of the Greek text. Those who still maintain the superior authenticity of the Greek shorter version argue that the Syriac is an epitome of the Greek. This does not, however, seem tenable when the matter is carefully examined. Although so much is absent from the Syriac version, not only is there no interruption of the sense, and no obscurity or undue curtness in the style, but the Epistles read more consecutively, without faults of construction or grammar; and passages which in the Greek text were confused, and almost unintelligible, have become quite clear in the Syriac. The interpolations of the text, in fact, had been so clumsily made that they had obscured the meaning, and their mere omission, without any other alteration of grammatical construction, has restored the epistles to clear and simple order. It is, moreover, a remarkable fact that the passages which, long before the discovery of the Syriac epistles, were pointed out as chiefly determining that the epistles were spurious, are not found in the Syriac version at all. Archbishop Usher, who only admitted the authenticity of six epistles, showed that much interpolation of these letters took place in the sixth century;<sup>2</sup> but this very fact increases the probability of much earlier interpolation also, to which the various existing versions most clearly point. The interpolations can be explained upon the most palpable dogmatic grounds, but not so the omissions upon the hypothesis that the Syriac version is an abridgment made upon any distinct dogmatic principle, for that which is allowed to remain renders the omissions ineffectual for dogmatic reasons. There is no ground of interest, therefore, upon which the portions omitted and retained by the Syriac version can be intelligently explained. Finally, here, we may mention that the MSS. of the three Syriac epistles are more ancient by some centuries than those of any of the Greek versions of the Seven epistles.<sup>3</sup> The strongest internal as well as other evidence, into which space forbids our going in

<sup>1</sup> *Opera, Bened. ed.*, i., p. 761.

<sup>2</sup> *Dissert.*, ch. vi., p. xxxiii.

<sup>3</sup> Cureton, *The Anc. Syr. Vers.*, p. xl.

detail, has led the majority of critics to recognise the Syriac version as the most ancient form of the letters of Ignatius extant, and this is admitted by many of those who nevertheless deny the authenticity of any of the epistles.<sup>1</sup>

Seven Epistles have been selected out of fifteen extant, all equally purporting to be by Ignatius, simply because only that number was mentioned by Eusebius, from whom, for the first time in the fourth century, except the general reference in the so-called Epistle of Polycarp, to which we shall presently refer, we hear of them. Now, neither the silence of Eusebius regarding the eight Epistles, nor his mention of the seven, can have much weight in deciding the question of their authenticity. The only point which is settled by the reference of Eusebius is that, at the date at which he wrote, seven Epistles were known to him which were ascribed to Ignatius. He evidently knew little or nothing regarding the man or the Epistles beyond what he had learnt from themselves, and he mentions the martyr-journey to Rome as a mere report: "It is said that he was conducted from Syria to Rome to be cast to wild beasts on account of his testimony to Christ."<sup>2</sup> It would be unreasonable to argue that no other Epistles existed simply because Eusebius did not mention them; and, on the other hand, it would be still more unreasonable to affirm that the seven Epistles are authentic merely because Eusebius, in the fourth century—that is to say, some two centuries after they are supposed to have been written—had met with them. Does anyone believe the letter of Jesus to Abgarus, Prince of Edessa, to be genuine because Eusebius inserts it in his history<sup>3</sup> as an authentic document out of the public records of the city of Edessa? There is, in fact, no evidence that the brief quotations of Irenæus and Origen are taken from either of the extant Greek versions of the Epistles; for, as we have mentioned, they exist in the Syriac Epistles, and there is nothing to show the original state of the letters from which they were derived. Nothing is more certain than the fact that, if any writer wished to circulate letters in the name of Ignatius, he would insert such passages as were said to have been quoted from genuine Epistles of Ignatius, and, supposing those quotations to be real, all that could be inferred on finding such passages would be that, at least, so much might be genuine. It is a total mistake to suppose that the seven Epistles mentioned by Eusebius have been transmitted to us in any special way. These Epistles are mixed up in the Medicean and corresponding ancient Latin

<sup>1</sup> Regarding the Armenian version, see Preface to 6th ed., p. xlv. ff.

<sup>2</sup> Λόγος δ' ἔχει τοῦτον ἀπὸ Συρίας ἐπὶ τὴν Ῥωμαίων πόλιν, κ.τ.λ., *H. E.*, iii. 36.

<sup>3</sup> *H. E.*, i. 13.

MSS. with the other eight Epistles, universally announced to be spurious, without distinction of any kind, and all have equal honour. The recognition of the number seven may, therefore, be ascribed simply to the reference to them by Eusebius, and his silence regarding the rest.

What, then, is the position of the so-called Ignatian Epistles? Towards the end of the second century, Irenæus makes a very short quotation from a source unnamed, which Eusebius, in the fourth century, finds in an Epistle attributed to Ignatius. Origen, in the third century, quotes a very few words, which he ascribes to Ignatius, although without definite reference to any particular Epistle; and in the fourth century Eusebius mentions seven Epistles ascribed to Ignatius. There is no other evidence. There are, however, fifteen Epistles extant attributed to Ignatius, of all of which, with the exception of three which are only known in a Latin version, we possess both Greek and Latin versions. Of seven of these Epistles—and they are those mentioned by Eusebius—we have two Greek versions, one of which is very much shorter than the other; and, finally, we now possess a Syriac version of three Epistles only, in a form still shorter than the shorter Greek version, in which are found all the quotations of the Fathers, without exception, up to the fourth century. Eight of the fifteen Epistles are universally rejected as spurious. The longer Greek version of the remaining seven Epistles is almost unanimously condemned as grossly interpolated; and the majority of critics recognise that the shorter Greek version is also much interpolated; whilst the Syriac version, which so far as MSS. are concerned is by far the most ancient text of any of the letters which we possess, reduces their number to three, and their contents to a very small compass. It is not surprising that the majority of critics have expressed doubt more or less strong regarding the authenticity of all of these Epistles, and that so large a number have repudiated them altogether. One thing is quite evident, that amidst such a mass of falsification, interpolation, and fraud, the Ignatian Epistles cannot, in any form, be considered evidence on any important point.

These doubts, however, have been intensified by consideration of the circumstances under which the Ignatian Epistles are represented as having been composed. They profess to have been written by Ignatius during his journey from Antioch to Rome, in the custody of Roman soldiers, in order to be exposed to wild beasts, the form of martyrdom to which he had been condemned. The writer describes the circumstances of his journey as follows: "From Syria even unto Rome I fight with wild beasts, by sea and by land, by night and day; being bound amongst ten leopards, which are the band of soldiers, who, even receiving benefits,

become worse."<sup>1</sup> Now, if this account be in the least degree true, how is it possible to suppose that the martyr could have found means to write so many long Epistles, entering minutely into dogmatic teaching, and expressing the most deliberate and advanced views regarding ecclesiastical government? Indeed, it may be asked why Ignatius should have considered it necessary in such a journey, even if the possibility be for a moment conceded, to address such Epistles to communities and individuals to whom, by the showing of the letters themselves, he had just had opportunities of addressing his counsels in person. The Epistles themselves bear none of the marks of composition under such circumstances, and it is impossible to suppose that soldiers, such as the quotation above describes, would allow a prisoner, condemned to wild beasts for professing Christianity, deliberately to write long Epistles at every stage of his journey, promulgating the very doctrines for which he was condemned. And not only this, but on his way to martyrdom, he has, according to the Epistles,<sup>2</sup> perfect freedom to see his friends. He receives the bishops, deacons, and members of various Christian communities, who come with greetings to him, and devoted followers accompany him on his journey. All this without hindrance from the "ten leopards," of whose cruelty he complains, and without persecution or harm to those who so openly declare themselves his friends and fellow-believers. The whole story is absolutely incredible.

