

written source show very clearly his abandonment of oral tradition, there is nothing in the name of his records which can identify them with our Gospels.

Justin designates the source of his quotations ten times, the *Memoirs of the Apostles*,¹ and five times he calls it simply the "Memoirs."² He says, upon one occasion, that these Memoirs were composed "by his Apostles and their followers,"³ but except in one place to which we have already referred, and which we shall hereafter fully examine, he never mentions the author's name, nor does he ever give any more precise information regarding their composition. It has been argued that, in saying that these Memoirs were recorded by the Apostles and their followers, Justin intentionally and literally described the four canonical Gospels, the first and fourth of which are ascribed to Apostles and the other two to Mark and Luke, the followers of Apostles; but such an inference is equally forced and unfounded. The language itself forbids this explanation, for Justin does not speak indefinitely of Memoirs of Apostles and their followers, but of Memoirs of *the* Apostles, invariably using the article which refers the Memoirs to the collective body of the Apostles. Moreover, the incorrectness of such an inference is manifest from the fact that circumstances are stated by Justin as derived from these Memoirs, which do not exist in our Gospels at all, and which, indeed, are contradictory to them. Vast numbers of spurious writings, moreover, bearing the names of Apostles and their followers, and claiming more or less direct apostolic authority, were in circulation in the early Church—Gospels according to Peter,⁴ to Thomas,⁵ to James,⁶ to Judas,⁷ according to the Apostles, or according to the Twelve,⁸ to Barnabas,⁹ to Matthias,¹⁰ to Nicodemus,¹¹ etc., and ecclesiastical

¹ *Apol.*, i. 66, 67, cf. i. 33; *Dial. c. Tr.*, 88, 100, 101, 102, 103, 104, and twice in 106.

² *Dial.*, 103, 105, thrice 107.

³ Ἐν γὰρ τοῖς ἀπομνημονεύμασι ἃ φημι ὑπὸ τῶν ἀποστόλων αὐτοῦ καὶ τῶν ἐκείνοις παρακολουθησάντων συντετάχθαι, κ.τ.λ. *Dial.*, 103.

⁴ Eusebius, *H. E.*, iii., 3, 25, vi. 12; Hieron., *De Vir. Ill.*, 1; Origen, in *Matth.*, x. 17.

⁵ Eusebius, *H. E.*, iii., 25; Origen, *Hom. i. in Lucam*; Irenæus, *Adv. Hær.*, i. 20; cf. Tischendorf, *Evang. Apocr.*, 1853, *proleg.*, p. xxxviii. ff.; *Wann wurden, u. s. w.*, p. 89 f.; Hieron., *Pref. in Matth.*

⁶ Tischendorf, *Evang. Apocr. proleg.*, p. xii. ff.; Epiphanius, *Hær.*, lxxix., § 5, etc.

⁷ Irenæus, *Adv. Hær.*, i. 31, § 1; Epiphanius, *Hær.*, xxxviii., § 1; Theodoret, *Fab. Hær.*, i. 15.

⁸ Origen, *Hom. i. in Lucam*; Hieron., *Pref. in Matth.*; *Adv. Pelagianos*, iii. 1; Fabricius, *Cod. Apocr. N. T.*, i., p. 339 f.

⁹ *Decret. Gelasii*, vi., § 10.

¹⁰ Origen, *Hom. i. in Lucam*; Eusebius, *H. E.*, iii., 25; *Decret. Gelasii*, vi. 8; Hieron., *Pref. in Matth.*

¹¹ If this be not its most ancient title, the Gospel is in the Prologue directly ascribed to Nicodemus. The superscription which this apocryphal

writers bear abundant testimony to the early and rapid growth of apocryphal literature.¹ The very names of most of such apocryphal Gospels are lost, whilst of others we possess considerable information; but nothing is more certain than the fact that there existed many works bearing names which render the attempt to interpret the title of Justin's Gospel as a description of the four in our canon quite unwarrantable. The words of Justin evidently imply simply that the source of his quotations is the collective recollections of the Apostles, and those who followed them, regarding the life and teaching of Jesus.

The title, *Memoirs of the Apostles*, by no means indicates a plurality of Gospels. A single passage has been pointed out in which the Memoirs are said to have been called εὐαγγέλια in the plural: "For the Apostles in the Memoirs composed by them, which are called Gospels,"² etc. The last expression, ἃ καλεῖται εὐαγγέλια, as many scholars have declared, is probably an interpolation. It is, in all likelihood, a gloss on the margin of some old MS. which some copyist afterwards inserted in the text.³ If Justin really stated that the Memoirs were called Gospels, it seems incomprehensible that he should never call them so himself. In no other place in his writings does he apply the plural to them, but, on the contrary, we find Trypho referring to the "so-called Gospel," which he states that he has carefully read,⁴ and which, of course, can only be Justin's "Memoirs"; and, again, in another part of the same dialogue, Justin quotes passages which are written "in the Gospel"⁵ (ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ γέγραπται). The term "Gospel" is nowhere else used by Justin in reference to a written record.⁶ In no case, however, considering the numerous Gospels then in circulation, and the fact that many of these, different from the canonical Gospels, are known to have been

Gospel bears in the form now extant, ὑπομνήματα τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, recalls the titles of Justin's Memoirs. Tischendorf, *Evang. Apocr.*, p. 203 f., cf. *Proleg.*, p. liv. ff.; Fabricius, *Cod. Apocr. N. T.*, i., p. 213 ff.; Thilo, *Cod. Apocr. N. T.*, p. cxviii.-cxlii., p. 487 ff.

¹ Luke i. 1; Irenæus, *Adv. Hær.*, i. 20, § 1; Origen, *Hom.* i. in *Lucam.* Eusebius, *H. E.*, iii. 3, 25, iv. 22, vi. 12; Fabricius, *Cod. Apocr. N. T.*; Thilo, *Cod. Apocr. N. T.*; Tischendorf, *Evang. Apocr.*

² Οἱ γὰρ ἀπόστολοι ἐν τοῖς γενομένοις ὑπ' αὐτῶν ἀπομνημονεύμασιν, ἃ καλεῖται εὐαγγέλια. κ.τ.λ. *Apol.*, i. 66.

³ An instance of such a gloss getting into the text occurs in *Dial.* 107, where in a reference to Jonah's prophecy that Nineveh should perish in three days, according to the version of the lxx. which Justin always quotes, there is a former marginal gloss "in other versions forty," incorporated parenthetically with the text.

⁴ τὰ ἐν τῷ λεγομένῳ εὐαγγελίῳ παραγγέλματα. κ.τ.λ. *Dial. c. Tr.*, 10.

⁵ *Dial.*, 100.

⁶ There is one reference in the singular to the Gospel in the fragment *De Resurr.*, 10, which is of doubtful authenticity.

exclusively used by distinguished contemporaries of Justin, and by various communities of Christians in that day, could such an expression be taken as a special indication of the canonical Gospels.¹

Describing the religious practices amongst Christians in another place, Justin states that, at their assemblies on Sundays, "the *Memoirs of the Apostles* or the writings of the prophets are read as long as time permits."² This, however, by no means identifies the Memoirs with the canonical Gospels, for it is well known that many writings which have been excluded from the canon were publicly read in the churches until very long after Justin's day. We have already met with several instances of this. Eusebius mentions that the Epistle of the Roman Clement was publicly read in churches in his time,³ and he quotes an Epistle of Dionysius of Corinth to Soter, the Bishop of Rome, which states that fact for the purpose of "showing that it was the custom to read it in the churches, even from the earliest times."⁴ Dionysius likewise mentions the public reading of the Epistle of Soter to the Corinthians. Epiphanius refers to the reading in the churches of the Epistle of Clement,⁵ and it continued to be so read in Jerome's day.⁶ In like manner the Shepherd of Hermas,⁷ the "Apocalypse of Peter,"⁸ and other works excluded from the canon, were publicly read in the church in early days.⁹ It is certain that Gospels which did not permanently secure a place in the canon, such as the Gospel according to the Hebrews, the Gospel according to Peter, the Gospel of the Ebionites, and many kindred Gospels, which in

¹ Credner argues that, had Justin intended such a limitation, he must have said, ἡ καλεῖται τὰ τέσσαρα εὐαγγέλια. *Gesch. d. N. T. Kan.*, p. 10.

² τὰ ἀπομνημονεύματα τῶν ἀποστόλων, ἢ τὰ συγγράμματα τῶν προφητῶν ἀναγινώσκειται μέχρις ἐγχωρεῖ. *Apol.*, i. 67.

³ *H. E.*, iii. 16.

⁴ *H. E.*, iv. 23.

⁵ *Hær.*, xxx. 15.

⁶ *De Vir. Ill.*, 15..... "quæ in nonnullis ecclesiis publice legitur."

⁷ Eusebius, *H. E.*, iii. 3; Hieron., *De Vir. Ill.*, 10.

⁸ Sozom., *H. E.*, vii. 19; *Canon Murator.*, Tregelles, p. 56 f.

⁹ The Shepherd of Hermas and the Apocalypse of Peter are enumerated amongst the books of Holy Scripture in the Stichometry of the *Codex Claramontanus* (ed. Tischendorf, p. 469; cf. Credner, *Gesch. N. T. Kan.*, p. 175 f.), and the latter is placed amongst the ἀντιλεγόμενα in the Stichometry of Nicephorus, together with the Apocalypse of John and the Gospel according to the Hebrews. (Credner, *Zur Gesch. d. Kan.*, p. 117 ff.) In the *Can. Murat.* the Apoc. of Peter is received along with that of John, although some object to its being read in the Church. (*Can. Murat.*, Tregelles, p. 65; Credner, *Gesch. N. T. Kan.*, p. 175 f.) Tischendorf conjectures that the Apocalypse of Peter may have been inserted between the Ep. of Barnabas and the Shepherd of Hermas, where six pages are missing in the *Codex Sinaiticus*. (*Nov. Test. Sinait.*, Lipsiæ, 1863, *Proleg.*, p. xxxii.)

early times were exclusively used by various communities,¹ must have been read at their public assemblies. The public reading of Justin's Memoirs, therefore, does not prove anything, for this practice was by no means limited to the works now in our canon.

The idea of attributing inspiration to the Memoirs, or to any other work of the Apostles, with the single exception, as we shall presently see, of the Apocalypse of John,² which, as prophecy, entered within his limits, was quite foreign to Justin, who recognised the Old Testament alone as the inspired Word of God. Indeed, as we have already said, the very name "Memoirs" in itself excludes the thought of inspiration, which Justin attributed only to prophetic writings; and he could not in any way regard as inspired the written tradition of the Apostles and their followers, or a mere record of the words of Jesus. On the contrary, he held the accounts of the Apostles to be credible solely from their being authenticated by the Old Testament, and he clearly states that he believes the facts recorded in the Memoirs because the spirit of prophecy had already foretold them.³ According to Justin, the Old Testament contained all that was necessary for salvation, and its prophecies are the sole criterion of truth—the Memoirs, and even Christ himself, being merely its interpreters.⁴ He says that Christ commanded us not to put faith in human doctrines, but in those proclaimed by the holy prophets, and taught by himself.⁵ Prophecy and the words of Christ himself are alone of dogmatic value; all else is human teaching. Indeed, from a passage quoted with approval by Irenæus, Justin, in his lost work against Marcion, said: "I would not have believed the Lord himself if he had proclaimed any other God than the Creator—that is to say, the God of the Old Testament."⁶

That Justin does not mention the name of the author of the Memoirs would, in any case, render any argument as to their identity with our canonical Gospels inconclusive; but the total omission to do so is the more remarkable from the circumstance that the names of Old Testament writers constantly occur in his

¹ Cf. Irenæus, *Adv. Hær.*, i. 26, § 2, iii., 11, § 7; Origen, *Comm. in Ezech.*, xxiv. 7; Eusebius, *H. E.*, iii. 25, 27, vi. 12; Epiphanius, *Hær.*, xxix. 9, xxx. 3, 13 f.; Theodoret, *Hær. Fab.*, ii. 22; Hieron., *Adv. Pelag.*, iii. 2, *Comm. in Matth.*, xii. 13.

² *Dial. c. Tr.*, 81.

³ *Apol.*, i. 33; cf. *Dial. c. Tr.*, 119, *Apol.*, i. 32, *Dial. c. Tr.*, 48, 53.

⁴ Cf. *Apol.*, i. 30, 32, 52, 53, 61, *Dial. c. Tr.*, 32, 43, 48, 100.

⁵ ἐπειδὴ οὐκ ἀνθρωπείους διδάγμασι κεκελεύσμεθα ὑπ' αὐτοῦ τοῦ Χριστοῦ πείθεσθαι, ἀλλὰ τοῖς διὰ τῶν μακαρίων προφητῶν κηρυχθεῖσι καὶ δι' αὐτοῦ διδαχθεῖσι. *Dial. c. Tr.*, 48.

⁶ Καὶ καλῶς ὁ Ἰουστίνος ἐν τῷ πρὸς Μαρκίωνα συντάγματι φησιν· "Ὅτι αὐτῷ τῷ κυρίῳ οὐκ ἂν ἐπέισθην, ἄλλον θεὸν καταγγέλλοντι παρὰ τὸν δημιουργόν. *Adv. Hær.*, iv. 6, § 2. Eusebius, *H. E.*, iv. 18.

12

11. This
states
mind

important
for the
same
reason.