Against these objections Dr. Lightfoot advances arguments, derived from Zahn, regarding the Roman procedure in cases that are said to be "known." These cases, however, are neither analogous nor have they the force which is assumed. That Christians imprisoned for their religious belief should receive their nourishment, while in prison, from friends, is anything but extraordinary, and that bribes should secure access to them in many cases, and some mitigation of suffering, is possible. The case of Ignatius, however, is very different. If the meaning of οἱ καὶ εὐεργετούμενοι χείρους γίνονται be that, although receiving bribes, the "ten leopards" only became more cruel, the very reverse of the leniency and mild treatment ascribed to the Roman procedure is described by the writer himself as actually taking place, and certainly nothing approaching a parallel to the correspondence of pseudo-Ignatius can be pointed out in any known instance. The case of Saturus and Perpetua, even if true, is no confirmation, the

<sup>1</sup> Ἀπὸ Συρίας μέχρι Ῥώμης θηριομαχῶ διὰ γῆς καὶ θαλάσσης, νυκτὸς καὶ ἡμέρας, ἐνδεδεμένος δέκα λεοπάρδοις, ὃ ἐστὶν στρατιωτικὸν τάγμα· οἱ καὶ εὐεργετούμενοι χείρους γίνονται. *Ep. Ad. Rom.*, v.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. *ad Ephes.*, i. ii., *ad Magnes.* ii. xv., *ad Trall.* i., *ad Rom.* x., *ad Philadelph.* xi., *ad Smyrn.* x. xiii., etc.

circumstances being very different;<sup>1</sup> but, in fact, there is no evidence whatever that the extant history was written by either of them,<sup>2</sup> but, on the contrary, every reason to believe that it was not.

Dr. Lightfoot advances the instance of Paul as a case in point of a Christian prisoner treated with great consideration, and who "writes letters freely, receives visits from his friends, communicates with churches and individuals as he desires."<sup>3</sup> It is scarcely possible to imagine two cases more dissimilar than those of pseudo-Ignatius and Paul, as narrated in the "Acts of the Apostles," although doubtless the story of the former has been framed upon some of the lines of the latter. Whilst Ignatius is condemned to be cast to the wild beasts as a Christian, Paul is not condemned at all, but stands in the position of a Roman citizen, rescued from infuriated Jews (xxiii. 27), repeatedly declared by his judges to have done nothing worthy of death or of bonds (xxv. 25, xxvi. 31), and who might have been set at liberty but that he had appealed to Cæsar (xxv. 11 f., xxvi. 32). His position was one which secured the sympathy of the Roman soldiers. Ignatius "fights with beasts from Syria even unto Rome," and is cruelly treated by his "ten leopards"; but Paul is represented as receiving very different treatment. Felix commands that his own people should be allowed to come and minister to him (xxiv. 23), and when the voyage is commenced it is said that Julius, who had charge of Paul, treated him courteously, and gave him liberty to go to see his friends at Sidon (xxvii. 3). At Rome he was allowed to live by himself with a single soldier to guard him (xxviii. 16), and he continued for two years in his own hired house (xxviii. 28). These circumstances are totally different from those under which the Epistles of Ignatius are said to have been written.

"But the most powerful testimony," Dr. Lightfoot goes on to say, "is derived from the representations of a heathen writer."<sup>4</sup> The case of Peregrinus, to which he refers, seems to us even more unfortunate than that of Paul. Of Peregrinus himself, historically, we really know little or nothing, for the account of Lucian is scarcely received by anyone as serious. Lucian narrates that this Peregrinus Proteus, a cynic philosopher, having been guilty of parricide and other crimes, found it convenient to leave his own country. In the course of his travels he fell in with Christians and learnt their doctrines, and, according to Lucian, the Christians soon were mere children in his hands, so that he became in his own person "prophet, high priest, and ruler of a synagogue";

<sup>1</sup> Ruinart, *Acta Mart.*, p. 137 ff.; cf. Baronius, *Mart. Rom.*, 1631, p. 152.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Lardner, *Credibility*, etc., Works, iii., p. 3.

<sup>3</sup> *Contemporary Review*, February, 1875, p. 349.

<sup>4</sup> *Ib.*, p. 350.

and, further, "they spoke of him as a god, used him as a law-giver, and elected him as their chief man."<sup>1</sup> After a time he was put in prison for his new faith, which, Lucian says, was a real service to him afterwards in his impostures. During the time he was in prison he is said to have received those services from Christians which Dr. Lightfoot quotes. Peregrinus was subsequently set at liberty by the Governor of Syria, who loved philosophy,<sup>2</sup> and travelled about, living in great comfort at the expense of the Christians, until at last they quarrelled, in consequence, Lucian thinks, of his eating some forbidden food. Finally, Peregrinus ended his career by throwing himself into the flames of a funeral pile during the Olympian games. An earthquake is said to have taken place at the time; a vulture flew out from the pile, crying out with a human voice; and shortly after Peregrinus rose again, and appeared clothed in white raiment, unhurt by the fire.

Now, this writing, of which we have given the barest sketch, is a direct satire upon Christians, or even, as Baur affirms, "a parody of the history of Jesus."<sup>3</sup> There are no means of ascertaining that any of the events of the Christian career of Peregrinus were true; but it is obvious that Lucian's policy was to exaggerate the facility of access to prisoners, as well as the assiduity and attention of the Christians to Peregrinus, the ease with which they were duped being the chief point of the satire.

There is another circumstance which must be mentioned. Lucian's account of Peregrinus is claimed by supporters of the Ignatian Epistles as evidence for them.<sup>4</sup> "The singular correspondence in this narrative with the account of Ignatius, combined with some striking coincidences of expression," they argue, show "that Lucian was acquainted with the Ignatian history, if not with the Ignatian letters." These are the words of Dr. Lightfoot, although he guards himself, in referring to this argument, by the words, "if it be true," and does not express his own opinion; but he goes on to say: "At all events it is conclusive for the matter in hand, as showing that Christian prisoners were treated in the very way described in these Epistles."<sup>5</sup> On the contrary, it is in no case conclusive of anything. If it were true that Lucian employed, as the basis of his satire, the Ignatian Epistles and Martyrology, it is clear that his narrative cannot be used as independent testimony for the truth of the statements regarding the treatment of Christian prisoners. On the other hand, as this cannot be shown, his story remains a mere satire, with very little

<sup>1</sup> *De Morte Peregr.*, II.

<sup>2</sup> *Ib.*, 14.

<sup>3</sup> *Gesch. chr. Kirche*, i., p. 410 f.

<sup>4</sup> See, for instance, Denzinger, *Ueber die Aechtheit d. bish. Textes d. Ignat. Briefe*, 1849, p. 87 ff.; Zahn, *Ignatius v. Ant.*, 1873, p. 517 ff.

<sup>5</sup> *Contemporary Review*, February, 1875, p. 350 f.

historical value. Apart from all this, however, the case of Peregrinus, a man confined in prison for a short time, under a favourable governor, and not pursued with any severity, is no parallel to that of Ignatius, condemned *ad bestias*, and, according to his own express statement, cruelly treated by the "ten leopards"; and, further, the liberty of pseudo-Ignatius must greatly have exceeded all that is said of Peregrinus, if he was able to write such Epistles, and hold such free intercourse as they represent.

There seems to be good reason for believing that Ignatius was not sent to Rome at all, but suffered martyrdom in Antioch itself on the 20th December A.D. 115, being condemned to be cast to wild beasts in the amphitheatre, in consequence of the fanatical excitement produced by the earthquake which occurred on the 13th of that month. There are no less than three martyrologies of Ignatius giving an account of the martyr's supposed journey from Antioch to Rome, but these can have no weight, as they are all recognised to be mere idle legends, of whose existence we do not hear till a very late period.

We shall briefly state the case for holding that the martyrdom took place in Antioch, and not in Rome. The Ignatian Epistles and martyrologies set forth that, during a general persecution of Christians, in Syria at least, Ignatius was condemned by Trajan, when he wintered in Antioch during the Parthian War, to be taken to Rome and cast to wild beasts in the amphitheatre. When we inquire whether these facts are supported by historical data, the reply is emphatically adverse. All that is known of the treatment of Christians during the reign of Trajan, as well as of the character of the Emperor, is opposed to the supposition that Ignatius could have been condemned by Trajan himself, or even by a provincial governor, to be taken to Rome and there cast to the beasts. It is well known that, under Trajan, there was no general persecution of Christians, although there may have been instances in which prominent members of the body were either punished or fell victims to popular fury and superstition.<sup>1</sup> An instance of this kind was the martyrdom of Simeon, Bishop of Jerusalem, reported by Hegesippus. He was not condemned *ad bestias*, however, and much less deported to Rome for the purpose. Why should Ignatius have been so exceptionally treated? In fact, even during the persecutions under Marcus Aurelius, although Christians in Syria were frequently enough cast to the beasts, there is no instance recorded in which anyone condemned to this fate was sent to Rome. Such a sentence is

<sup>1</sup> Milman says: "Excepting of Ignatius, probably of Simeon of Jerusalem, there is no authentic martyrdom in the reign of Trajan."—*Hist. of Christianity*, 1867, ii., p. 103 note.



quite at variance with the clement character of Trajan and his principles of government. Neander, in a passage quoted by Baur, says: "As he (Trajan), like Pliny, considered Christianity mere fanaticism, he also probably thought that if severity were combined with clemency, if too much noise were not made about it, the open demonstration not left unpunished, but also minds not stirred up by persecution, fanatical enthusiasm would more easily cool down, and the matter by degrees come to an end."<sup>1</sup> This was certainly the policy which mainly characterised his reign. Now, not only would such a severe sentence have been contrary to such principles, but the agitation excited would have been enormously increased by sending the martyr a long journey by land through Asia, and allowing him to pass through some of the principal cities, hold constant intercourse with the various Christian communities, and address long epistles to them. With the fervid desire for martyrdom then prevalent, such a journey would have been a triumphal progress, spreading everywhere excitement and enthusiasm. It may not be out of place, as an indication of the results of impartial examination, to point out that Neander's inability to accept the Ignatian epistles largely rests on his disbelief of the whole tradition of this sentence and martyr-journey. "We do not recognise the Emperor Trajan in this narrative" (the martyrology), he says, "therefore cannot but doubt everything which is related by this document, as well as that, during this reign, Christians can have been cast to the wild beasts."<sup>2</sup>

If, for a moment, we suppose that, instead of being condemned by Trajan himself, Ignatius received his sentence from a provincial governor, the story does not gain greater probability. It is not credible that such an official would have ventured to act so much in opposition to the spirit of the Emperor's government. Besides, if such a governor did pronounce so severe a sentence, why did he not execute it in Antioch? Why send the prisoner to Rome? By doing so he made all the more conspicuous a severity which was not likely to be pleasing to the clement Trajan. The cruelty which dictated a condemnation *ad bestias* would have been more gratified by execution on the spot. The transport to Rome is in no case credible, and the utmost that can be admitted is that Ignatius, like Simeon of Jerusalem, may have been condemned to death during this reign, more especially if the event be associated with some sudden outbreak of superstitious fury against the Christians, to which the martyr may at once have fallen a victim. We are not without indications of such a cause operating in the case of Ignatius.

<sup>1</sup> *K. G.*, 1842, i., p. 171.

<sup>2</sup> *Ib.*, p. 172 ann.

It is generally admitted that the date of Trajan's visit to Antioch is A.D. 115, when he wintered there during the Parthian war. An earthquake occurred on the 13th of December of that year, which was well calculated to excite popular superstition. It may not be out of place to quote here the account of the earthquake given by Dean Milman, who, although he mentions a different date, and adheres to the martyrdom in Rome, still associates the condemnation of Ignatius with the earthquake. He says: "Nevertheless, at that time there were circumstances which account with singular likelihood for that sudden outburst of persecution in Antioch..... At this very time an earthquake, more than usually terrible and destructive, shook the cities of the East. Antioch suffered its most appalling ravages—Antioch, crowded with the legionaries prepared for the Emperor's invasion of the East, with ambassadors and tributary kings from all parts of the East. The city shook through all its streets; houses, palaces, theatres, temples fell crashing down. Many were killed: the Consul Pedro died of his hurts. The Emperor himself hardly escaped through a window, and took refuge in the Circus, where he passed some days in the open air. Whence this terrible blow but from the wrath of the Gods, who must be appeased by unusual sacrifices? This was towards the end of January; early in February the Christian Bishop, Ignatius, was arrested. We know how, during this century, at every period of public calamity, whatever that calamity might be, the cry of the panic-stricken Heathens was, 'The Christians to the lions!' It may be that, in Trajan's humanity, in order to prevent a general massacre by the infuriated populace, or to give greater solemnity to the sacrifice, the execution was ordered to take place, not in Antioch, but in Rome."<sup>1</sup> These reasons, on the contrary, render execution in Antioch infinitely more probable. To continue, however: the earthquake occurred on the 13th, and the martyrdom of Ignatius took place on the 20th of December, just a week after the earthquake. His remains, as we know from Chrysostom and others, were interred at Antioch. The natural inference is that the martyrdom, the only part of the Ignatian story which is credible, occurred not in Rome, but in Antioch itself, in consequence of the superstitious fury against the *atheoi* aroused by the earthquake.

We must now go more into the details of the brief statements just made, and here we come to John Malalas. In the first place he mentions the occurrence of the earthquake on the 13th of December. We shall quote Dr. Lightfoot's own rendering of his further important narrative. He says:—

"The words of John Malalas are:

<sup>1</sup> *Hist. of Christianity*, ii., p. 101 f.

“The same king Trajan was residing in the same city (Antioch) when the visitation of God (*i.e.*, the earthquake) occurred. And at that time the holy Ignatius, the bishop of the city of Antioch, was martyred (or bore testimony, *ἐμαρτύρησε*) before him (*ἐπὶ αὐτοῦ*); for he was exasperated against him because he reviled him.”<sup>1</sup>

Dr. Lightfoot endeavours in every way to discredit this statement. He argues that Malalas tells foolish stories about other matters, and, therefore, is not to be believed here; but so simple a piece of information may well be correctly conveyed by a writer who elsewhere may record stupid traditions.<sup>2</sup> If the narrative of foolish stories and fabulous traditions is to exclude belief in everything else stated by those who relate them, the whole of the Fathers are disposed of at one fell swoop, for they all do so. Then Dr. Lightfoot actually makes use of the following extraordinary argument to explain away the statement of Malalas:—

“But it may be worth while adding that the error of Malalas is capable of easy explanation. He has probably misinterpreted some earlier authority, whose language lent itself to misinterpretation. The words *μαρτυρεῖν*, *μαρτυρία*, which were afterwards used especially of martyrdom, had in the earlier ages a wider sense, including other modes of witnessing to the faith: the expression *ἐπὶ Τραιάνου* again is ambiguous and might denote either ‘during the reign of Trajan’ or ‘in the presence of Trajan.’ A blundering writer like Malalas might have stumbled over either expression.”<sup>3</sup>

It would be difficult, indeed, to show that the words *μαρτυρεῖν*, *μαρτυρία*, already used in that sense in the New Testament, were not, at the date at which any record of the martyrdom of Ignatius which Malalas could have had before him was written, employed to express martyrdom when applied to such a case, as Dr. Lightfoot, indeed, has in the first instance rendered the phrase. Even Zahn, whom Dr. Lightfoot so implicitly follows, emphatically decides against him on both points. “The *ἐπὶ αὐτοῦ* together with *τότε* can only signify ‘*coram Trajano*’ (‘in the presence of Trajan’), and *ἐμαρτύρησε* only the execution.”<sup>4</sup> Let anyone simply read over Dr. Lightfoot’s own rendering, which we have quoted above, and he will see that Malalas seems excellently well, and directly, to have interpreted his earlier authority.

That the statement of Malalas does not agree with the reports of the Fathers is no real objection, for we have good reason to believe that none of them had information from any other source than the Ignatian Epistles themselves, or tradition. Eusebius evidently had not. Irenæus, Origen, and some later Fathers tell us nothing about him. Jerome and Chrysostom clearly take their accounts from these sources. Malalas is the first who, by his variation, proves that he had another and different authority

<sup>1</sup> P. 276 (ed. Bonn), *Contemporary Review*, February, 1875, p. 352.

<sup>2</sup> *Ib.*, p. 353 f.