Note
 writings. Semisch counts 197 quotations of the Old Testament, in which Justin refers to the author by name, or to the book, and only 117 in which he omits to do so,¹ and the latter number might be reduced by considering the nature of the passages cited, and the inutility of repeating the reference.² When it is considered, therefore, that notwithstanding the numerous quotations and references to facts of Christian history, all purporting to be derived from the Memoirs, he absolutely never, except in the one instance referred to, mentions an author's name, or specifies more clearly the nature of the source, the inference must not only be that he attached small importance to the Memoirs, but also that he was actually ignorant of the author's name, and that his Gospel had no more definite superscription. Upon the theory that the *Memoirs of the Apostles* were simply our four canonical Gospels, the singularity of the omission is increased by the diversity of contents and of authors, and the consequently greater necessity and probability that he should, upon certain occasions, distinguish between them. The fact is that the only writing of the New Testament to which Justin refers by name is, as we have already mentioned, the Apocalypse, which he attributes to "a certain man whose name was John, one of the Apostles of Christ, who prophesied by a revelation made to him," etc.³ The manner in which John is here mentioned, after the Memoirs had been so constantly indefinitely referred to, clearly shows that Justin did not possess any Gospel also attributed to John. That he does name John, however, as author of the Apocalypse, and so frequently refers to Old Testament writers by name, yet never identifies the author of the Memoirs, is quite irreconcilable with the idea that they were the canonical Gospels.

It is perfectly clear, however—and this is a point of very great importance, upon which critics of otherwise widely diverging views are agreed—that Justin quotes from a *written* source, and that oral tradition is excluded from his system. He not only does not, like Papias, attach value to tradition, but, on the contrary, he affirms that in the Memoirs is recorded "*everything* that concerns our

¹ Semisch, *Denkwürd. Justinus*, p. 84.

² It is not requisite that we should in detail refute the groundless argument that the looseness of Justin's quotations from the Old Testament justifies the assumption that his evangelical quotations, notwithstanding their disagreement and almost universal inaccuracy, are taken from our Gospels. Those, however, who desire to examine the theory further may be referred to Semisch, *Die ap. Denkw. d. Märtyr. Justinus*, pp. 239-273, and Bindemann, *Th. Stud. u. Kritiken*, 1842, p. 412 ff., on the affirmative side, and to its refutation by Hilgenfeld, *Die Evv. Justin's*, pp. 46-62, *Theol. Jahrb.*, 1850, pp. 385-439, 567-578; and Credner, *Beiträge*, ii.

³ Καὶ ἐπειδὴ καὶ παρ' ἡμῶν ἀνὴρ τις, ᾧ ὄνομα Ἰωάννης, εἰς τῶν ἀποστόλων τοῦ Χριστοῦ, ἐν ἀποκαλύψει γενομένη αὐτῷ, κ.τ.λ. *Dial. c. Tr.*, 81.

Saviour Jesus Christ."¹ He constantly refers to them, directly, as the source of his information regarding the history of Jesus, and distinctly states that he has derived his quotations from them. There is no reasonable ground for affirming that Justin supplemented or modified the contents of the Memoirs by oral tradition. It must, therefore, be remembered, in considering the nature of these Memoirs, that the facts of Christian history and the sayings of Jesus are derived from a determinate written source, and are quoted as Justin found them there. Those who attempt to explain the divergences of Justin's quotations from the canonical Gospels, which they still maintain to have been his Memoirs, on the plea of oral tradition, defend the identity at the expense of the authority of the Gospels; for nothing could more forcibly show Justin's disregard and disrespect for the Gospels than would the fact that, possessing them, he not only never names their authors, but considers himself at liberty continually to contradict, modify, and revise their statements.

As we have already remarked, when we examine the contents of the *Memoirs of the Apostles* through Justin's numerous quotations, we find that many parts of the Gospel narratives are apparently quite unknown, whilst, on the other hand, we meet with facts of evangelical history which are foreign to the canonical Gospels, and others which are contradictory of Gospel statements. Justin's quotations, almost without exception, vary more or less from the parallels in the canonical text, and often these variations are consistently repeated by himself, and are found in other works about his time. Moreover, Justin quotes expressions of Jesus which are not found in our Gospels at all. The omissions, though often very singular, supposing the canonical Gospels before him, and almost inexplicable when it is considered how important they would often have been to his argument, need not, as merely negative evidence, be dwelt on here; but we shall briefly illustrate the other peculiarities of Justin's quotations.

The only genealogy of Jesus which is recognised by Justin is traced through the Virgin Mary. She it is who is descended from Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, and from the house of David, and Joseph is completely set aside.² Jesus "was born of a virgin of the lineage of Abraham and tribe of Judah and of David, Christ, the Son of God."³ "Jesus Christ, the Son of God, has been

¹ οἱ ἀπομνημονεύσαντες πάντα τὰ περὶ τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐδίδαξαν. *Apol.*, i. 33.

² *Dial. c. Tr.* 23, 43 twice, 45 thrice, 100 twice, 101, 120, *Apol.*, i. 32; cf. *Matt.* i. 1-16; *Luke* iii. 23-28.

³ εἰς τὸν διὰ τῆς ἀπὸ τοῦ γένους τοῦ Ἀβραάμ, καὶ φυλῆς Ἰούδα, καὶ Δαβὶδ παρθένου γεννηθέντα υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ Χριστόν. *Dial. c. Tr.*, 43.

born without sin, of a virgin sprung from the lineage of Abraham."¹ "For of the virgin of the seed of Jacob, who was the father of Judah, who, as we have shown, was the father of the Jews, by the power of God was he conceived; and Jesse was his forefather according to the prophecy, and he (Jesus) was the son of Jacob and Judah according to successive descent."² The genealogy of Jesus in the canonical Gospels, on the contrary, is traced solely through Joseph, who alone is stated to be of the lineage of David.³ The genealogies of Matthew and Luke, though differing in several important points, at least agree in excluding Mary. That of the third Gospel commences with Joseph, and that of the first ends with him: "And Jacob begat Joseph, the husband of Mary, of whom was born Jesus, who is called Christ."⁴ The angel who warns Joseph not to put away his wife addresses him as "Joseph, thou son of David";⁵ and the angel Gabriel, who, according to the third Gospel, announces to Mary the supernatural conception, is sent "to a virgin espoused to a man whose name was Joseph, of the house of David."⁶ So persistent, however, is Justin in ignoring this Davidic descent through Joseph that not only does he at least eleven times trace it through Mary, but his Gospel materially differs from the canonical, where the descent of Joseph from David is mentioned by the latter. In the third Gospel Joseph goes to Judæa, "unto the city of David, which is called Bethlehem, because he was of the house and lineage of David."⁷

Note. Justin, however, simply states that he went "to Bethlehem.....for his descent was from the tribe of Judah, which inhabited that region."⁸ There can be no doubt that Justin not only did not derive his genealogies from the canonical Gospels, but that, on the contrary, the *Memoirs*, from which he did learn the Davidic descent through Mary only, differed persistently and materially from them.

Many traces still exist to show that the view of Justin's *Memoirs of the Apostles* of the Davidic descent of Jesus through Mary instead of through Joseph, as the canonical Gospels represent it, was anciently held in the Church. Apocryphal Gospels of early date, based without doubt upon more ancient evangelical works, are still extant, in which the genealogy of Jesus is traced, as in Justin's *Memoirs*, through Mary. One of these is the Gospel of James, commonly called the *Protevangelium*, a work referred to by ecclesiastical writers of the third and fourth centuries,⁹ and which Tischendorf even ascribes to the first three

¹ *Dial. c. Tr.*, 23. ² *Apol.*, i. 32. ³ Matt. i. 1-16; cf. Luke iii. 23-28.

⁴ Matt. i. 16; cf. Luke iii. 23. ⁵ Matt. i. 20. ⁶ Luke i. 27.

⁷ Luke ii. 4. ⁸ *Dial. c. Tr.*, 78.

⁹ Clemens, Al., *Strom.*, vii. 16, § 93; Origen, *Comm. in Matth.* iii.; Epiphanius, *Hær.*, lxxix., § 5; cf. Fabricius, *Cod. Apocr. N. T.*, i., p. 39 ff.; Thilo, *Cod. Apocr. N. T. proleg.*, xlv. ff.

decades of the second century,¹ in which Mary is stated to be of the lineage of David.² She is also described as of the royal race and family of David in the Gospel of the Nativity of Mary;³ and in the Gospel of pseudo-Matthew her Davidic descent is prominently mentioned.⁴ There can be no doubt that all of these works are based upon earlier originals,⁵ and there is no reason why they may not have been drawn from the same source from which Justin derived his version of the genealogy in contradiction to the Synoptics.⁶

In the narrative of the events which preceded the birth of Jesus, the first Gospel describes the angel as appearing only to Joseph and explaining the supernatural conception,⁷ and the author seems to know nothing of any announcement to Mary.⁸ The third Gospel, on the contrary, does not mention any such angelic appearance to Joseph, but represents the angel as announcing the conception to Mary herself alone.⁹ Justin's Memoirs know of the appearances, both to Joseph and to Mary; but the words spoken by the angel on each occasion differ materially from those of both Gospels.¹⁰ In this place only one point, however, can be noticed. Justin describes the angel as

¹ *Wann wurden u. s. w.*, p. 76 ff., cf. *Evangelia Apocr. Proleg.*, p. xii. ff.

² Καὶ ἐμνήσθη ὁ ἱερεὺς τῆς παιδὸς Μαρίας, ὅτι ἦν ἐκ τῆς φυλῆς Δαβίδ, κ. τ. λ. *Protevangelium Jacobi*, x. Tischendorf, *Evangelia Apocr.*, p. 19 f.; Fabricius, *Cod. Apocr. N. T.*, i., p. 90.

³*Maria de stirpe regia et familia David oriunda. Evang. de Nativ. Mariae*, i.; Fabricius, *Cod. Apocr. N. T.*, i., p. 19; Tischendorf, *Ev. Apocr.*, p. 106.

⁴ *Pseudo-Matth. Evang.*, i., xiii., etc.; Tischendorf, *Ev. Apocr.*, p. 54, 73; cf. *Hist. de Nativ. Mar. et de Inf. Salv.*, xiii; Thilo, *Cod. ap. N. T.*, p. 374. Regarding the antiquity of some of these works, cf. Tischendorf, *Ev. Apocr. Proleg.*, p. xxv. ff.

⁵ Hilgenfeld, *Die Evv. Justin's*, p. 154 ff. Hilgenfeld conjectures that the *Protevangelium* may have been based upon the Gnostic work, the *Γέννα Μαρίας* mentioned by Epiphanius, or on the Gospel according to Peter, *ib.*, p. 159 ff.; cf. Volkmar, *Der Ursprung*, p. 84 ff.; Tischendorf, *Wann wurden, u. s. w.*, p. 78 ff.

⁶ Several of the Fathers in like manner assert the Davidic descent through Mary. Irenæus states that she was "of the lineage of David" (οὗτός ἐστιν ἐκ τῆς Δαβίδ παρθένου γενόμενος. *Adv. Hær.*, iii., 21, § 5), and he argues that the Davidic descent through the Virgin was clearly indicated by prophecy. The same argument is taken up by Tertullian, who distinctly traces the descent of Christ through Mary (*ex stirpe autem Jesse deputatum per Mariam inde censendum. Adv. Marcionem*, iii. 17. *Eundem ex genere David secundum Mariæ censum, Ib.*, iv. 1, cf. v. 8). It is most probable that both Irenæus and Tertullian, who were well acquainted with the writings of Justin, followed him in this matter, for they very closely adopt his arguments. They may, however, have known apocryphal works containing the Davidic descent through Mary. They certainly did not derive it from the canonical Gospels.

⁷ Matt. i. 20 f.

⁸ Cf. Matt. i. 18.

⁹ Luke i. 26 f., cf. ii. 5-6.

¹⁰ *Apol.*, i. 33, *Dial. c. Tr.*, 78, 100.

saying to Mary, "Behold, thou shalt conceive of the Holy Ghost, and shalt bear a son, and he shall be called the Son of the Highest, and thou shalt call his name Jesus, for he shall save his people from their sins," as they taught who recorded everything that concerns our Saviour Jesus Christ."¹ Now, this is a clear and direct quotation, but, besides distinctly differing in form from our Gospels, it presents the important peculiarity that the words, "for he shall save his people from their sins," are not, in Luke, addressed to Mary at all, but that they occur in the first Gospel in the address of the angel to Joseph.²

These words, however, are not accidentally inserted in this place, for we find that they are joined in the same manner to the address of the angel to Mary in the *Protevangelium* of James: "For the power of the Lord will overshadow thee; wherefore also that holy thing which is born of thee shall be called the Son of the Highest, and thou shalt call his name Jesus, for he shall save his people from their sins."³ Tischendorf states his own opinion that this passage is a recollection of the *Protevangelium* unconsciously added by Justin to the account in Luke,⁴ but the arbitrary nature of the limitation "unconsciously" (*ohne dass er sich dessen bewusst war*) here is evident. There is a point in connection with this which merits a moment's attention. In the text of the *Protevangelium*, edited by Tischendorf, the angel commences his address to Mary by saying, "Fear not, Mary, for thou hast found favour before the Lord, and thou shalt conceive of His Word" (*καὶ συλλήψῃ ἐκ λόγου αὐτοῦ*).⁵ Now, Justin, after quoting the passage above, continues to argue that the Spirit and the power of God must not be misunderstood to mean anything else than the Word, who is also the first-born of God, as the prophet Moses declared; and it was this which, when it came upon the Virgin and overshadowed her, caused her to conceive.⁶ The occurrence of the singular expression in the *Protevangelium*

¹ Ἰδοὺ συλλήψῃ ἐν γαστρὶ ἐκ πνεύματος ἁγίου, καὶ τέξῃ υἱόν, καὶ υἱὸς ὑψίστου κληθήσεται· καὶ καλέσεις τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦν· αὐτὸς γὰρ σώσει τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν αὐτῶν· ὡς οἱ ἀπομνημονεύσαντες πάντα τὰ περὶ τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐδίδαξαν. *Apol.*, i. 33.

² *Matt.* i. 21.

³ Δύναμις γὰρ κυρίου ἐπισκιάσει σοι· διὸ καὶ τὸ γεννώμενον ἐκ σοῦ ἅγιον κληθήσεται υἱὸς ὑψίστου· καὶ καλέσεις τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦν· αὐτὸς γὰρ σώσει τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν αὐτῶν. *Protev. Jacobi*, xi.; Tischendorf, *Evang. Apocr.*, p. 22; Fabricius, *Cod. Apocr. N. T.*, i., p. 93.