<sup>3</sup> *Ib.*, p. 353 f.

<sup>4</sup> *Ignatius v. Ant.*, p. 66, anm. 3.

before him, and, in abandoning the martyr-journey to Rome, his account has infinitely greater apparent probability. Malalas lived at Antioch, which adds some weight to his statement. It is objected that so, also, did Chrysostom, and at an earlier period, and yet he repeats the Roman story. This, however, is no valid argument against Malalas. Chrysostom was too good a Churchman to doubt the story of Epistles so much tending to edification, which were in wide circulation, and had been quoted by earlier Fathers. It is in no way surprising that, some two centuries and a half after the martyrdom, he should quietly have accepted the representations of the Epistles purporting to have been written by the martyr himself, and that their story should have shaped the prevailing tradition.

The remains of Ignatius, as we are informed by Chrysostom and Jerome, long remained interred in the cemetery of Antioch, but finally—in the time of Theodosius, it is said—were translated with great pomp and ceremony to a building which, such is the irony of events, had previously been a Temple of Fortune. The story told, of course, is that the relics of the martyr had been carefully collected in the Coliseum and carried from Rome to Antioch. After reposing there for some centuries, the relics, which are said to have been transported from Rome to Antioch, were, about the seventh century, carried back from Antioch to Rome.<sup>1</sup> The natural and more simple conclusion is that, instead of this double translation, the bones of Ignatius had always remained in Antioch, where he had suffered martyrdom, and the tradition that they had been brought back from Rome was merely the explanation which reconciled the fact of their actually being in Antioch with the legend of the Ignatian Epistles.

The 20th of December is the date assigned to the death of Ignatius in the Martyrology,<sup>2</sup> and Zahn admits that this interpretation is undeniable.<sup>3</sup> Moreover, the anniversary of his death was celebrated on that day in the Greek churches and throughout the East. In the Latin Church it is kept on the 1st of February. There can be little doubt that this was the day of the translation of the relics to Rome, and this was evidently the view of Ruinart, who, although he could not positively contradict the views of his own Church, says: "*Ignatii festum Graeci vigesima die mensis Decembris celebrant, quo ipsum passum fuisse Acta testantur; Latini vero die prima Februarii, an ob aliquam sacrarum ejus reliquiarum*

<sup>1</sup> I need not refer to the statement of Nicephorus that these relics were first brought from Rome to Constantinople and afterwards translated to Antioch.

<sup>2</sup> Ruinart, *Acta Mart.*, pp. 59, 69.

<sup>3</sup> *Ignatius v. Ant.*, p. 68.

*translationem? plures enim fuisse constat.*"<sup>1</sup> Zahn<sup>2</sup> states that the Feast of the translation in later calendars was celebrated on the 29th of January, and he points out the evident ignorance which prevailed in the West regarding Ignatius.<sup>3</sup>

On the one hand, therefore, all the historical data which we possess regarding the reign and character of Trajan discredit the story that Ignatius was sent to Rome to be exposed to beasts in the Coliseum; and all the positive evidence which exists, independent of the Epistles themselves, tends to establish the fact that he suffered martyrdom in Antioch itself. On the other hand, all the evidence which is offered for the statement that Ignatius was sent to Rome is more or less directly based upon the representations of the letters, the authenticity of which is in discussion, and it is surrounded with improbabilities of every kind.

We might well spare our readers the trouble of examining further the contents of the Epistles themselves, for it is manifest that they cannot afford testimony of any value on the subject of our inquiry. We shall, however, briefly point out all the passages contained in the seven Greek Epistles which have any bearing upon our Synoptic Gospels, in order that their exact position may be more fully appreciated. Tischendorf<sup>4</sup> refers to a passage in the Epistle to the Romans, c. vi., as a verbal quotation of Matt. xvi. 26, but he neither gives the context nor states the facts of the case. The passage reads as follows: "The pleasures of the world shall profit me nothing, nor the kingdoms of this time; it is better for me to die for Jesus Christ than to reign over the ends of the earth. For what is a man profited if he gain the whole world but lose his soul?"<sup>5</sup> Now, this quotation not only is not found in the Syriac version of the Epistle, but it is also omitted from the ancient Latin version, and is absent from the passage in the work of Timotheus of Alexandria against the Council of Chalcedon, and from other authorities. It is evidently a later addition, and is recognised as

<sup>1</sup> Ruinart, *Acta Mart.*, p. 56. Baronius makes the anniversary of the martyrdom 1st February, and that of the translation 17th December. *Mart. Rom.*, p. 87, p. 766 ff.

<sup>2</sup> *Ignatius v. Ant.*, p. 27, p. 68, anm. 2.

<sup>3</sup> There is no sufficient evidence for the statement that in Chrysostom's time the day dedicated to Ignatius was in June. The mere allusion, in a Homily delivered in honour of Ignatius, that "recently" the feast of Sta. Pelagia (in the Latin Calendar 9th June) had been celebrated, by no means justifies such a conclusion and there is nothing else to establish it.

<sup>4</sup> *Wann wurden, u. s. w.*, p. 22.

<sup>5</sup> Οὐδέν με ὠφελήσει τὰ πέρατα τοῦ κόσμου, οὐδὲ αἱ βασιλείαι τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου. Καλόν μοι ἀποθανεῖν διὰ Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν, ἢ βασιλεύειν τῶν περάτων τῆς γῆς. Τι γὰρ ὠφελείται ἄνθρωπος, εἰάν κερδήσῃ τὸν κόσμον ὅλον, τὴν δὲ ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ ζημιωθῆ; c. vi.

such by most critics.<sup>1</sup> It was probably a gloss, which subsequently was inserted in the text. Of these facts, however, Tischendorf does not say a word.<sup>2</sup>

The next passage to which he refers is in the Epistle to the Smyrnæans, c. i., where the writer says of Jesus, "He was baptised by John in order that all righteousness might be fulfilled by Him,"<sup>3</sup> which Tischendorf considers a reminiscence of Matt. iii. 15, "For thus it becometh us to fulfil all righteousness."<sup>4</sup> The phrase, besides being no quotation, has, again, all the appearance of being an addition; and when in ch. iii. of the same Epistle we find a palpable quotation from an apocryphal Gospel, which Jerome states to be the "Gospel according to the Hebrews," to which we shall presently refer, a Gospel which we know to have contained the baptism of Jesus by John, it is not possible, even if the Epistle were genuine, which it is not, to base any such conclusion upon these words. There is not only the alternative of tradition, but the use of the same apocryphal Gospel, elsewhere quoted in the Epistle, as the source of the reminiscence.

Tischendorf does not point out any more supposed references to our Synoptic Gospels, but we proceed to notice all the other passages which have been indicated by others. In the Epistle to Polycarp, c. ii., the following sentence occurs: "Be thou wise as the serpent in everything, and harmless as the dove." This is, of course, compared with Matt. x. 16, "Be ye therefore, wise as serpents, and innocent as doves." The Greek of both is as follows:—

EPISTLE.	MATT. X. 16.
Φρόνιμος γίνου ὡς ὁ ὄφεις ἐν πᾶσιν καὶ ἀκέραιος ὡς ἡ περιστέρα.	Γίνεσθε οὖν φρόνιμοι ὡς οἱ ὄφεις <sup>5</sup> καὶ ἀκέραιοι ὡς αἱ περιστέρας,

In the Syriac version the passage reads, "Be thou wise as the serpent in everything, and harmless as to those things which are requisite as the dove."<sup>6</sup> It is unnecessary to add that no source is indicated for the reminiscence. Ewald assigns this part of our first Gospel originally to the Spruchsammlung, and, even apart from the variations presented in the Epistle, there is nothing to

<sup>1</sup> Anger, *Synops. Ev.*, p. 119 f.; Cureton, *Ancient Syriac Version*, etc., p. 42 ff.; Dressel, *Patr. Ap.*, p. 170; Grabe, *Spicil. Patr.*, ii., p. 16; Jacobson, *Patr. Ap.*, ii., p. 402; Kirchhofer, *Quellensamml.*, p. 48, anm. 6; etc.