⁴ *Wann wurden*, u. s. w., p. 77.

⁵ *Protev. Jac.*, xi.; Tischendorf, *Evang. Apocr.*, p. 21 f. The peculiar expression is wanting in most of the other known MSS.

⁶ Τὸ πνεῦμα οὖν καὶ τὴν δύναμιν τὴν παρὰ τοῦ θεοῦ οὐδὲν ἄλλο νοῆσαι θέμις ἢ τὸν λόγον, ὃς καὶ πρωτότοκος τῷ θεῷ ἐστὶ, ὡς Μωσῆς ὁ προδεδηλωμένος προφήτης ἐμήνυσε. Καὶ τοῦτο, ἐλθὼν ἐπὶ τὴν παρθένον καὶ ἐπισκιάσαν, κ. τ. λ. *Apol.*, i. 33.

and the similar explanation of Justin immediately accompanying a variation from our Gospels, which is equally shared by the apocryphal work, strengthens the suspicion of a similarity of origin. Justin's divergences from the *Protevangelium* prevent our supposing that, in its present state, it could have been the actual source of his quotations; but the wide differences which exist between the extant MSS. of the *Protevangelium* show that even the most ancient does not present it in its original form. It is much more probable that Justin had before him a still older work, to which both the *Protevangelium* and the third Gospel were indebted.

Justin's account of the removal of Joseph to Bethlehem is peculiar, and evidently is derived from a distinct uncanonical source. It may be well to present his account and that of Luke side by side:—

JUSTIN. DIAL. C. TR. 78.

On the occasion of the first census which was taken *in Judæa* (ἐν τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ)

under Cyrenius (*first Procurator* (ἐπίτροπος) of Judæa. *Apol.*, i. 34), Joseph had gone up from Nazareth, where he dwelt, to Bethlehem, from whence he was, to enrol himself; for his descent was from the tribe of Judah, which inhabited that region.

LUKE II. 1-5.

1.....there went out a decree from Cæsar Augustus that *all the world* (πᾶσαν τὴν οἰκουμένην) should be enrolled.

2. And this census was first made when Cyrenius was *Governor* (ἡγεμῶν) of Syria. 4. And Joseph went up from Galilee, out of the city of Nazareth into Judæa, unto the City of David, which is called Bethlehem; because he was of the house and lineage of David; 5. to enrol himself.

Attention has already been drawn to the systematic manner in which the Davidic descent of Jesus is traced by Justin through Mary, and to the suppression in this passage of all that might seem to indicate a claim of descent through Joseph. As the continuation of a peculiar representation of the history of the infancy of Jesus, differing materially from that of the Synoptics, it is impossible to regard this, with its remarkable variations, as an arbitrary correction by Justin of the canonical text, and we must hold it to be derived from a different source—perhaps, indeed, one of those from which Luke's Gospel itself first drew the elements of the narrative; and this persuasion increases as further variations in the earlier history, presently to be considered, are taken into account. It is not necessary to enter into the question of the correctness of the date of this census, but it is evident that Justin's *Memoirs* clearly and deliberately modify the canonical narrative. The limitation of the census to Judea, instead of extending it to the whole Roman Empire; the designation of Cyrenius as

ἐπίτροπος of Judæa instead of ἡγεμόν of Syria; and the careful suppression of the Davidic element in connection with Joseph, indicate a peculiar written source different from the Synoptics.

Had Justin departed from the account in Luke with the view of correcting inaccurate statements, the matter might have seemed more consistent with the use of the third Gospel, although, at the same time, it might have evinced but little reverence for it as a canonical work. On the contrary, however, the statements of Justin are still more inconsistent with history than those in Luke, inasmuch as, so far from being the first Procurator of Judea, as Justin's narrative states in opposition to the third Gospel, Cyrenius never held that office, but was really, later, the imperial proconsul over Syria, and, as such, when Judæa became a Roman province after the banishment of Archelaus, had the power to enrol the inhabitants, and instituted Caponius as first Procurator of Judæa. Justin's statement involves the position that at one and the same time Herod was the King, and Cyrenius the Roman Procurator of Judæa.¹ In the same spirit, and departing from the usual narrative of the Synoptics, which couples the birth of Jesus with "the days of Herod the King," Justin, in another place, states that Christ was born "under Cyrenius."² Justin evidently adopts, without criticism, a narrative which he found in his Memoirs, and does not merely correct and remodel a passage of the third Gospel, but, on the contrary, seems altogether ignorant of it.

The genealogies of Jesus in the first and third Gospels differ irreconcilably from each other. Justin differs from both. In this passage another discrepancy arises. While Luke seems to represent Nazareth as the dwelling-place of Joseph and Mary, and Bethlehem as the city to which they went solely on account of the census,³ Matthew, who appears to know nothing of the census, makes Bethlehem, on the contrary, the place of residence of Joseph;⁴ and, on coming back from Egypt, with the evident intention of returning to Bethlehem, Joseph is warned by a dream to turn aside into Galilee, and he goes and dwells—apparently for the first time—"in a city called Nazareth, that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophets: He shall be called a Nazarene."⁵ Justin, however, goes still further than the third Gospel in his

¹ Cf. Joseph., *Antiq.*, xviii. 1, § 1; Tertullian, *Adv. Marc.*, iv. 19.

² *Apol.*, i. 46.

³ Luke ii. 4.

⁴ Matt. ii. 1; cf. Alford, *Greek Test.*, i., p. 14.

⁵ Matt. ii. 22 f. It is scarcely necessary to point out that the author of the first Gospel quotes some apocryphal work, and that the last word is a total misconception of the phrase. The word Ναζωραῖος should have been Ναζιραῖος, and the term has nothing whatever to do with the town of Nazareth.

departure from the data of Matthew, and where Luke merely infers, Justin distinctly asserts Nazareth to have been the dwelling-place of Joseph (ἐνθα ᾤκει), and Bethlehem, in contradistinction, the place from which he derived his origin (ὅθεν ἦν).

The same view is to be found in several apocryphal Gospels still extant. In the *Protevangelium* of James, again, we find Joseph journeying to Bethlehem with Mary before the birth of Jesus.¹ The census here is ordered by Augustus, who commands: "That all who were in Bethlehem of Judæa should be enrolled,"² a limitation worthy of notice in comparison with that of Justin. In like manner the Gospel of the Nativity. This Gospel represents the parents of Mary as living in Nazareth, in which place she was born,³ and it is here that the angel Gabriel announces to her the supernatural conception.⁴ Joseph goes to Bethlehem to set his house in order and prepare what is necessary for the marriage, but then returns to Nazareth, where he remains with Mary until her time was nearly accomplished,⁵ "when Joseph, having taken his wife, with whatever else was necessary, went to the city of Bethlehem, whence he was."⁶ The phrase "*unde ipse erat*" recalls the ὅθεν ἦν of Justin.⁷

As we continue the narrative of the birth and infancy of Jesus we meet with further variations from the account in the canonical Gospels for which the preceding have prepared us, and which indicate that Justin's Memoirs certainly differed from them.

JUSTIN. DIAL. 78.

But the child having been born in Bethlehem—for Joseph, not being able to find a lodging in the village, lodged in a certain cave near the village, and then while they were there Mary had brought forth the Christ and had placed him in a manger, etc.

LUKE II. 7.

And she brought forth her first-born son, and wrapped him in swaddling clothes and laid him in the manger; because there was no room in the inn.

¹ *Protev. Jac.*, xvii., cf. xxi.; Fabricius, *Cod. Apocr. N. T.*, i., p. 103; Tischendorf, *Evang. Apocr.*, p. 30, p. 39.

² Κέλευσις δὲ ἐγένετο ἀπὸ Αὐγούστου βασιλέως ἀπογράφεσθαι πάντας τοὺς ἐν Βηθλεὲμ τῆς Ἰουδαίας. *Protev. Jac.*, xvii.

³ *Evang. de Nativ. Mariæ*, i. and viii.; cf. *Evang. Thomæ Lat.*, iii.; Tischendorf, *Evang. Apocr.*, p. 158.

⁴ *Ev. de Nat. Mariæ*, ix.

⁵ *Ib.*, viii., ix.

⁶ *Joseph, uxore cum aliis quæ necessaria erant assumpta Bethlehem civitatem, unde ipse erat, tetendit. Evang. de Nat. Mar.*, x.; Fabricius, *Cod. Apocr. N. T.*, i., p. 37; Tischendorf, *Ev. Apocr.*, p. 114, cf. *Evang. infantie Arab.*, ii.; Fabricius, *ib.*, i., p. 169; Tischendorf, *ib.*, p. 171. Here Joseph goes from Jerusalem to Bethlehem, his native city.

⁷ Cf. *Hist. de Nat. Mar. et de Inf. Salv.*, xiii. "Necesse autem fuerat, ut et Joseph cum Maria proficisceretur in Bethlehem, quia exinde erat, et Maria de tribu Juda et de domo ac patria David." Thilo, *Cod. Apocr. N. T.*, p. 374.

At least it is clear that these particulars of the birth of Jesus—not taking place in Bethlehem itself, but in a cave (ἐν σπηλαίῳ) near the village, because Joseph could not find a lodging there—are not derived from our Gospels; and here even Semisch¹ is forced to abandon his theory that Justin's variations arise merely from imperfectly quoting from memory, and to conjecture that he must have adopted tradition. It has, however, been shown that Justin himself distinctly excludes tradition, and in this case, moreover, there are many special reasons for believing that he quotes from a written source. Ewald rightly points out that here, and in other passages where, in common with ancient ecclesiastical writers, Justin departs from our Gospels, the variation can in no way be referred to oral tradition;² and, moreover, that when Justin proves³ from Isaiah xxxiii. 16 that Christ *must* be born in a cave, he thereby shows how certainly he found the fact of the cave in his written Gospel.⁴ The whole argument of Justin excludes the idea that he could avail himself of mere tradition. He maintains that everything which the prophets had foretold of Christ had actually been fulfilled, and he perpetually refers to the Memoirs and other written documents for the verification of his assertions. He either refers to the prophets for the confirmation of the Memoirs or shows in the Memoirs the narrative of facts which are the accomplishment of prophecies; but in both cases it is manifest that there must have been a record of the facts which he mentions. There can be no doubt that the circumstances we have just quoted, and which are not found in the canonical Gospels, must have been narrated in Justin's Memoirs.

We find, again, the same variations as in Justin in several extant apocryphal Gospels. The *Protevangelium* of James represents the birth of Jesus as taking place in a cave;⁵ so, also, the Arabic Gospel of the Infancy,⁶ and several others.⁷ This uncanonical detail is also mentioned by several of the Fathers, Origen and Eusebius both stating that the cave and the manger were still shown in their day.⁸ Tischendorf does not hesitate to

¹ *Denkwürdigk. d. Märtyr. Just.*, p. 390 f.

² *Jahrb. bibl. Wiss.*, 1853-54, p. 60.

³ *Dial.* 71, cf. 70.

⁴ *Ib.*, p. 60, anm. 1.

⁵ *Protev. Jac.*, xviii.; Fabricius, *Cod. Apocr. N. T.*, i., p. 105; Tischendorf, *Evang. Apocr.*, p. 32.

⁶ *Evang. Infantie Arab.*, ii., iii.; Fabricius, *ib.*, i., p. 169 f.; Tischendorf, *ib.*, p. 171 f.

⁷ *Pseudo-Matt. Ev.*, xiii., xiv.; Tischendorf, *ib.*, p. 74 f.; *Historia Josephi Fab. Lign.*, vii.; Tischendorf, *ib.*, p. 118; *Hist. de Nat. Mar. et de Inf. Salv.*, xiv.; Thilo, *Cod. Apocr. N. T.*, p. 381.

⁸ Origen, *Contra Cels.*, i. 51; Eusebius, *Vita Const.*, iii. 40 f. Their only variation from Justin's account is, that they speak of the cave as in Bethlehem, while Justin describes it as near the village. Credner remarks that

Cave

affirm that Justin derived this circumstance from the *Protevangelium*.¹ Justin, however, does not distinguish such a source; and the mere fact that we have still extant a form of that Gospel in which it occurs by no means justifies such a specific conclusion, when so many other works, now lost, may equally have contained it. If the fact be derived from the *Protevangelium*, that work, or whatever other apocryphal Gospel may have supplied it, must be admitted to have at least formed part of the *Memoirs of the Apostles*, and with that necessary admission ends all special identification of the *Memoirs* with our canonical Gospels. Much more probably, however, Justin quotes from the more ancient source from which the *Protevangelium* and, perhaps, Luke drew their narrative. There can be very little doubt that the Gospel according to the Hebrews contained an account of the birth in Bethlehem, and, as it is at least certain that Justin quotes other particulars known to have been in it, there is fair reason to suppose that he likewise found this fact in that work. In any case, it is indisputable that he derived it from a source different from our canonical Gospels.

Justin does not apparently know anything of the episode of the shepherds of the plain, and the angelic appearance to them, narrated in the third Gospel.²

To the cave in which the infant Jesus is born came the Magi; but, instead of employing the phrase used by the first Gospel, "Magi from the East"³ (μάγοι ἀπὸ ἀνατολῶν), Justin always describes them as "Magi from Arabia" (μάγοι ἀπὸ Ἀραβίας). Justin is so punctilious that he never speaks of these Magi without adding "from Arabia," except twice, where, however, he immediately mentions Arabia as the point of the argument for which they are introduced; and in the same chapter in which this occurs he four times calls them directly Magi from Arabia.⁴ He uses this expression not less than nine times.⁵ That he had no objection to the term "the East," and that with a different context it was common to his vocabulary, is proved by his use of it elsewhere.⁶ It is impossible to resist the conviction that Justin's *Memoirs* contained the phrase, "Magi from Arabia," which is foreign to our Gospels.

the sacredness of the spot might by that time have attracted people, and led to the extension of the town in that direction, till the site might have become really joined to Bethlehem. Credner, *Beiträge*, i., p. 235, cf. Socrates, *H. E.*, i. 17; Sozomen, *H. E.*, ii. 2; Epiphanius, *Hær.*, xx. 1; Hieron., *Ep.*, lviii., ad Paul.

¹ *Evang. Apocr. Proleg.*, p. xiii., *Wann wurden, u. s. w.*, p. 76 ff.

² Luke ii. 8, 20.

³ Matt. ii. 1.

⁴ *Dial. c. Tr.*, 78.

⁵ *Dial.* 77, 78 four times, 88, 102, 103, 106.

⁶ *Dial.* 76, 120, 121, 126, 140, etc.; cf. Hilgenfeld, *Die Evv. Justin's*, p. 149.

Again, according to Justin, the Magi see the star "in the heaven" (ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ),¹ and not "in the East" (ἐν τῇ ἀνατολῇ), as the first Gospel has it:² "When a star rose in heaven (ἐν οὐρανῷ) at the time of his birth, as is recorded in the *Memoirs of the Apostles*."³ He apparently knows nothing of the star guiding them to the place where the young child was.⁴ Herod, moreover, questions the elders (πρεσβύτεροι)⁵ as to the place where the Christ should be born, and not the "chief priests and scribes of the people" (ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ γραμματεῖς τοῦ λαοῦ).⁶ These divergences, taken in connection with those which are interwoven with the whole narrative of the birth, can only proceed from the fact that Justin quotes from a source different from ours.

Justin relates that when Jesus came to Jordan he was believed to be the son of Joseph, the carpenter, and he appeared without comeliness, as the Scriptures announced; "and being considered a carpenter—for, when he was amongst men, he made carpenter's works, ploughs, and yokes (ἄροτρα καὶ ζυγά); by these both teaching the symbols of righteousness and an active life."⁷ These details are foreign to the canonical Gospels. Mark has the expression, "Is not this the carpenter, the son of Mary?"⁸ but Luke omits it altogether.⁹ The idea that the Son of God should do carpenter's work on earth was very displeasing to many Christians, and attempts to get rid of the obnoxious phrase are evident in Mark. Apparently the copy which Origen used had omitted even the modified phrase, for he declares that Jesus himself is nowhere called a carpenter in the Gospels current in the Church.¹⁰ A few MSS. are still extant without it, although it is found in all the more ancient Codices.

Note. (Traces of these details are found in several apocryphal works; especially in the Gospel of Thomas, where it is said: "Now, his father was a carpenter, and made at that time ploughs and yokes" (ἄροτρα καὶ ζυγούς)¹¹—an account which, from the similarity of

¹ *Dial.* 106.

² *Matt.* ii. 2, cf. ii. 9.

³ *Dial.* 106.

⁴ *Matt.* ii. 9.

⁵ *Dial.* 78.

⁶ *Matt.* ii. 4.

⁷καὶ τέκτονος νομιζομένου ταῦτα γὰρ τὰ τεκτονικὰ ἔργα εἰργάζετο ἐν ἀνθρώποις ὦν, ἄροτρα καὶ ζυγά· διὰ τούτων καὶ τὰ τῆς δικαιοσύνης σύμβολα διδάσκων, καὶ ἐνεργῆ βίον. *Dial.* 88.

⁸ οὐχ οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ τέκτων, ὁ υἱὸς Μαρίας; *Mark* vi. 3.

⁹ Cf. *Luke* iii. 23.

¹⁰ὅτι οὐδαμοῦ τῶν ἐν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις φερομένων εὐαγγελίων τέκτων αὐτὸς ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἀναγέγραπται. *Contra Cels.*, vi. 36; cf. Credner, *Beiträge*, i., p. 239; Hilgenfeld, *Die Evv. Justin's*, p. 152.

¹¹ Ὁ δὲ πατὴρ αὐτοῦ τέκτων ἦν, καὶ ἐποίησεν ἐν τῷ καιρῷ ἐκείνῳ ἄροτρα καὶ ζυγούς. *Evang. Thomæ Græce*, A. xiii.; Tischendorf, *Ev. Apocr.*, p. 144 cf.; *Evang. Thomæ Lat.*, xi.; Tischendorf, *ib.*, p. 166; *Pseudo-Matth. Ev.*, xxxvii.; Tischendorf, *ib.*, p. 99; *Evang. Infant. Arab.*, xxxviii.; Tischendorf, *ib.*, p. 193; Fabricius, *Cod. Apocr. N. T.*, p. 200.

language, was in all probability derived from the same source as that of Justin. The explanation which Justin adds, "by which he taught the symbols of righteousness and an active life," seems to indicate that he refers to a written narrative containing the detail, already, perhaps, falling into sufficient disfavour to require the aid of symbolical interpretation.

In the narrative of the baptism there are many peculiarities which prove that Justin did not derive it from our Gospels. Thrice he speaks of John sitting by the river Jordan: "He cried as he sat by the river Jordan";¹ "While he still sat by the river Jordan";² and "For when John sat by the Jordan."³ This peculiar expression, so frequently repeated, must have been derived from a written Gospel. Then Justin, in proving that Jesus predicted his second coming, and the reappearance of Elijah, states: "And therefore our Lord, in his teaching, announced that this should take place, saying Elias also should come" (εἰπὼν καὶ Ἡλίαν ἐλεύσεσθαι). A little lower down he again expressly quotes the words of Jesus: "For which reason our Christ declared on earth to those who asserted that Elias must come before Christ: Elias, indeed, shall come," etc. (Ἡλίας μὲν ἐλεύσεται, κ.τ.λ.).⁴ Matthew, however, reads: "Elias indeed cometh," Ἡλίας μὲν ἔρχεται, κ.τ.λ.⁵ Now, there is no version in which ἐλεύσεται is substituted for ἔρχεται as Justin does; but, as Credner has pointed out,⁶ the whole weight of Justin's argument lies in the use of the future tense. As there are so many other variations in Justin's context, this likewise appears to be derived from a source different from our Gospels.

When Jesus goes to be baptised by John many striking peculiarities occur in Justin's narrative: "As Jesus went down to the water a fire also was kindled in the Jordan; and when he came up from the water the Holy Spirit, like a dove, fell upon him, as the apostles of this very Christ of ours wrote.....and at the same time a voice came from the heavens.....Thou art my son; this day have I begotten thee."⁷

The incident of the fire in Jordan is, of course, quite foreign to our Gospels; and, further, the words spoken by the heavenly voice differ from those reported by them, for, instead of the passage

¹ ὅστις ἐπὶ τὸν Ἰορδάνην ποταμὸν καθεζόμενος, ἐβόα· κ.τ.λ. *Dial.* 49.

² ἔτι αὐτοῦ καθεζομένου ἐπὶ τοῦ Ἰορδάνου ποταμοῦ, κ.τ.λ. *Dial.* 51.

³ Ἰωάννου γὰρ καθεζομένου ἐπὶ τοῦ Ἰορδάνου, κ.τ.λ. *Dial.* 88.

⁴ *Dial.* 49. ⁵ xvii. 11. Many MSS. add πρῶτον. ⁶ *Beiträge*, i., p. 219.

⁷κατελθόντος τοῦ Ἰησοῦ ἐπὶ τὸ ὕδωρ, καὶ πῦρ ἀνήφθη ἐν τῷ Ἰορδάνῃ· καὶ ἀναδύντος αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ τοῦ ὕδατος, ὡς περιστερὰν τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα ἐπιπτῆναι ἐπ' αὐτὸν ἔγραψαν οἱ ἀπόστολοι αὐτοῦ τούτου τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἡμῶν.....καὶ φωνὴ ἐκ τῶν οὐρανῶν ἅμα ἐληλύθει..... "Υἱός μου εἶ σύ· ἐγὼ σήμερον γεγέννηκά σε." *Dial.* 88.

from Psalm ii. 7, the Gospels have : "Thou art my beloved son ; in thee I am well pleased."¹ Justin repeats his version a second time in the same chapter, and again elsewhere he says, regarding the temptation : "For this devil also, at the time when he (Jesus) went up from the river Jordan, when the voice declared to him : 'Thou art my son ; this day have I begotten thee,' it is written in the *Memoirs of the Apostles*, came to him and tempted him," etc.²

In both of these passages it will be perceived that Justin directly refers to the *Memoirs of the Apostles* as the source of his statements. Some have argued that Justin only appeals to them for the fact of the descent of the Holy Ghost, and not for the rest of the narrative. It has of course been felt that, if it can be shown that Justin quotes from the Memoirs words and circumstances which are not to be found in our canonical Gospels, the identity of the two can no longer be maintained. It is, however, in the highest degree arbitrary to affirm that Justin intends to limit his appeal to the testimony of the apostles to one-half of his sentence. To quote authority for one assertion, and to leave another in the same sentence, closely connected with it and part indeed of the very same narrative, not only unsupported, but weakened by direct exclusion, would indeed be singular, for Justin affirms with equal directness and confidence the fact of the fire in Jordan, the descent of the Holy Ghost, and the words spoken by the heavenly voice. If, in the strictest grammatical accuracy, there be no absolute necessity to include in the quotation more than the phrase immediately preceding, there is not, on the other hand, anything which requires or warrants the exclusion of the former part of the sentence. The matter must therefore be decided according to fair inference and reasonable probability ; and these, as well as all the evidence concerning Justin's use of the Memoirs, irresistibly point to the conclusion that the whole passage is derived from one source. In the second extract given above it is perfectly clear that the words spoken by the heavenly voice, which Justin again quotes, and which are not in our Gospels, were recorded in the Memoirs, for Justin could not have referred to them for an account of the temptation at the time when Jesus went up from Jordan and the voice said to him, "Thou art my son ; this day have I begotten thee," if these facts and words were not recorded in them at all.³ It is impossible to doubt, after

¹ Σὺ εἶ ὁ υἱὸς μου ὁ ἀγαπητός, ἐν σοὶ εὐδόκησα. Mark i. 11, Luke iii. 22. The first Gospel has a slight variation : "This is my son, etc., in whom, etc.," Οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ υἱὸς μου κ.τ.λ. . . . ἐν ᾧ εὐδόκησα. Matt. iii. 17 ; cf. 2 Peter i. 17, which agrees with Matt.

² *Dial.* 103.

³ *Ib.* 103. The quotations regarding the temptation do not agree with our Gospels, but they will be referred to later.

impartial consideration, that the incident of the fire in Jordan, the words spoken by the voice from heaven, and the temptation were taken from the same source: they must collectively be referred to the *Memoirs*.

Of one thing we may be sure: had Justin known the form of words used by the voice from heaven according to our Gospels, he would certainly have made use of it in preference to that which he actually found in his *Memoirs*. He is arguing that Christ is pre-existing God, become incarnate by God's will through the Virgin Mary, and Trypho demands how he can be demonstrated to have been pre-existent, who is said to be filled with the power of the Holy Ghost, as though he had required this. Justin replies that these powers of the Spirit have come upon him, not because he had need of them, but because they would accomplish Scripture, which declared that after him there should be no prophet.¹ The proof of this, he continues, is that, as soon as the child was born, the Magi from Arabia came to worship him, because even at his birth he was in possession of his power,² and after he had grown up like other men by the use of suitable means, he came to the river Jordan, where John was baptising, and as he went into the water a fire was kindled in the Jordan, and the Holy Ghost descended like a dove. He did not go to the river because he had any need of baptism or of the descent of the Spirit, but because of the human race which had fallen under the power of death. Now if, instead of the passage actually cited, Justin could have quoted the words addressed to Jesus by the voice from heaven according to the Gospels: "Thou art my beloved son; in thee I am well pleased," his argument would have been greatly strengthened by such direct recognition of an already existing, and, as he affirmed, pre-existent, divinity in Jesus. Not having these words in his *Memoirs of the Apostles*, however, he was obliged to be content with those which he found there: "Thou art my son; this day have I begotten thee"—words which, in fact, destroyed the argument for pre-existence, and dated the divine begetting of Jesus as the son of God that very day. The passage, indeed, supported those who actually asserted that the Holy Ghost first entered into Jesus at his baptism. These considerations, and the repeated quotation of the same words in the same form, make it clear that Justin quotes from a source different from our Gospel.

In the scanty fragments of the "Gospel according to the Hebrews" which have been preserved, we find both the incident of the fire kindled in Jordan and the words of the heavenly voice as quoted by Justin. "And as he went up from the water the heavens were opened, and he saw the Holy Spirit of God in the

¹ *Dial.* 87.

² Καὶ γὰρ γεννηθεὶς, δύναμιν τὴν αὐτοῦ ἔσχε. *Dial.* 88.

form of a dove which came down and entered into him. And a voice came from heaven saying: 'Thou art my beloved son; in thee I am well pleased'; and again: 'This day have I begotten thee.' And immediately a great light shone round about the place."¹ Epiphanius extracts this passage from the version in use among the Ebionites, but it is well known that there were many other varying forms of the same Gospel; and Hilgenfeld,² with all probability, conjectures that the version known to Epiphanius was no longer in the same purity as that used by Justin, but represents the transition stage to the canonical Gospels—adopting the words of the voice which they give without yet discarding the older form. Jerome gives another form of the words from the version in use amongst the Nazarenes: "Factum est autem cum ascendisset Dominus de aquâ, descendit fons omnis Spiritus Sancti et requievit super eum, et dixit illi: Fili mi, in omnibus Prophetis expectabam te ut venires et requiescerem in te, tu es enim requies mea, tu es filius meus primogenitus qui regnas in sempiternum."³ This supports Justin's reading. Regarding the Gospel according to the Hebrews more must be said hereafter, but when it is remembered that Justin, a native of Samaria, probably first knew Christianity through believers in Syria, to whose Jewish view of Christianity he all his life adhered, and that these Christians almost exclusively used this Gospel⁴ under various forms and names, it is reasonable to suppose that he also, like them, knew and made use of it—a supposition increased almost to certainty when it is found that Justin quotes words and facts foreign to the canonical Gospels which are known to have been contained in it. The argument of Justin, that Jesus did not need baptism, may also be compared to another passage of the Gospel according to the Hebrews preserved by Jerome, and which preceded the circumstances narrated above, in which the mother and brethren of Jesus say to him that John the Baptist is baptising for the remission of sins, and propose that they should go to be baptised by him. Jesus replies: "In what way have I sinned that I should go and be baptised by him?"⁵ The most competent critics agree that

¹ Καὶ ὡς ἀνῆλθεν ἀπὸ τοῦ ὕδατος, ἠνοίγησαν οἱ οὐρανοὶ, καὶ εἶδε τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ θεοῦ τὸ ἅγιον ἐν εἴδει περιστερᾶς κατελθούσης καὶ εἰσελθούσης εἰς αὐτόν. Καὶ φωνὴ ἐγένετο ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, λέγουσα, Σὺ μου εἶ ὁ υἱὸς ὁ ἀγαπητὸς, ἐν σοὶ ἠυδόκησα· καὶ πάλιν, Ἐγὼ σήμερον γεγέννηκά σε. Καὶ εὐθὺς περιέλαμψε τὸν τόπον φῶς μέγα. Epiphanius, *Hær.*, xxx. 13.