<sup>2</sup> Dr. Lightfoot omits the supposed quotation from his text of the Epistle—*Apost. Fathers*, p. 122. Dr. Westcott does not refer to the passage at all.

<sup>3</sup> βεβαπτισμένον ὑπὸ Ἰωάννου, ἵνα πληρωθῇ πᾶσα δικαιοσύνη ὑπ' αὐτοῦ, κ.τ.λ. c. i.

<sup>4</sup> οὕτως γὰρ πρέπον ἐστὶν ἡμῖν πληρῶσαι πᾶσαν δικαιοσύνην.

<sup>5</sup> *The Cod. Sin.* alone reads ὡς ὁ ὄφεις here.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. Cureton, *Ancient Syriac Version*, etc., p. 5, p. 72.

warrant exclusive selection of our first Gospel as the source of the saying. The remaining passages we subjoin in parallel columns :—

## EP. TO THE EPHESIANS V.

For if the prayer of one or two has such power, how much more that of the bishop and of all the Church.<sup>1</sup>

## EP. TO EPHESIANS VI.

For every one whom the Master of the house sends to be over his own household we ought to receive as we should him that sent (πέμψαντα) him.

Πάντα γὰρ ὃν πέμπει ὁ οἰκοδεσπότης εἰς ἰδίαν οἰκονομίαν, οὕτως δεῖ ἡμᾶς αὐτὸν δέχεσθαι, ὡς αὐτὸν τὸν πέμψαντα.

## EP. TO TRALLIANS XI.

For these are not a planting of the Father.

Οὗτοι γὰρ οὐκ εἰσιν φυτεία πατρός.

## EP. TO SMYRNÆANS VI.

He that receiveth it let him receive it.

Ὁ χωρῶν χωρεῖτω.

## MATT. XVIII. 19.

Again I say unto you that if two of you shall agree on earth as touching anything that they shall ask it shall be done for them by my Father. v. 20. For where two or three are gathered together, etc.

## MATT. X. 40.

He that receiveth you receiveth me, and he that receiveth me receiveth him that sent (ἀποστείλαντα) me.

Ὁ δεχόμενος ὑμᾶς ἐμὲ δέχεται, καὶ ὁ ἐμὲ δεχόμενος δέχεται τὸν ἀποστείλαντά με.

## MATT. XV. 13.

Every plant which my heavenly Father did not plant shall be rooted up.

Πᾶσα φυτεία ἣν οὐκ ἐφύτευσεν ὁ πατήρ μου ὁ οὐράνιος ἐκριζωθήσεται.

## MATT. XIX. 12.

He that is able to receive it let him receive it.

Ὁ δυνάμενος χωρεῖν χωρεῖτω.

None of these passages are quotations, and they generally present such marked linguistic variations from the parallel passages in our first Gospel that there is not the slightest ground for specially referring them to it. The last words cited are introduced without any appropriate context. In no case are the expressions indicated as quotations from, or references to, any particular source. They may either be traditional, or reminiscences of some of the numerous Gospels current in the early Church, such as the Gospel according to the Hebrews. That the writer made use of one of these cannot be doubted. In the Epistle to the Smyrnæans, c. iii., there occurs a quotation from an apocryphal Gospel to which we have already, in passing, referred: "For I know that also after his resurrection he was in the flesh, and I believe he is so now. And when he came to those who were with Peter he said to them: Lay hold, handle me, and see that I am not an incorporeal spirit (δαιμόνιον).

<sup>1</sup> Εἰ γὰρ ἐνὸς καὶ δευτέρου προσευχῆ τοσαύτην ἰσχὺν ἔχει, πόσῳ μᾶλλον ἢ τε τοῦ ἐπισκόπου καὶ πάσης τῆς ἐκκλησίας;

And immediately they touched him and believed, being convinced by his flesh and spirit."<sup>1</sup> Eusebius, who quotes this passage, says that he does not know whence it is taken.<sup>2</sup> Origen, however, quotes it from a work well known in the early Church, called "The Teaching of Peter" (*Διδαχὴ Πέτρον*);<sup>3</sup> and Jerome found it in the "Gospel according to the Hebrews," in use among the Nazarenes,<sup>4</sup> which he translated, as we shall hereafter see. It was, no doubt, in both of those works. The narrative, Luke xxiv. 39 f., being neglected, and an apocryphal Gospel used here, the inevitable inference is clear, and very suggestive. As it is certain that this quotation was taken from a source different from our Gospels, there is reason to suppose that the other passages which we have cited are reminiscences of the same work. The passage on the three mysteries in the Epistle to the Ephesians, c. xix., is evidently another quotation from an uncanonical source.<sup>5</sup>

We must, however, again point out that, with the single exception of the short passage in the Epistle to Polycarp, c. ii., which is not a quotation, none of these supposed reminiscences of our Synoptic Gospels are found in the Syriac version of the three Epistles.

With regard to Scriptural quotations in all the seven Ignatian letters, it may be well to quote the words of Dr. Lightfoot. "The Ignatian letters do, indeed, show a considerable knowledge of the writings included in our Canon of the New Testament; but this knowledge betrays itself in casual words and phrases, stray metaphors, epigrammatic adaptations, and isolated coincidences of thought. Where there is an obligation, the borrowed figure or expression has passed through the mind of the writer, has been assimilated, and has undergone some modification in the process. Quotations from the New Testament, strictly speaking, there are none."<sup>6</sup> Dr. Lightfoot is speaking here, not only of the Gospels, but of the whole New Testament, and he adds, in regard to such approaches: "Even such examples can be counted on the fingers." Without discussing how such knowledge can be limited to special writings, it is obvious that, whatever view may be taken of the Ignatian letters, they afford no evidence

<sup>1</sup> Ἐγὼ γὰρ καὶ μετὰ τὴν ἀνάστασιν ἐν σαρκὶ αὐτὸν οἶδα καὶ πιστεύω ὄντα. Καὶ ὅτε πρὸς τοὺς περὶ Πέτρον ἦλθεν, εἶπεν αὐτοῖς: "Λάβετε, ψηλαφήσατέ με, καὶ ἴδετε ὅτι οὐκ εἰμι δαιμόνιον ἀσώματον." Καὶ εὐθὺς αὐτοῦ ἤψαντο, καὶ ἐπίστευσαν, κραθίντες τῇ σαρκὶ αὐτοῦ καὶ τῷ αἵματι.

<sup>2</sup> οὐκ οἶδ' ὅπόθεν ῥητοῖς συγκέχρηται. *H. E.*, iii. 36.

<sup>3</sup> *De Princip. Præf.*, § 8.

<sup>4</sup> *De vir. ill.*, 16; cf. *Comm. in Is. lib. xviii., præf.*

<sup>5</sup> Cf. Ewald, *Gesch. d. Volkes Isr.*, vii., p. 318, anm. 1.

<sup>6</sup> *Apostolic Fathers*, part ii., vol. i., 1885, p. 580.



even of the existence of our Gospels, and throw no light whatever on their authorship and trustworthiness as witnesses for miracles and the reality of Divine revelation.

We have hitherto deferred all consideration of the so-called Epistle of Polycarp to the Philippians, from the fact that, instead of proving the existence of the Epistles of Ignatius, with which it is intimately associated, it is itself discredited in proportion as they are shown to be inauthentic. We have just seen that the martyr-journey of Ignatius to Rome is, for cogent reasons, declared to be wholly fabulous, and the Epistles purporting to be written during that journey must be held to be spurious. The Epistle of Polycarp, however, not only refers to the martyr-journey (c. ix.), but to the Ignatian Epistles which are inauthentic (c. xiii.), and the manifest inference is that it also is spurious.