² *Die Evv. Justin's*, p. 165 f., anm. 1. ³ Hieron., *Comm. in Esaiæ*, xi. 2.

⁴ Origen, *Comment. in Ezech.*, xxiv. 7; Epiphanius, *Hær.*, xxx. 3; Eusebius, *H. E.*, iii. 27; Hieron., *Adv. Pelag.*, iii. 1 f.

⁵ *Ecce mater Domini et fratres ejus dicebant ei: Johannes Baptista baptizat in remissionem peccatorum, eamus et baptizemur ab eo. Dixit autem eis: Quid peccavi ut vadam et baptizer ab eo? Nisi forte hoc ipsum, quod dixi, ignorantia est.* Hieron., *Adv. Pelag.*, iii. 2.

Note.

Justin derived the incidents of the fire in Jordan and the words spoken by the heavenly voice from the Gospel according to the Hebrews or some kindred work, and there is every probability that the numerous other quotations in his works differing from our Gospels are taken from the same source.

The incident of the fire in Jordan likewise occurs in the ancient work, *Prædicatio Pauli*,¹ coupled with a context which forcibly recalls the passage of the Gospel according to the Hebrews, which has just been quoted, and apparent allusions to it are found in the Sibylline Books and early Christian literature.² Credner has pointed out that the marked use which was made of fire or lights at Baptism by the Church, during early times, probably rose out of this tradition regarding the fire which appeared in Jordan at the baptism of Jesus.³ The peculiar form of words used by the heavenly voice according to Justin and to the Gospel according to the Hebrews was also known to several of the Fathers.⁴ Augustine mentions that some MSS. in his time contained that reading in Luke iii. 22, although without the confirmation of more ancient Greek codices.⁵ It is still extant in the *Codex Bezae* (D). The Itala version adds to Matt. iii. 15: "and when he was baptised a great light shone round from the water, so that all who had come were afraid" (*et cum baptizaretur, lumen ingens circumfulsit de aqua, ita ut timerent omnes qui advenerant*); and again at Luke iii. 22 it gives the words of the voice in a form agreeing, at least, in sense with those which Justin found in his *Memoirs of the Apostles*.

These circumstances point with certainty to an earlier original corresponding with Justin, in all probability the Gospel according to the Hebrews, and to the subsequent gradual elimination of the passage from the Gospels finally adopted by the Church for dogmatic reasons, as various sects based on its doctrines which were at variance with the ever-enlarging belief of the majority.

Then Justin states that the men of his time asserted that the miracles of Jesus were performed by magical art (*μαγικῆ*)

¹ *In quo libro contra omnes Scripturas et de peccato proprio confitentem invenies Christum, qui solus omnino nihil deliquit, et ad accipiendum Joannis baptismi pæne invitum a matre sua Maria esse compulsus; item, cum baptizaretur, ignem super aquam esse visum. Quod in Evangelio nullo est scriptum. Auctor tract. de Rebaptismate; Fabricius, Cod. Apocr., i., p. 800.*

² *Sibyll Oracula*, lib., vii., viii.

³ Credner, *Beiträge*, i., p. 237; cf. Hilgenfeld, *Die Evv. Justin's*, p. 167 f.; Volkmar, *Die Evangelien*, p. 43.

⁴ Clemens Al., *Pædag.*, i. 6; Methodius, *Conviv. Virg.*, ix. Lactantius, *Instit. Div.*, iv. 15; Augustine, *Enchirid. ad Laurent.*, 49.

⁵ *Illud vero, quod nonnulli codices habent secundum Lucam, hoc illa voce sonuisse, quod in Psalmo scriptum est: Filius meus es tu; ego hodie genui te: quamquam in antiquioribus codicibus græcis non inveniri perhibeatur, etc. De Consensu Evang.*, ii. 14.

φαντασία), "for they ventured to call him a magician and deceiver of the people."¹ This cannot be accepted as a mere version of the charge that Jesus cast out demons by Beelzebub, but must have been found by Justin in his Memoirs. In the Gospel of Nicodemus or *Acta Pilati* the Jews accuse Jesus before Pilate of being a magician,² coupled with the assertion that he casts out demons through Beelzebub, the prince of the demons; and again they simply say: "Did we not tell thee that he is a magician?"³ We shall presently see that Justin actually refers to certain acts of Pontius Pilate in justification of other assertions regarding the trial of Jesus.⁴ In the Clementine Recognitions, moreover, the same charge is made by one of the Scribes, who says that Jesus did not perform his miracles as a prophet, but as a magician.⁵ Celsus makes a similar charge,⁶ and Lactantius refers to such an opinion as prevalent amongst the Jews at the time of Jesus,⁷ which we find confirmed by many passages in Talmudic literature.⁸ There was, indeed, a book called *Magia Jesu Christi*, of which Jesus himself, it was pretended, was the author.⁹

In speaking of the trial of Jesus, Justin says: "For also as the prophet saith, reviling him (διασύροντες αὐτὸν), they set him (ἐκάθισαν) upon a judgment seat (ἐπὶ βήματος), and said: 'Judge for us' (Κρίνον ἡμῖν)."¹⁰—a peculiarity which is not found in the canonical Gospels. Justin had just quoted the words of Isaiah (lxv. 2, lviii. 2): ".....They now ask of me judgment, and dare to draw nigh to God"; and then he cites Psalm xxii. 16, 22: "They pierced my hands and my feet, and upon my vesture they cast lots." He says that this did not happen to David, but was fulfilled in Christ, and the expression regarding the piercing the hands and feet referred to the nails of the cross which were driven through his hands and feet. And after he was crucified they cast lots upon his vesture. "And that these things occurred," he continues, "you may learn from the Acts drawn up under Pontius Pilate."¹¹

¹ Καὶ γὰρ μάγον εἶναι αὐτὸν ἐτόλμων λέγειν καὶ λαοπλάνον. *Dial.* 69.

² λέγουσιν αὐτῷ γόης ἐστίν, κ.τ.λ. *Evang. Nicod. sive Gesta Pilati, Pars.* I. A. i.; Tischendorf, *Evang. Apocr.*, p. 208; cf. Fabricius, *Cod. Apocr. N. T.*, i.; *Nicod. Evang. Lat.*, i., p. 239, xxvii., p. 296, cf. 417.

³ Μὴ οὐκ εἶπαμέν σοι ὅτι γόης ἐστίν; κ.τ.λ. c. ii.; Tischendorf, *Ev. Ap.*, p. 214; Fabricius, *Cod. Apocr. N. T.*, i., p. 243. ⁴ *Apol.*, i. 35, 48.

⁵ *Et ecce quidam de Scribis de medio populi exclamans ait: Jesus veste signa et prodigia quæ fecit, ut magus non ut propheta fecit.*, i. 58; cf. 40.

⁶ Origen, *Contra Cels.*, ii. 50, 51.

⁷ *Instit. Div.*, v. 3, et passim.

⁸ Lightfoot, *Hora Hebraicæ*, Works, xi., p. 195 ff.

⁹ Cf. August. *de Consensu Evang.*, i. 9; Fabricius, *Cod. Apocr. N. T.*, i., p. 305 ff.

¹⁰ Καὶ γὰρ, ὡς εἶπεν ὁ προφήτης, διασύροντες αὐτὸν, ἐκάθισαν ἐπὶ βήματος, καὶ εἶπον· Κρίνον ἡμῖν. *Apol.*, i. 35.

¹¹ Καὶ ταῦτα ὅτι γέγονε, δύνασθε μαθεῖν ἐκ τῶν ἐπὶ Ποντίου Πιλάτου γενομένων ἄκτων. *Apol.*, i. 35.

perhaps some
forged Acts
showing us
later.

He likewise upon another occasion refers to the same *Acta* for confirmation of statements.¹ The Gospel of Nicodemus or *Gesta Pilati*, now extant, does not contain the circumstance to which we are referring, but, in contradiction to the statement in the fourth Gospel (xviii. 28, 29), the Jews in this apocryphal work freely go in to the very judgment seat of Pilate.² Tischendorf maintains that the first part of the Gospel of Nicodemus, or *Acta Pilati*, still extant, is the work, with more or less of interpolation, which, existing in the second century, is referred to by Justin.³ A few reasons may here be given against such a conclusion. The fact of Jesus being set upon the judgment seat is not contained in the extant *Acta Pilati* at all, and therefore this work does not correspond with Justin's statement. It seems most unreasonable to suppose that Justin should seriously refer Roman Emperors to a work of this description, so manifestly composed by a Christian, and the *Acta* to which he directs them must have been a presumed official document, to which they had access, as, of course, no other evidence could be of any weight with them. The extant work neither pretends to be, nor has in the slightest degree the form of, an official report. Moreover, the prologue attached to it distinctly states that Ananias, a provincial warden in the reign of Flavius Theodosius (towards the middle of the fifth century), found these Acts written in Hebrew by Nicodemus, and that he translated them into Greek.⁴ The work itself, therefore, only pretends to be a private composition in Hebrew, and does not claim any relation to Pontius Pilate. The Greek is very corrupt and degraded, and considerations of style alone would assign it to the fifth century, as would still more imperatively the anachronisms with which it abounds. Tischendorf considers that Tertullian refers to the same work as Justin; but it is evident that he implies an official report, for he says distinctly, after narrating the circumstances of the crucifixion and resurrection: "All these facts regarding Christ, Pilate.....reported to the reigning Emperor Tiberius."⁵ It is extremely probable that in saying this Tertullian merely extended the statement of Justin. He nowhere states that he himself had seen this report, nor does Justin, and, as is the case with the latter, some of the facts which Tertullian supposes to be reported by Pilate are not contained in the apocryphal work. There are still extant some apocryphal writings in

¹ *Apol.*, i. 48. Cf. Tertullian, *Apol.* xxi.

² *Evang. Nicod. sive Gesta Pilati*, Pars i. A., i. ii.; Tischendorf, *Evang. Apocr.*, p. 208 ff.

³ *Evang. Apocr. Proleg.*, p. lxiv. ff.; *Wann wurden, u. s. w.*, pp. 82-89.

⁴ *Evang. Nicod. Proleg.*; Tischendorf, *Ev. Apocr.*, p. 203 f.

⁵ *Ea omnia super Christo Pilatus.....Cæsari tum Tiberio nuntiavit.* *Apol.* xxi.

the form of official reports made by Pilate of the trial, crucifixion, and resurrection of Jesus,¹ but none are of very ancient date. It is certain that, on the supposition that Pilate may have made an official report of events so important in their estimation, Christian writers, with greater zeal than conscience, composed fictitious reports in his name, in the supposed interest of their religion; and there was in that day little or no critical sense to detect and discredit such forgeries. There is absolutely no evidence to show that Justin was acquainted with any official report of Pilate to the Roman Emperor, nor, indeed, is it easy to understand how he could possibly have been, even if such a document existed; and it is most probable, as Scholten conjectures, that Justin merely referred to documents which tradition supposed to have been written, but of which he himself had no personal knowledge.² Be this as it may, as he considered the incident of the judgment seat a fulfilment of prophecy, there can be little or no doubt that it was narrated in the Memoirs which contained "everything relating to Jesus Christ," and, finding it there, he all the more naturally assumed that it must have been mentioned in some official report.

In the Akhmîm fragment of the Gospel of Peter, published in 1893, we have a similar passage to that quoted by Justin. The fragment states: "They said: 'Let us drag along (σύρωμεν) the son of God'.....and they sat him (ἐκάθισαν αὐτον) upon a seat of judgment (καθέδραν κρίσεως), saying: 'Judge justly (Δικαίως κρίνε), King of Israel.'" This is not in our Gospels, but it has singular points of agreement with the passage in Justin. The Septuagint version of Isaiah, which Justin had previously cited, reads: "They ask me for just judgment" (αἰτοῦσίν με νῦν κρίσιν δικαίαν), and doubtless the narrative, like that of all the Gospels regarding the trial and crucifixion of Jesus, was compiled to show the fulfilment of supposed prophecies like this.

We may here go on to quote more fully Justin's allusions to the parting of the garments, which are also in close agreement with the fragment of the Gospel of Peter. Justin says: "And those who were crucifying him parted his garments (ἐμερίσαν τὰ ἱμάτια αὐτοῦ) amongst themselves, casting lots (λαχμὸν βάλλοντες), each taking what pleased him, according to the cast of the lot" (τοῦ κλήρου).³ This account, which differs materially from that of our Gospels, may be compared with the words in the fragment. "And they laid the clothes (τὰ ἐνδύματα) before him, and distributed them (διεμερίσαντο), and cast lots (λαχμὸν ἔβαλον) for

¹ Cf. Fabricius, *Cod. Apocr. N. T.*, i., p. 298 ff.; Thilo, *Cod. Apocr. N. T.*, p. 796 ff.; Tischendorf, *Evang. Apocr.*, p. 411.

² Scholten, *Die ält. Zeugnisse*, p. 165 ff.