Polycarp, who is said by Irenæus<sup>1</sup> to have been in his youth a disciple of the Apostle John, became Bishop of Smyrna, and suffered martyrdom at a very advanced age.<sup>2</sup> On the authority of Eusebius and Jerome it has hitherto been generally believed that his death took place in A.D. 166–167. In the account of his martyrdom, which we possess in the shape of a letter from the Church of Smyrna, purporting to have been written by eye-witnesses, which must be pronounced spurious, Polycarp is said to have died under the Proconsul Statius Quadratus.<sup>3</sup> If this statement be correct, the date hitherto received can no longer be maintained, for recent investigations have determined that Statius Quadratus was proconsul in A.D. 155–5 or 155–6.<sup>4</sup> Some critics, who affirm the authenticity of the Epistle attributed to Polycarp, date the Epistle before A.D. 120, but the preponderance of opinion assigns it to a much later period. Doubts of its authenticity, and of the integrity of the text, were very early expressed, and the close scrutiny to which later and more competent criticism has subjected it has led very many to the conclusion that the Epistle is either largely interpolated or altogether spurious. The principal argument in favour of its authenticity is the fact that the Epistle is mentioned by Irenæus,<sup>5</sup> who in his extreme

<sup>1</sup> *Adv. Hær.*, iii., 3, § 4; cf. Eusebius, *H. E.*, v. 20.

<sup>2</sup> In the *Mart. Polycarpi* (c. 9) he is represented as declaring that he had served Christ eighty-six years.

<sup>3</sup> *Mart. Polycarpi*, c. 21.

<sup>4</sup> Waddington, *Mém. de l'Inst. imp. de France, Acad. des Inscript. et Belles Lettres*, T. xxvi., 1 Part., 1867, p. 232 ff.; cf. *Fastes des Provinces Asiatiques*, 1872, 1 Part., p. 219 ff. It should be mentioned, however, that in A.D. 167 there was a Consul of the name of Ummidius Quadratus (Waddington, l.c., p. 238). Wieseler and Keim reject M. Waddington's conclusions, and adhere to the later date.

<sup>5</sup> *Adv. Hær.*, iii. 3, § 4.

youth was acquainted with Polycarp.<sup>1</sup> We have no very precise information regarding the age of Irenæus; but Jerome states that he flourished under Commodus (180-192), and we may, as a favourable conjecture, suppose that he was then about 35-37. In that case his birth must be dated about A.D. 145. There is reason to believe that he fell a victim to persecution under Septimius Severus, and it is only doubtful whether he suffered during the first outbreak in A.D. 202 or later. According to this calculation the martyrdom of Polycarp, in A.D. 155-156, took place when he was ten or eleven years of age. Even if a further concession be made in regard to his age, it is evident that the intercourse of Irenæus with the Bishop of Smyrna must have been confined to his very earliest years—a fact which is confirmed by the almost total absence of any record in his writings of the communications of Polycarp. This certainly does not entitle Irenæus to speak more authoritatively of an Epistle ascribed to Polycarp than anyone else of his day.

In the Epistle itself there are several anachronisms. In ch. ix. the "blessed Ignatius" is referred to as already dead, and he is held up with Zosimus and Rufus, and also with Paul and the rest of the Apostles, as examples of patience—men who have not run in vain, but are with the Lord; but in ch. xiii. he is spoken of as living, and information is requested regarding him, "and those who are with him."<sup>2</sup> Yet, although thus spoken of as alive, the writer already knows of his Epistles, and refers, in the plural, to those written by him "to us, and all the rest which we have by us."<sup>3</sup> The reference here, it will be observed, is not only to the Epistles to the Smyrnæans, and to Polycarp himself, but to other spurious Epistles which are not included in the Syriac version. Daillé<sup>4</sup> pointed out long ago that ch. xiii. abruptly interrupts the conclusion of the Epistle, and most critics, including those who assert the authenticity of the rest of the Epistle, reject it, at least, although many of these likewise repudiate ch. ix. as interpolated. Others, however, consider that the latter chapter is quite consistent with the later date, which, according to internal evidence, must be assigned to the Epistle. The writer vehemently denounces,<sup>5</sup> as already widely spread, the Gnostic heresy and other forms of false doctrine which did not exist until the time of Marcion, to whom

<sup>1</sup> Ἐν τῇ πρώτῃ ἡμῶν ἡλικίᾳ κ.τ.λ. *Adv. Hær.*, iii. 3, § 4, Eusebius, *H. E.*, iv., 14, cf. v. 20.

<sup>2</sup> *Et de ipso Ignatio, et de his qui cum eo sunt, quod certius agnoveritis, significate.* Cf. Donaldson, *Hist. Chr. Lit. and Doctr.*, i., p. 184 f.

<sup>3</sup> Τὰς ἐπιστολάς Ἰγνατίου τὰς πεμφθείσας ἡμῖν ὑπ' αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἄλλας ὅσας εἶχομεν παρ' ἡμῖν, κ.τ.λ.

<sup>4</sup> *De Scriptis*, etc., 427 ff.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. chaps. vi., vii.

and to whose followers he refers in unmistakable terms. An expression is used in ch. vii., in speaking of these heretics, which Polycarp is reported by Irenæus to have actually applied to Marcion in person, during his visit to Rome. He is said to have called Marcion the "first-born of Satan" (*πρωτότοκος τοῦ Σατανᾶ*),<sup>1</sup> and the same term is employed in this Epistle with regard to everyone who holds such false doctrines. The development of these heresies, therefore, implies a date for the composition of the Epistle, at earliest, after the middle of the second century, a date which is further confirmed by other circumstances.<sup>2</sup> The writer of such a letter must have held a position in the Church, to which Polycarp could only have attained in the latter part of his life, when he was deputed to Rome for the Paschal discussion, and the Epistle depicts the developed ecclesiastical organisation of a later time.<sup>3</sup> The earlier date which has now been adopted for the martyrdom of Polycarp by limiting the period during which it is possible that he himself could have written any portion of it, only renders the inauthenticity of the Epistle more apparent. Hilgenfeld has pointed out, as another indication of the same date, the injunction, "Pray for the kings" (*Orate pro regibus*), which, in 1 Peter ii. 17, is "Honour the King" (*τὸν βασιλέα τιμᾶτε*), which, he argues, accords with the period after Antoninus Pius had elevated Marcus Aurelius to joint sovereignty (A.D. 147), or, better still, with that in which Marcus Aurelius appointed Lucius Verus his colleague, A.D. 161; for to rulers outside the Roman Empire there can be no reference. If authentic, however, the Epistle must have been written, at latest, shortly after the martyrdom of Ignatius in A.D. 115; but, as we have seen, there are strong internal characteristics excluding such a supposition. The reference to the

<sup>1</sup> *Adv. Hær.*, iii. 3, § 4; Eusebius, *H. E.*, iv. 14.

<sup>2</sup> Schwegler, *Das nachap. Zeit.*, ii., p. 155 f.; Hilgenfeld, *Die ap. Väter*, p. 272 f.; Lipsius, *Zeitschr. wiss. Theol.*, 1874, p. 208 f.; Scholten, *Die ält. Zeugnisse*, p. 41 ff.; Volkmar, *Der Ursprung*, p. 44 ff. Schwegler and Hilgenfeld consider the insertion of this phrase, reported to have been actually used in Rome against Marcion, as proof of the inauthenticity of the Epistle. They argue that the well-known saying was employed to give an appearance of reality to the forgery. In any case, it shows that the Epistle cannot have been written earlier than the second half of the second century.

<sup>3</sup> Schwegler, *Das nachap. Zeit.*, ii., p. 158; Hilgenfeld, *Die ap. Väter*, p. 273; Ritschl., *Enst. altk. Kirche*, p. 402 f.; Scholten, *Die ält. Zeugnisse*, p. 42. It has been pointed out that, in the superscription, Polycarp is clearly distinguished, as Bishop, from the Presbyters of Smyrna: *Πολύκαρπος καὶ οἱ σὺν αὐτῷ πρεσβύτεροι*. Dorner, *Lehre Pers. Christi*, 1851, i., p. 172 f. anm.; Rothe, *Anfänge chr. Kirche*, 1837, i., p. 408 f. anm. 107, 108; Hilgenfeld, l. c.; Ritschl., l. c. The writer, in admonishing the Philippians, speaks of their "being subject to the Presbyters and Deacons as to God and Christ" *ὑποτασσομένους τοῖς πρεσβυτέροις καὶ διακόνοις ὡς τῷ Θεῷ καὶ Χριστῷ κ.τ.λ.* c. 5.

martyr-journey of Ignatius and to the Epistles falsely ascribed to him is alone sufficient to betray the spurious nature of the composition, and to class the Epistle with the rest of the pseudo-Ignatian literature.