³ *Dial.* xcvi.

them." The use of the peculiar expression, "λαχμὸν βάλλειν," both in the fragment and by Justin, is most striking, for its employment in this connection is limited, so far as we know, to the Gospel of Peter, Justin, and Cyril.¹ Justin, here, is not making an exact quotation, but merely giving an account of what he believes to have occurred, yet the peculiar words of his text remained in his mind and confirm the idea that it was the Gospel of Peter.

In narrating the agony in the Garden, there are further variations. Justin says: "And the passage, 'All my bones are poured out and dispersed like water; my heart has become like wax melting in the midst of my belly,' was a prediction of that which occurred to him that night when they came out against him to the Mount of Olives to seize him. For in the Memoirs, composed, I say, by his Apostles and their followers, it is recorded that his sweat fell down like drops while he prayed, saying: 'If possible, let this cup pass.'"² It will be observed that this is a direct quotation from the Memoirs, but there is a material difference from our Gospels. Luke is the only Gospel which mentions the bloody sweat, and there the account reads (xxii. 44), "as it were drops of blood falling down to the ground."

LUKE. ὡσεὶ θρόμβοι αἵματος καταβαίνοντες ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν.

JUSTIN. ὡσεὶ θρόμβοι κατεχεῖτο.

In addition to the other linguistic differences Justin omits the emphatic αἵματος, which gives the whole point to Luke's account, and which evidently could not have been in the text of the Memoirs. Semisch argues that θρόμβοι alone, especially in medical phraseology, meant "drops of blood," without the addition of αἵματος;³ but the author of the third Gospel did not think so, and undeniably makes use of both, and Justin does not. Moreover, Luke introduces the expression θρόμβοι αἵματος to show the intensity of the agony, whereas Justin evidently did not mean to express "drops of blood" at all, his intention in referring to the sweat being to show that the prophecy, "All my bones are poured out, etc., like water," had been fulfilled, with which the reading in his Memoirs more closely corresponded. The prayer also so directly quoted decidedly varies from Luke xxii. 42, which reads: "Father, if thou be willing to remove this cup from me":

LUKE. Πάτερ, εἰ βούλει παρενεγκεῖν τοῦτο τὸ ποτήριον ἀπ' ἐμοῦ

JUSTIN. Παρελθέτω, εἰ δυνατόν, τὸ ποτήριον τοῦτο.

In Matt. xxvi. 39 this part of the prayer is more like the reading

Note. ¹ This is also pointed out by Dr. Swete, *The Akhmîm Fragment*, 1893, p. xxxiv. Mr. Rendel Harris says: "I regard it as certain that the reading λαχμὸς implies connection between Justin and Peter, either directly or through a third source accessible to both" (*Contemp. Rev.*, August, 1893, p. 231).

² *Dial.* 103.

³ *D. ap. Denkw. Just.*, p. 146.

of Justin: "Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass from me" (Πάτερ, εἰ δυνατόν ἐστίν, παρελθάτω ἀπ' ἐμοῦ τὸ ποτήριον τοῦτο); but that Gospel has nothing of the sweat of agony, which excludes it from consideration. In another place Justin also quotes the prayer in the Garden as follows: "He prayed, saying: 'Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass from me'; and besides this, praying, he said: 'Not as I wish, but as thou willest.'" The first phrase,¹ apart from some transposition of words, agrees with Matthew; but even if this reading be preferred, the absence of the incident of the sweat of agony from the first Gospel renders it impossible to regard it as the source; and, further, the second part of the prayer which is here given differs materially both from the first and third Gospels.

MATT. Nevertheless not as I will but as thou.

LUKE. Nevertheless not my will but thine be done.

JUSTIN. Not as I wish but as thou willest.

MATT. πλὴν οὐχ ὡς ἐγὼ θέλω ἀλλ' ὡς σύ.

LUKE. πλὴν μὴ τὸ θέλημα μου ἀλλὰ τὸ σὸν γινέσθω.

JUSTIN. μὴ ὡς ἐγὼ βούλομαι, ἀλλ' ὡς σὺ θέλεις.

The two parts of this prayer, moreover, seem to have been separate in the Memoirs, for not only does Justin not quote the latter portion at all in *Dial.* 103, but here he markedly divides it from the former. Justin knows nothing of the episode of the Angel who strengthens Jesus, which is related in Luke xxii. 43. There is, however, a still more important point to mention—that although verses 43, 44, with the incidents of the angel and the bloody sweat, are certainly in a great number of MSS., they are omitted by some of the oldest codices, as, for instance, by the Alexandrian and Vatican MSS.² It is evident that in this part Justin's Memoirs differed from our first and third Gospels much in the same way that they do from each other.

In the same chapter Justin states that, when the Jews went out to the Mount of Olives to take Jesus, "there was not even a single man to run to his help as a guiltless person."³ This is in direct contradiction to all the Gospels,⁴ and Justin not only completely ignores the episode of the ear of Malchus, but in this passage excludes it, and his Gospel could not have contained it. Luke is specially marked in generalising the resistance of those

¹ *Dial.* 99.

² In the *Sinaitic Codex* they are marked for omission by a later hand. Lachmann brackets, and Drs. Westcott and Hort double-bracket them. The MS. evidence may be found in detail in Scrivener's *Int. to Crit. N. T.*, 2nd ed., p. 521, stated in the way which is most favourable for the authenticity.

³ Οὐδεὶς γὰρ οὐδὲ μέχρις ἐνὸς ἀνθρώπου βοηθεῖν αὐτῷ ὡς ἀναμαρτήτῳ βοηθὸς ὑπῆρχε. *Dial.* 103.

⁴ Matt. xxvi. 51 ff.; Mark xiv. 46 ff.; Luke xxii. 49 ff.; John xviii., 10 f.

about Jesus to his capture: "When they which were about him saw what would follow, they said unto him: 'Lord, shall we smite with the sword?' And a certain one of them smote the servant of the high priest and cut off his right ear."¹ As this episode follows immediately after the incident of the bloody sweat and prayer in the Garden, and the statement of Justin occurs in the very same chapter in which he refers to them, this contradiction further tends to confirm the conclusion that Justin employed a different Gospel.

It is quite in harmony with the same peculiar account that Justin states that, "after he (Jesus) was crucified, all his friends (the Apostles) stood aloof from him, having denied him²..... (who, after he rose from the dead, and after they were convinced by himself that before his passion he had told them that he must suffer these things, and that they were foretold by the prophets, repented of their flight from him when he was crucified), and while remaining among them he sang praises to God, as is made evident in the *Memoirs of the Apostles*."³ Justin, therefore, repeatedly asserts that *after* the crucifixion all the Apostles forsook him, and he extends the denial of Peter to the whole of the twelve. It is impossible to consider this distinct and reiterated affirmation a mere extension of the passage, "they all forsook him and fled" (πάντες ἀφέντες αὐτὸν ἔφυγον),⁴ when Jesus was arrested, which proceeded mainly from momentary fear. Justin seems to indicate that the disciples withdrew from and denied Jesus when they saw him crucified, from doubts which consequently arose as to his Messianic character. Now, on the contrary, the canonical Gospels represent the disciples as being together after the crucifixion.⁵ Justin does not exhibit any knowledge of the explanation given by the angels at the sepulchre as to Christ having foretold all that had happened,⁶ but makes this proceed from Jesus himself. Indeed, he makes no mention of these angels at all.

There are some traces elsewhere of the view that the disciples were offended after the Crucifixion.⁷ Hilgenfeld points out the

¹ Luke xxii. 49, 50.

² Μετὰ οὖν τὸ σταυρωθῆναι αὐτὸν, καὶ οἱ γνώριμοι αὐτοῦ πάντες ἀπέστησαν, ἀρνησάμενοι αὐτόν. *Apol.*, i. 50.

³ (οἷτινες μετὰ τὸ ἀναστῆναι αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν, καὶ πεισθῆναι ὑπ' αὐτοῦ, ὅτι καὶ πρὸ τοῦ παθεῖν ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς, ὅτι ταῦτα αὐτὸν δεῖ παθεῖν, καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν προφητῶν ὅτι προεκεκήρυκτο ταῦτα, μετενόησον ἐπὶ τῷ ἀφίστασθαι αὐτοῦ ὅτε ἐσταυρώθη), καὶ μετ' αὐτῶν διάγων, ὕμνησε τὸν Θεόν, ὡς καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἀπομνημονεύμασι τῶν ἀποστόλων δηλοῦται γεγεννημένον, κ.τ.λ. *Dial.* 106; cf. *Apol.* i. 50; *Dial.* 53; *de Resurr.*, 9.

⁴ Matt. xxvi. 56; Mark xiv. 50.

⁵ Luke xxiv. 9-12, 33; Mark xvi. 10; John xx. 18, 19; cf. Luke xxiii. 49.

⁶ Luke xxiv. 4-8; Matt. xxviii. 5-7; Mark xvi. 5-7.

⁷ In the *Ascensio Isaiæ*, iii. 14, the following passage occurs: "Et duodecim, qui cum eo, offensionem accipient in eum, et custodes constituentur, qui custodient sepulchrum." Hilgenfeld, *Die Evv. Justin's*, p. 246, anm. 2.

appearance of special Petrine tendency in this passage, in the fact that it is not Peter alone, but all the Apostles, who are said to deny their master; and he suggests that an indication of the source from which Justin quoted may be obtained from the kindred quotation in the Epistle to the Smyrnæans (iii.) by pseudo-Ignatius: "For I know that also after his resurrection he was in the flesh, and I believe that he is so now. And when he came to those that were with Peter he said to them: Lay hold, handle me, and see that I am not an incorporeal spirit. And immediately they touched him and believed, being convinced by his flesh and spirit." Jerome, it will be remembered, found this in the Gospel according to the Hebrews used by the Nazarenes, which he translated,¹ from which we have seen that Justin in all probability derived other particulars differing from the canonical Gospels, and with which we shall constantly meet, in a similar way, in examining Justin's quotations. Origen also found it in a work called the "Teaching of Peter" (*Διδαχὴ Πέτρον*),² which must have been akin to the "Preaching of Peter" (*Κήρυγμα Πέτρον*).³ Hilgenfeld suggests that, in the absence of more certain information, there is no more probable source from which Justin may have derived his statement than the Gospel according to Peter, or the Gospel according to the Hebrews, which is known to have contained so much in the same spirit.⁴

It may well be expected that, at least in touching such serious matters as the Crucifixion and last words of Jesus, Justin must adhere with care to authentic records, and not fall into the faults of loose quotation from memory, free handling of texts, and careless omissions and additions, by which those who maintain the identity of the Memoirs with the canonical Gospels seek to explain the systematic variations of Justin's quotations from the text of the latter. It will, however, be found that here also marked discrepancies occur. Justin says, after referring to numerous prophecies regarding the treatment of Christ: "And again, when he says: 'They spake with their lips, they wagged the head, saying: Let him deliver himself.' That all these things happened to the Christ from the Jews, you can ascertain. For when he was being crucified they shot out the lips and wagged their heads, saying: 'Let him who raised the dead deliver himself.'"⁵ And in another place, referring to the same Psalm (xxii.) as a prediction of what was to happen to Jesus, Justin says: "For they who saw him crucified

¹ *De Vir. Ill.*, 16. ² *De Princip.*, proem. ³ Grabe, *Spicil. Patr.*, i., p. 56.

⁴ Hilgenfeld, *Die Evv. Justin's*, p. 248 ff.

⁵ Καὶ πάλιν ὅταν λέγῃ· Ἐλάλησαν ἐν χεῖλεσιν, ἐκίνησαν κεφαλὴν, λέγοντες· Ῥυσάσθω ἑαυτόν. Ἄτινα πάντα ὡς γέγονεν ὑπὸ τῶν Ἰουδαίων τῷ Χριστῷ, μαθεῖν δύνασθε. Σταυρωθέντος γὰρ αὐτοῦ, ἐξέστρεφον τὰ χεῖλη, καὶ ἐκίκουν τὰς κεφαλὰς, λέγοντες· Ὁ νεκροῦς ἀνεγείρας Ῥυσάσθω ἑαυτόν. *Απολ.*, i. 38.

also wagged their heads, each one of them, and distorted (*διέστρεφον*) their lips, and sneeringly and in scornful irony repeated among themselves those words which are also written in the Memoirs of his Apostles: He declared himself the Son of God; (let him) come down, let him walk about; let God save him."¹ In both of these passages Justin directly appeals to written authority. The *μαθεῖν δύνασθε* may leave the source of the first uncertain,² but the second is distinctly stated to contain the actual words "written in the Memoirs of his Apostles," and it seems reasonable to suppose that the former passage is also derived from them. It is scarcely necessary to add that both differ very materially from the canonical Gospels.³ The taunt contained in the first of these passages is altogether peculiar to Justin: "Let him who raised the dead deliver himself" (*Ὁ νεκροὺς ἀνεγείρας ῥυσάσθω ἑαυτόν*);⁴ and even if Justin did not indicate a written source, it would not be reasonable to suppose that he should himself for the first time record words to which he refers as the fulfilment of prophecy.⁵ It would be still more ineffectual to endeavour to remove the difficulty presented by such a variation by attributing the words to tradition, at the same time that it is asserted that Justin's Memoirs were actually identical with the Gospels. No aberration of memory could account for such a variation, and it is impossible that Justin should prefer tradition regarding a form of words, so liable to error and alteration, with written Gospels within his reach. Besides, to argue that Justin affirmed that the truth of his statement could be ascertained (*μαθεῖν δύνασθε*), whilst the words which he states to have been spoken were not actually recorded, would be against all reason.

¹ Οἱ γὰρ θεωροῦντες αὐτὸν ἐσταυρωμένον καὶ κεφαλὰς ἕκαστος ἐκίνουν, καὶ τὰ χεῖλη διέστρεφον, καὶ τοῖς μυξωτῆρσιν ἐν ἀλλήλοις διερινοῦντες ἔλεγον εἰρωνευόμενοι ταῦτα ἃ καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἀπομνημονεύμασι τῶν ἀποστόλων αὐτοῦ γέγραπται. "Υἱὸν Θεοῦ ἑαυτὸν ἔλεγε· καταβάς περιπατεῖτω· σωσάτω αὐτὸν ὁ Θεός." *Dial.* 101.

² Some writers consider that this is a reference to the *Acta Pilati* as in *Apol.*, i. 35.

³ Dr. Westcott admits that in the latter passage Justin does profess to give the exact words which were recorded in the Memoirs, and that they are not to be found in our Gospels; "but," he apologetically adds, "we do find these others so closely connected with them that few readers would feel the difference"! This is a specimen of apologetic criticism. Dr. Westcott goes on to say that as no MS. or Father known to him has preserved any reading more closely resembling Justin's, "if it appear not to be deducible from our Gospels, due allowance being made for the object which he had in view, its source must remain concealed" (*On the Canon*, p. 114 f.). Cf. Matt. xxvii. 39-43; Mark xv. 29-32; Luke xxiii. 34-37.

⁴ The nearest parallel in our Gospels is in Luke xxiii. 35: "He saved others; let him save himself if this man be the Christ of God, his chosen" (*Ἄλλους ἔσωσεν, σωσάτω ἑαυτόν, κ.τ.λ.*).

⁵ Hilgenfeld, *Die Evv. Justin's*, p. 244 f.

The second of the mocking speeches¹ of the lookers-on is referred distinctly to the *Memoirs of the Apostles*; but is also, with the accompanying description, foreign to our Gospels. The nearest approach to it occurs in our first Gospel, and we subjoin both passages for comparison:—

JUSTIN, DIAL. 101.

He declared himself the Son of God; (let him) come down, let him walk about; let God save him.

γλὸν θεοῦ ἑαυτὸν ἔλεγε· καταβὰς περιπατεῖτω σωσάτω αὐτὸν ὁ θεός.

MATT. XXVII. 40, AND 42, 43.

40. Thou that destroyest the temple, and buildest it in three days, save thyself; if thou art the Son of God, come down from the cross.

42. He saved others, himself he cannot save. He is the King of Israel; let him now come down from the cross, and we will believe in him.

43. He trusted in God; let him deliver him now, if he will have him, for he said, I am the Son of God.

42.καταβάτω νῦν ἀπὸ τοῦ σταυροῦ καὶ πιστεύσομεν ἐπ' αὐτῷ.

43. πέποιθεν ἐπὶ τὸν θεόν, ῥυσάσθω νῦν αὐτὸν² εἰ θέλει αὐτόν· εἶπεν γὰρ ὅτι θεοῦ εἰμι υἱός.

It is evident that Justin's version is quite distinct from this, and cannot have been taken from our Gospels, although professedly derived from the *Memoirs of the Apostles*.

Justin likewise mentions the cry of Jesus on the cross, "O God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" (Ὁ θεός, ὁ θεός μου, ἵνα τί ἐγκατέλιπές με;),³ as a fulfilment of the words of the Psalm, which he quotes here, and elsewhere,⁴ with the peculiar addition of the Septuagint version: "attend to me" (πρόσχες μοι), which, however, he omits when giving the cry of Jesus, thereby showing that he follows a written source which did not contain it, for the quotation of the Psalm, and of the cry which is cited to show that it refers to Christ, immediately follow each other. He apparently knows nothing of the Chaldaic cry, "Eli, Eli, lama sabac-thani," of the Gospels.⁵ The first and second Gospels give the words of the cry from the Chaldaic differently from Justin, from the version of the LXX., and from each other. Matt. xxvii. 46, Θεέ μου, θεέ μου, ἵνα τί με ἐγκατέλιπες; Mark xv. 34, Ὁ

¹ Semisch argues that both forms are quotations of the same sentence, and that there is consequently a contradiction in the very quotations themselves; but there can be no doubt that the two phrases are distinct parts of the mockery, and the very same separation and variation occur in each of the canonical Gospels. *Die ap. Denkw. Mart. Just.*, p. 282; cf. Hilgenfeld, *Die Evv. Justin's*, p. 244.

² *The Cod. Sin.* omits αὐτόν.

⁴ *Dial.* 98.

³ *Dial.* 99.

⁵ Matt. xxvii. 46; Mark xv. 34.

θεός, ὁ θεός μου, εἰς τί ἐγκατέλιπές με; the third Gospel makes no mention at all of this cry, but, instead, has one altogether foreign to the other Gospels: "And Jesus cried with a loud voice, and said: Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit: and having said this, he expired."¹ Justin has this cry also, and in the same form as the third Gospel. He says: "For when he (Jesus) was giving up his spirit on the cross, he said: 'Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit,' as I have also learned from the Memoirs."² Justin's Gospel, therefore, contained both cries, and as even the first two Synoptics mention a second cry of Jesus³ without, however, giving the words, it is not surprising that other Gospels should have existed which included both. Even if we had no trace of this cry in any other ancient work, there would be no ground for asserting that Justin must have derived it from the third Gospel, for, if there be any historical truth in the statement that these words were actually spoken by Jesus, it follows, of course, that they may have been, and probably were, reported in a dozen Christian writings now no longer extant, and in all probability they existed in some of the many works referred to in the prologue to the third Gospel. Both cries, however, are given in the Gospel of Nicodemus, or *Gesta Pilati*, to which reference has already so frequently been made. In the Greek versions edited by Tischendorf we find only the form contained in Luke. In the Codex A the passage reads: "And crying with a loud voice, Jesus said: Father, *Baddach ephkid rouchi*—that is, interpreted: 'into thy hands I commend my spirit': and, having said this, he gave up the ghost."⁴ In the Codex B the text is: "Then Jesus, having called out with a loud voice, 'Father, into thy hands will I commend my spirit,' expired."⁵ In the ancient Latin version, however, both cries are given: "And about the ninth hour Jesus cried with a loud voice, saying, *Hely, Hely, lama zabacthani*, which, interpreted, is: 'My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?' And after this Jesus said: 'Father, into thy

¹ Καὶ φωνήσας φωνῇ μεγάλῃ ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν, Πάτερ, εἰς χεῖράς σου παρατίθεμαι τὸ πνεῦμά μου. τοῦτο δὲ εἰπὼν ἐξέπνευσεν. Luke xxiii. 46.

² Καὶ γὰρ ἀποδιδοὺς τὸ πνεῦμα ἐπὶ τῷ σταυρῷ, εἶπε, Πάτερ, εἰς χεῖράς σου παρατίθεμαι τὸ πνεῦμά μου ὡς καὶ ἐκ τῶν ἀπομνημονευμάτων καὶ τοῦτο ἔμαθον. *Dial.* 105.

³ Matt. xxvii. 50; Mark xv. 37.

⁴ Καὶ φωνήσας φωνῇ μεγάλῃ ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν Πατὴρ, βαδδάχ ἐφκιδ ρουέλ, ὃ ἐρμηνεύεται εἰς χεῖράς σου παρατίθημι τὸ πνεῦμά μου. καὶ τοῦτο εἰπὼν παρέδωκε τὸ πνεῦμα. *Evang. Nicod.*, Pars I. A. sive *Gesta Pilati*, xi.; Tischendorf, *Evang. Apocr.*, p. 233; cf. Thilo, *Cod. Apocr. N. T.*, p. 590 f.

⁵ Ἐπειτα ὁ Ἰησοῦς κράξας φωνῇ μεγάλῃ Πάτερ, εἰς χεῖράς σου παραθήσομαι τὸ πνεῦμά μου, ἀπέπνευσε. *Ev. Nicod.*, Pars I. B. sive *Acta Pilati B.*, xi.; Tischendorf, *Ev. Apocr.*, p. 287.

hands I commend my spirit'; and, saying this, he gave up the ghost."¹

One of the Codices of the same apocryphal work likewise gives the taunting speeches of the Jews in a form more nearly approaching that of Justin's Memoirs than any found in our Gospels. "And the Jews that stood and looked ridiculed him, and said: If thou saidst truly that thou art the Son of God, come down from the cross, and at once, that we may believe in thee. Others, ridiculing, said: He saved others, he healed others, and restored the sick, the paralytic, lepers, demoniacs, the blind, the lame, the dead, and himself he cannot heal."² The fact that Justin actually refers to certain *Acta Pilati* in connection with the Crucifixion renders this coincidence all the more important. Other texts of this Gospel read: "And the Chief Priests, and the rulers with them, derided him, saying: He saved others, let him save himself; if he is the Son of God, let him come down from the cross."³

It is clear from the whole of Justin's treatment of the narrative that he followed a Gospel adhering more closely than the canonical to Psalm xxii., but yet with peculiar variations from it. Our Gospels differ very much from each other; Justin's Memoirs of the Apostles in like manner differed from them. It had its characteristic features clearly and sharply defined. In this way his systematic variations are natural and perfectly intelligible, but they become quite inexplicable if it be supposed that, having our Gospels for his source, he thus persistently and in so arbitrary a way ignored, modified, or contradicted their statements.

Upon two occasions Justin distinctly states that the Jews sent persons throughout the world to spread calumnies against Christians.

¹ *Et circa horam nonam exclamavit Jesus voce magnâ dicens: Hely, Hely, lama zabachani, quod est interpretatum: Deus meus, Deus meus, ut quid dereliquisti me? Et post hæc dicit Jesus: Pater in manus tuas commendo spiritum meum. Et hæc dicens emisit spiritum.* *Nicod. Ev.*, xi.; Fabricius, *Cod. Ap. N. T.*, i., p. 261; cf. Thilo, *Cod. Apocr. N. T.*, p. 591 f.

² Οἱ δὲ Ἰουδαῖοι οἱ ἰστάμενοι καὶ βλέποντες κατεγέλων αὐτὸν καὶ ἔλεγον Ἐὰν ἀληθῶς ἔλεγες ὅτι υἱὸς εἶ τοῦ θεοῦ, κατὰβηθι ἀπὸ τοῦ σταυροῦ, καὶ παρευθὺς ἵνα πιστεύσωμεν εἰς σέ. ἕτεροι ἔλεγον καταγελῶντες Ἄλλους ἔσωσεν, ἄλλους ἐθεράπευσεν, καὶ ἴασατο ἀσθενεῖς, παραλελυμένους, λεπρούς, δαιμονιζομένους, τυφλοῦς, χωλοῦς, νεκρωμένους, καὶ ἑαυτὸν οὐ δύναται θεραπεῦσαι. *Evang. Nicod.*, Pars I. B., sive *Acta Pilati*, B. X.; Tischendorf, *Ev. Apocr.*, p. 286.

³ *Ev. Nicod.*, Pars I. A. x.; Tischendorf, *Ev. Apocr.*, p. 232; cf. Thilo, *Cod. Apocr. N. T.*, p. 584; Fabricius, *Cod. Apocr. N. T.*, i., p. 259; Tischendorf, *ib.*, p. 340. There are differences between all these texts—indeed, there are scarcely two MSS. which agree—clearly indicating that we have now nothing but corrupt versions of a more ancient text.

“When you knew that he had risen from the dead, and ascended into heaven, as the prophets had foretold, not only did you (the Jews) not repent of the wickedness which you had committed, but at that time you selected and sent forth from Jerusalem throughout the land chosen men, saying that the atheistic heresy of the Christians had arisen,” etc.¹..... “from a certain Jesus, a Galilæan impostor, whom we crucified, but his disciples stole him by night from the tomb where he had been laid when he was unloosed from the cross, and they now deceive men, saying that he has risen from the dead and ascended into heaven.”² This circumstance is not mentioned by our Gospels, but, reiterated twice by Justin in almost the same words, it was in all probability contained in the *Memoirs*. Eusebius quotes the passage from Justin without comment, evidently on account of the information which it conveyed. The fragment of the Gospel of Peter describes the elders as going to Pilate and asking for soldiers to watch the grave for three days, “lest his disciples steal him, and the people believe that he rose from the dead.”

These instances, which, although far from complete, have already occupied too much of our space, show that Justin quotes from the *Memoirs of the Apostles* many statements and facts of Gospel history which are not only foreign to our Gospels, but in some cases contradictory to them, whilst the narrative of the most solemn events in the life of Jesus presents distinct and systematic variations from parallel passages in the Synoptic records. It will now be necessary to compare his general quotations from the same *Memoirs* with the Canonical Gospels, and here a very wide field opens before us. As we have already stated, Justin's works teem with these quotations, and to take them all in detail would be impossible within the limits of this work. Such a course, moreover, is unnecessary. It may be broadly stated that even those who maintain the use of the Canonical Gospels can only point out two or three passages out of this vast array which verbally agree with them.³ This extraordinary anomaly—on the supposition that Justin's *Memoirs* were in fact our Gospels—is, as we have mentioned, explained by the convenient hypothesis that Justin quotes imperfectly from memory, interweaves and

¹ *Dial.* 17.

² *Ib.*, 108. This passage commences with statements to the same effect as the preceding.

³ Credner, *Beiträge*, i., p. 229; Hilgenfeld, *Die Evv. Justin's*, p. 252 ff., p. 255; Kirchhofer, *Quellensamml.*, p. 34 f., p. 89; Reuss, *Hist. du Canon*, p. 56; Schwegler, *Das Nachap. Zeit.*, i., p. 222 f.; Semisch, *Die ap. Denkw. M. Just.*, p. 140 f.; De Wette, *Lehrb. Einl. N. T.*, p. 104 f.; Westcott, *On the Canon*, p. 106 f.

modifies texts, and, in short, freely manipulates these Gospels according to his argument. Even strained to the uttermost, however, could this be accepted as a reasonable explanation of such systematic variation, that only twice or thrice out of the vast number of his quotations does he literally agree with passages in them? In order to illustrate the case with absolute impartiality we shall first take the instances brought forward as showing agreement with our Synoptic Gospels.