We shall now examine all the passages in this Epistle which are pointed out as indicating any acquaintance with our Synoptic Gospels.<sup>1</sup> The first occurs in ch. ii., and we subjoin it in contrast with the nearest parallel passages of the Gospels; but, although we break it up into paragraphs, it will, of course, be understood that the quotation is continuous in the Epistle:—

## EPISTLE, C. II.

Remembering what the Lord said, teaching :

Judge not, that ye be not judged ;

forgive, and it shall be forgiven to you ;

be pitiful, that ye may be pitied ;

with what measure ye mete it shall be measured to you again ; and that blessed are the poor and those that are persecuted for righteousness sake, for theirs is the kingdom of God.

## EPISTLE C. II.

Μνημονεύοντες δὲ ὧν εἶπεν ὁ κύριος διδασκων·

Μὴ κρίνετε, ἵνα μὴ κριθῆτε.  
ἀφίετε, καὶ ἀφεθήσεται ὑμῖν.

ἐλεᾶτε, ἵνα ἐλεηθῆτε·

ὡς μέτρῳ μετρεῖτε, ἀντιμετρηθήσεται ὑμῖν.

καὶ ὅτι μακάριοι οἱ πτωχοὶ καὶ οἱ διωκόμενοι ἕνεκεν δικαιοσύνης, ὅτι αὐτῶν ἐστὶν ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ.

## MATTHEW.

vii. 1.

Judge not, that ye be not judged.

vi. 14. For if ye forgive men their trespasses your heavenly Father will also forgive you : (cf. Luke vi. 37.....pardon and ye shall be pardoned.)

v. 7. Blessed are the pitiful, for they shall obtain pity.

vii. 2. With what measure ye mete it shall be measured to you.

v. 3. Blessed are the poor in spirit.....v. 10. Blessed are they that are persecuted for righteousness sake, for theirs is the kingdom of heaven.

## MATTHEW.

vii. i.

Μὴ κρίνετε, ἵνα μὴ κριθῆτε.

vi. 14. Ἐὰν γὰρ ἀφῆτε τοῖς ἀνθρώποις κ. τ. λ. (cf. Luke vi. 37, Ἀπολύετε καὶ ἀπολυθήσεσθε.)

v. 7. Μακάριοι οἱ ἐλεήμονες, ὅτι αὐτοὶ ἐλεηθήσονται.

vii. 2. ἐν ᾧ μέτρῳ μετρεῖτε μετρηθήσεται ὑμῖν.

v. 3. Μακάριοι οἱ πτωχοὶ τῷ πνεύματι—10 μακ. οἱ δεδιωγμένοι ἕνεκεν δικαιοσύνης, ὅτι αὐτῶν ἐστὶν ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν.

It will be remembered that an almost similar direct quotation of words of Jesus occurs in the so-called Epistle of Clement to the Corinthians, ch. xiii., which we have already examined.<sup>2</sup> There the

<sup>1</sup> Tischendorf, *Wann wurden*, u. s. w., p. 23 f.; Westcott, *On the Canon*, p. 48, note.

<sup>2</sup> P. 223 f.

passage is introduced by the same words, and in the midst of brief phrases which have parallels in our Gospel there occurs in both Epistles the same expression, "Be pitiful, that ye may be pitied," which is not found in any of our Gospels. In order to find parallels for the quotation, upon the hypothesis of a combination of texts, we have to add together portions of the following verses in the order shown: Matt. vii. 1, vi. 14 (although, with complete linguistic variations, the sense of Luke vi. 37 is much closer), v. 7, vii. 2, v. 3, v. 10. Such fragmentary compilation is in itself scarcely conceivable in an Epistle of this kind, but when in the midst we find a passage foreign to our Gospels, which occurs in another work in connection with so similar a quotation, it is reasonable to conclude that the whole is derived from tradition or from a Gospel different from ours. In no case can such a passage be considered material evidence even of the existence of any one of our Gospels.

Another expression which is pointed out occurs in ch. vii., "beseeching in our prayers the all-searching God not to lead us into temptation, as the Lord said: The spirit, indeed, is willing, but the flesh is weak."<sup>1</sup> This is compared with the phrase in "the Lord's Prayer" (Matt. vi. 13), or the passage (xxvi. 41): "Watch and pray, that ye enter not into temptation: the spirit, indeed, is willing, but the flesh is weak."<sup>2</sup> The second Gospel, however, equally has the phrase (xiv. 38), and shows how unreasonable it is to limit these historical sayings to a single Gospel. The next passage is of a similar nature (ch. vi.): "If, therefore, we pray the Lord that he may forgive us, we ought also ourselves to forgive."<sup>3</sup> The thought, but not the language, of this passage corresponds with Matt. vi. 12-14, but equally so with Luke xi. 4. Now, we must repeat that all such sayings of Jesus were the common property of the early Christians—were, no doubt, orally current amongst them, and still more certainly were recorded by many of the numerous Gospels then in circulation, as they are by several of our own. In no case is there any written source indicated from which these passages are derived; they are simply quoted as words of Jesus, and, being all connected either with the "Sermon on the Mount" or the "Lord's Prayer," the two portions of the teaching of Jesus which were most popular, widely known, and characteristic, there can be no doubt that they were familiar throughout the whole of the early Church, and must

<sup>1</sup> δεήσεσιν αἰτούμενοι τὸν παντεπόπτῃν θεόν, μὴ εἰσενεγκεῖν ἡμᾶς εἰς πειρασμόν, καθὼς εἶπεν ὁ κύριος· τὸ μὲν πνεῦμα πρόθυμον, ἡ δὲ σὰρξ ἀσθενής. c. vii.

<sup>2</sup> γρηγορεῖτε καὶ προσεύχεσθε, ἵνα μὴ εἰσέλθητε εἰς πειρασμόν. τὸ μὲν πνεῦμα πρόθυμον, ἡ δὲ σὰρξ ἀσθενής. Matt. xxvi. 41.

<sup>3</sup> Εἰ οὖν δεόμεθα τοῦ κυρίου, ἵνα ἡμῖν ἀφῆ, ὀφείλομεν καὶ ἡμεῖς ἀφιέναι. c. vi.

have formed a part of most, or all, of the many collections of the words of the Master. The anonymous quotation of historical expressions of Jesus cannot prove even the existence of one special document among many to which we may choose to trace it, much less establish its authorship and character.

## CHAPTER III.

### JUSTIN MARTYR

WE shall now consider the evidence furnished by the works of Justin Martyr regarding the existence of our Synoptic Gospels at the middle of the second century, and we may remark, in anticipation, that, whatever differences of opinion may finally exist regarding the solution of the problem which we have to examine, at least it is clear that the testimony of Justin Martyr is not of a nature to establish the date, authenticity, and character of Gospels professing to communicate such momentous and astounding doctrines. The determination of the source from which Justin derived his facts of Christian history has for a century attracted more attention, and excited more controversy, than almost any other similar question in connection with patristic literature, and upon none have more divergent opinions been expressed.

Justin, who suffered martyrdom about A.D. 166-167<sup>1</sup> under Marcus Aurelius, probably at the instigation of the cynical philosopher, Crescens, was born in the Greek-Roman colony, Flavia Neapolis,<sup>2</sup> established during the reign of Vespasian, near the ancient Sichem in Samaria. By descent he was a Greek, and during the earlier part of his life a heathen; but, after long and disappointed study of Greek philosophy, he became a convert to Christianity<sup>3</sup> strongly tinged with Judaism. It is not necessary to enter into any discussion as to the authenticity of the writings which have come down to us bearing Justin's name, many of which are undoubtedly spurious, for the two Apologies and the Dialogue with Trypho, with which we have almost exclusively to do, are generally admitted to be genuine. It is true that there has been a singular controversy regarding the precise relation to each other of the two Apologies now extant, the following contradictory views having been maintained: that they are the two Apologies mentioned by Eusebius, and in their original order; that they are Justin's two Apologies, but that Eusebius was wrong in affirming that the second was addressed to Marcus Aurelius; that our second Apology was the preface or appendix to the first, and that the original second is lost. The shorter

<sup>1</sup> Eusebius, *H. E.*, iv. 16, *Chron. Pasch.*, A.D. 165.

<sup>2</sup> *Apol.*, i. 1.

<sup>3</sup> *Dial. c. Tryph.*, ii. ff.

Apology contains nothing of interest connected with our inquiry.

There has been much controversy as to the date of the two Apologies, and much difference of opinion still exists on the point. Many critics assign the larger to about A.D. 138-140, and the shorter to A.D. 160-161. A passage, however, occurs in the longer Apology, which indicates that it must have been written about a century and a half after the commencement of the Christian era, or, according to accurate reckoning, about A.D. 147. Justin speaks, in one part of it, of perverted deductions being drawn from his teaching "that Christ was born 150 years ago under Cyrenius."<sup>1</sup> Those who contend for the earlier date have no stronger argument against this statement than the unsupported assertion, that in this passage Justin merely speaks "in round numbers"; but many important circumstances confirm the date which Justin thus gives us. In the superscription of the Apology, Antoninus is called "Pius," a title which was first bestowed upon him in the year 139. Moreover, Justin directly refers to Marcion, as a man "now living and teaching his disciples.....and who has, by the aid of demons, caused many of all nations to utter blasphemies," etc.<sup>2</sup> Now the fact has been established that Marcion did not come to Rome, where Justin himself was, until A.D. 139-142, when his prominent public career commenced, and it is apparent that the words of Justin indicate a period when his doctrines had already become widely diffused. For these and many other strong reasons, which need not here be detailed, the majority of competent critics agree in more correctly assigning the first Apology to about A.D. 147. The *Dialogue with Trypho*, as internal evidence shows,<sup>3</sup> was written after the longer Apology, and it is therefore generally dated some time within the first decade of the second half of the second century.

In these writings Justin quotes very copiously from the Old Testament, and he also very frequently refers to facts of Christian history and to sayings of Jesus. Of these references, for instance, some fifty occur in the first Apology, and upwards of seventy in the *Dialogue with Trypho*, a goodly number, it will be admitted, by means of which to identify the source from which he quotes. Justin himself frequently and distinctly says that his information and quotations are derived from the *Memoirs of the Apostles* (*ἀπομνημονεύματα τῶν ἀποστόλων*), but except upon one occasion, which we shall hereafter consider, when he indicates Peter, he never mentions an author's name. Upon examination it is found that, with only one or two brief exceptions, the numerous quotations from these Memoirs differ more or less widely from parallel passages in our Synoptic Gospels, and in

<sup>1</sup> *Apol.*, i. 46.

<sup>2</sup> *Apol.*, i. 26.

<sup>3</sup> *Dial. c. Tr.*, cxx.



many cases differ in the same respects as similar quotations found in other writings of the second century, the writers of which are known to have made use of uncanonical Gospels ; and, further, that these passages are quoted several times, at intervals, by Justin with the same variations. Moreover, sayings of Jesus are quoted from these Memoirs which are not found in our Gospels at all, and facts in the life of Jesus and circumstances of Christian history derived from the same source, not only are not found in our Gospels, but are in contradiction with them.

These peculiarities have, as might have been expected, created much diversity of opinion regarding the nature of the *Memoirs of the Apostles*. In the earlier days of New Testament criticism more especially, many of course at once identified the Memoirs with our Gospels exclusively, and the variations were explained by conveniently elastic theories of free quotation from memory, imperfect and varying MSS., combination, condensation, and transposition of passages, with slight additions from tradition, or even from some other written source, and so on. Others endeavoured to explain away difficulties by the supposition that they were a simple harmony of our Gospels, or a harmony of the Gospels, with passages added from some apocryphal work. A much greater number of critics, however, adopt the conclusion that, along with our Gospels, Justin made use of one or more apocryphal Gospels, and more especially of the Gospel according to the Hebrews, or according to Peter, and also perhaps of tradition. Others assert that he made use of a special unknown Gospel, or of the Gospel according to the Hebrews or according to Peter, with the subsidiary use of a version of one or two of our Gospels, to which, however, he did not attach much importance, preferring the apocryphal work ; whilst others have concluded that Justin did not make use of our Gospels at all, and that his quotations are either from the Gospel according to the Hebrews, or according to Peter, or from some other special apocryphal Gospel now no longer extant.

Evidence permitting of such wide diversity of results to serious and laborious investigation of the identity of Justin's *Memoirs of the Apostles* cannot be of much value towards establishing the authenticity of our Gospels, and, in the absence of any specific mention of our Synoptics, any very elaborate examination of the Memoirs might be considered unnecessary, more especially as it is admitted almost universally by competent critics that Justin did not himself consider the *Memoirs of the Apostles* inspired, or of any dogmatic authority, and had no idea of attributing canonical rank to them. In pursuance of the system which we desire invariably to adopt of enabling every reader to form his own opinion, we shall, as briefly as possible, state the facts of the

case, and furnish materials for a full comprehension of the subject.

Justin himself, as we have already mentioned, frequently and distinctly states that his information regarding Christian history and his quotations are derived from the *Memoirs of the Apostles* (*ἀπομνημονεύματα τῶν ἀποστόλων*), to adopt the usual translation, although the word might more correctly be rendered "Recollections," or "Memorabilia." It has frequently been surmised that this name was suggested by the *ἀπομνημονεύματα Σωκράτους* of Xenophon, but, as Credner has pointed out, the similarity is purely accidental, and, to constitute a parallel, the title should have been *Memoirs of Jesus*.<sup>1</sup> The word *ἀπομνημονεύματα* is here evidently used merely in the sense of records written from memory, and it is so employed by Papias in the passage preserved by Eusebius regarding Mark, who, although he had not himself followed the Lord, yet recorded his words from what he heard from Peter, and who, having done so without order, is still defended for "thus writing some things as he remembered them" (*οὕτως ἔνια γράψας ὡς ἀπεμνημόνευσεν*).<sup>2</sup> In the same way Irenæus refers to the "Memoirs of a certain Presbyter of apostolic times" (*ἀπομνημονεύματα ἀποστολικοῦ τινὸς πρεσβυτέρου*),<sup>3</sup> whose name he does not mention; and Origen still more closely approximates to Justin's use of the word when, expressing his theory regarding the Epistle to the Hebrews, he says that the thoughts are the Apostle's, but the phraseology and the composition are of one recording from memory what the Apostle said (*ἀπομνημονεύσαντός τινος τὰ ἀποστολικὰ*), and as of one writing at leisure the dictation of his master.<sup>4</sup> Justin himself speaks of the authors of the Memoirs as *οἱ ἀπομνημονεύσαντες*,<sup>5</sup> and the expression was then and afterwards constantly in use amongst ecclesiastical and other writers.<sup>6</sup>

This title, *Memoirs of the Apostles*, however, although the most appropriate to mere recollections of the life and teaching of Jesus, evidently could not be applied to works ranking as canonical Gospels, but, in fact, excludes such an idea; and the whole of Justin's views regarding Holy Scripture prove that he saw in the Memoirs merely records from memory to assist memory. He does not call them *γραφαί*, but adheres always to the familiar name of *ἀπομνημονεύματα*, and whilst his constant appeals to a

<sup>1</sup> Credner, *Beiträge*, i., p. 105.

<sup>2</sup> Eusebius, *H.E.*, iii. 39.

<sup>3</sup> *Ib.*, v. 8.

<sup>4</sup> *Ib.*, vi. 25.

<sup>5</sup> *Apol.*, i. 33.

<sup>6</sup> Credner, *Beiträge*, i., p. 105 f., *Gesch. N. T. Kanon*, p. 12; Reuss, *Hist. du Canon*, p. 53 f.; Westcott, *On the Canon*, p. 95, note 1. The Clementine Recognitions (ii. 1) make the Apostle Peter say: *In consuetudine habui verba domini mei, quæ ab ipso audieram revocare ad memoriam.*