Tischendorf only cites two passages in support of his affirmation that Justin makes use of our first Gospel.¹ It might be supposed that, in selecting these, at least two might have been produced literally agreeing; but this is not the case, and this may be taken as an illustration of the almost universal variation of Justin's quotations. The first of Tischendorf's examples is the supposed use of Matt. viii. 11, 12: "Many shall come from the east and from the west, and shall sit down," etc. (Πολλοὶ ἀπὸ ἀνατολῶν καὶ δυσμῶν ἤξουσιν, κ.τ.λ.) Now this passage is repeated by Justin no less than three times in three very distinct parts of his *Dialogue with Trypho*,² with a uniform variation from the text of Matthew—"They shall come from the west and from the east," etc. (Ἡξουσιν ἀπὸ δυσμῶν καὶ ἀνατολῶν, κ.τ.λ.)³ That a historical saying of Jesus should be reproduced in many Gospels, and that no particular work can have any prescriptive right to it, must be admitted, so that even if the passage in Justin agreed literally with our first Synoptic, it would not afford any proof of the actual use of that Gospel; but when, on the contrary, Justin upon three several occasions, and at distinct intervals of time, repeats the passage with the same persistent variation from the reading in Matthew, not only can it not be ascribed to that Gospel, but there is reason to conclude that Justin derived it from another source. It may be added that πολλοί is anything but a word uncommon in his vocabulary, and that elsewhere, for instance, he twice quotes a passage similar to one in Matthew, in which, amongst other variations, he reads "*Many* shall come (πολλοὶ ἤξουσιν)," instead of the phrase found in that Gospel.⁴

The second example adduced by Tischendorf is the supposed quotation of Matt. xii. 39; but in order fully to comprehend the nature of the affirmation, we quote the context of the Gospel and of Justin in parallel columns—

¹ *Wann wurden, u. s. w.*, p. 27, anm. 2.

² *Dial.* 76, 120, 140.

³ In *Dial.* 76 the text reads "from the east and from the west."

⁴ *Apol.*, i. 16, *Dial.* 35; cf. Matt. vii. 15.

JUSTIN. DIAL. 107.

And that he should rise again on the third day after the crucifixion, it is written in the Memoirs that some of your neighbours questioning him said: "Show us a sign;" and he answered them: "An evil and adulterous generation seeketh after a sign, and there shall no sign be given to them (*αὐτοῖς*) but the sign of Jonah (*Ἰωνᾶ*)."

Καὶ ὅτι τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ ἐμελλεν ἀναστήσεσθαι μετὰ τὸ σταυρωθῆναι, γέγραπται ἐν τοῖς ἀπομνημονεύμασιν, ὅτι οἱ ἀπὸ τοῦ γένους ὑμῶν συζητοῦντες αὐτῷ ἔλεγον, ὅτι, "Δεῖξον ἡμῖν σημεῖον." καὶ ἀπεκρίνατο αὐτοῖς, Γενεὰ πονηρὰ, κ.τ.λ.

MATTHEW XII. 38, 39.

38. Then certain of the scribes and Pharisees answered him, saying: Master, we would see a sign from thee.

39. But he answered and said unto them: An evil and adulterous generation seeketh after a sign, and there shall no sign be given to it (*αὐτῇ*), but the sign of the prophet Jonah (*Ἰωνᾶ τοῦ προφήτου*).

Τότε ἀπεκρίθησαν αὐτῷ τινὲς τῶν γραμματέων καὶ Φαρισαίων λέγοντες, "Διδάσκαλε, θέλομεν ἀπὸ σοῦ σημεῖον ἰδεῖν." ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, Γενεὰ πονηρὰ, κ.τ.λ.

Now it is clear that Justin here directly professes to quote from the Memoirs, and consequently that accuracy may be expected; but passing over the preliminary substitution of "some of your nation" for "certain of the scribes and Pharisees," although it recalls the "some of them," and "others," by which the parallel passage, otherwise so different, is introduced in Luke xi. 15, 16, 29 ff.,¹ the question of the Jews, which should be literal, is quite different from that of the first Gospel, whilst there are variations in the reply of Jesus, which, if not so important, are still undeniable. We cannot compare with the first Gospel the parallel passages in the second and third Gospels without recognising that other works may have narrated the same episode with similar variations, and whilst the distinct differences which exist totally exclude the affirmation that Justin quotes from Matthew, everything points to the conclusion that he makes use of another source. This is confirmed by another important circumstance. After enlarging during the remainder of the chapter upon the example of the people of Nineveh, Justin commences the next by returning to the answer of Jesus, and making the following statement: "And though all of your nation were acquainted with these things which occurred to Jonah, and Christ proclaimed among you that he would give you the sign of Jonah, exhorting you, at least, after his resurrection from the dead to repent of your evil deeds, and like the Ninevites to supplicate God, that your nation and city might not be captured and destroyed as it has been destroyed; yet not only have you not repented on learning his resurrection from the dead, but, as I have already said,² you sent chosen³ and select

¹ Cf. Mark viii. 11.

² *Dial.* 17. The passage quoted above, p. 215 f.

³ *χειροτονήσαντες*. Literally, "elected by a show of hands"—by vote.

men throughout all the world, proclaiming that an atheistic and impious heresy had arisen from a certain Jesus, a Galilæan impostor," etc.¹ Now, not only do our Gospels not mention this mission, as we have already pointed out, but they do not contain the exhortation to repent, at least, after the resurrection of Jesus here referred to, and which evidently must have formed part of the episode in the *Memoirs*.

Tischendorf does not produce any other instances of supposed quotations of Justin from Matthew, but rests his case upon these. As they are the best examples, apparently, which he can point out, we may judge of the weakness of his argument. De Wette divides the quotations of Justin, which may be compared with our first and third Gospels, into several categories. Regarding the first class, he says: "Some agree quite literally, which, however, is seldom";² and under this head he can only collect three passages of Matthew, and refer to one of Luke. Of the three from Matthew, the first is that, viii. 11, 12,³ also brought forward by Tischendorf, of which we have already disposed. The second is Matt. v. 20: "For I say unto you, that except your righteousness shall exceed that of the scribes and Pharisees, ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven." A parallel passage to this exists in *Dial.* 105, a chapter in which there are several quotations not found in our Gospels at all, with the exception that the first words, "For I say unto you that," are not in Justin. We shall speak of this passage presently. De Wette's third passage is Matt. vii. 19: "Every tree that bringeth not forth good fruit is hewn down and cast into the fire," which, with the exception of one word, "but," at the commencement of the sentence in Justin, also agrees with his quotation.⁴ In these two short passages there are no peculiarities specially pointing to the first Gospel as their source, and it cannot be too often repeated that the mere coincidence of short historical sayings in two works by no means warrants the conclusion that the one is dependent on the other. In order, however, to enable the reader to form a correct estimate of the value of the similarity of the two passages above noted, and also, at the same time, to examine a considerable body of evidence, selected with evident impartiality, we propose to take all Justin's readings of the Sermon on the Mount, from which the above passages are taken, and compare them with our Gospels. This should furnish a fair test of the composition of the *Memoirs of the Apostles*.

Taking first, for the sake of continuity, the first Apology, we find that chapters xv., xvi., xvii., are composed almost entirely of

¹ *Dial.* 108.

² De Wette, *Lehrb. Einl. N.T.*, p. 104.

³ *Dial.* 76, 120, 140; cf. p. 347.

⁴ *Apol.*, i. 16.

examples of what Jesus himself taught, introduced by the remark with which chapter xiv. closes, that "Brief and concise sentences were uttered by him, for he was not a sophist, but his word was the power of God."¹ It may broadly be affirmed that, with the exception of the few words quoted above by De Wette, not a single quotation of the words of Jesus in these three chapters agrees with the canonical Gospels. We shall, however, confine ourselves at present to the Sermon on the Mount. We must mention that Justin's text is quite continuous, except where we have inserted asterisks. We subjoin Justin's quotations, together with the parallel passages in our Gospels, side by side, for greater facility of comparison.²

JUSTIN.

a. *Apol.*, i., 15. He (Jesus) spoke thus of chastity: Whosoever may gaze on a woman to lust after her hath committed adultery already in the heart before God.

β. And, if thy right eye offend thee cut it out, for it is profitable for thee to enter into the kingdom of heaven with one eye (rather) than having two to be thrust into the everlasting fire.

α. Περὶ μὲν οὖν σωφροσύνης τοσοῦτον εἶπεν. Ὅς ἂν ἐμβλέψῃ γυναικὶ πρὸς τὸ ἐπιθυμῆσαι αὐτῆς ἤδη ἐμοίχευσε τῇ καρδίᾳ παρὰ τῷ Θεῷ.

β. Καὶ³ εἰ ὁ ὀφθαλμὸς σου ὁ δεξιὸς σκανδαλίζει σε, ἐκκοψον αὐτόν.

συμφέρει γὰρ σοι μονόφθαλμον εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν οὐρα-

GOSPEL.

Matt. v. 28. But I say unto you, that everyone that looketh on a woman to lust after her hath committed adultery with her already in his heart.

29. But if thy right eye offend thee, pluck it out and cast it from thee: for it is profitable for thee that one of thy members should perish, and not that thy whole body should be cast into hell.

Ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι πᾶς ὁ βλέπων.⁴ γυναῖκα πρὸς τὸ ἐπιθυμῆσαι αὐτὴν ἤδη ἐμοίχευσεν αὐτὴν ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ αὐτοῦ.

εἰ δὲ ὁ ὀφθαλμὸς σου ὁ δεξιὸς σκανδαλίζει σε, ἐξελε⁵ αὐτόν καὶ βάλε ἀπὸ σοῦ. συμφέρει γὰρ σοι ἵνα ἀπόληται ἐν τῶν μελῶν σου, κ.τ.λ.; cf.

¹ Βραχεῖς δὲ καὶ σύντομοι παρ' αὐτοῦ λόγοι γέγονασιν. Οὐ γὰρ σοφιστῆς ὑπῆρχεν, ἀλλὰ δύναμις Θεοῦ ὁ λόγος αὐτοῦ ἦν. *Apol.*, i. 14. This description completely contradicts the representation in the fourth Gospel of the discourses of Jesus. It seems clearly to indicate that Justin had no knowledge of that Gospel.

² It need not be said that the variations between the quotations of Justin and the text of our Gospels must be looked for only in the Greek. For the sake of the reader unacquainted with Greek, however, we shall endeavour as far as possible to indicate in translation where differences exist, although this cannot of course be fully done, nor often without being more literal than is desirable. Where it is not necessary to amend the authorised version of the New Testament for the sake of more closely following the text, and marking differences from Justin, we shall adopt it. We divide the quotations where desirable by initial letters, in order to assist reference at the end of our quotations from the Sermon on the Mount.

³ The "καὶ" here forms no part of the quotation, and seems to separate the two passages, which were, therefore, probably distinct in Justin's Memoirs, although consecutive verses in Matthew.

⁴ Origen repeatedly uses ὅς ἂν ἐμβλέψῃ, and only once πᾶς ὁ βλέπων. Griesbach, *Symb. Critica*, 1785, ii., p. 251.

⁵ Clem. Al. reads ἐκκοψον like Justin. Griesbach, *ib.*, ii., p. 252.

JUSTIN.

νῶν ἢ μετὰ τῶν δύο πεμφθῆναι εἰς τὸ αἰώνιον πῦρ.

γ. And, Whoever marrieth a woman divorced from another man committeth adultery.

Καὶ, Ὅς γαμεῖ ἀπολελυμένην ἀφ' ἑτέρου ἀνδρός, μοιχᾶται.

* * * *

δ. And regarding our affection for all, he taught thus :

If ye love them which love you, what new thing do ye? for even the fornicators do this; but I say unto you: Pray for your enemies and love them which hate you, and bless them which curse you, and pray for them which despitefully use you.

GOSPEL.

Matt. xviii. 9.¹.....καλόν σοί ἐστὶν μονόφθαλμον εἰς τὴν ζωὴν εἰσελθεῖν, ἢ δύο ὀφθαλμοὺς ἔχοντα βληθῆναι εἰς τὴν γέενναν τοῦ πυρός.

Matt. v. 32. And whosoever shall marry a woman divorced

.....καὶ ὅς ἐὰν ἀπολελυμένην γαμήσῃ, μοιχᾶται.²

Matt. v. 46.

For if ye should love them which love you, what reward have ye? do not even the publicans the same? v. 44.³ But I say unto you: Love your enemies⁴ (bless them which curse you, do good to them which hate you), and pray for them which (despitefully use you and) persecute you.⁵

¹ Matt. v. 29, 30, it will be remembered, are repeated with some variation and also reversed in order, and with a totally different context, Matt. xviii. 8, 9. The latter verse, the Greek of the concluding part of which we give above, approximates more nearly in form to Justin's, but is still widely different. "And if thine eye ('right' omitted) offend thee pluck it out and cast it from thee; it is good for thee to enter into life with one eye, rather than having two eyes to be cast into hell fire." The sequence of Matt. v. 28, 29, points specially to it. The double occurrence of this passage, however, with a different context, and with the order reversed in Matthew, renders it almost certain that the two passages *a.* and *β.* were separate in the Memoirs. The reading of Mark ix. 47 is equally distinct from Justin's: And if thine eye offend thee cast it out (ἐκβαλε αὐτόν); it is good for thee (καλόν ἐστίν σε) to enter into the kingdom of God (τοῦ θεοῦ) with one eye, rather than having two eyes to be cast into hell. (ἢ δύο ὀφθαλμοὺς ἔχοντα βληθῆναι εἰς γέενναν.)

² Cf. Matt. xix. 9, Luke xvi. 18. The words ἀφ' ἑτέρου ἀνδρός are peculiar to Justin. The passage in Luke has ἀπὸ ἀνδρός, but differs in the rest.

³ It will be observed that here again Justin's Gospel reverses the order in which the parallel passage is found in our Synoptics. It does so indeed with a clearness of design which, even without the actual peculiarities of diction and construction, would indicate a special and different source. The passage varies throughout from our Gospels, but Justin repeats the same phrases in the same order elsewhere. In *Dial.* 133 he says: "While we all pray for you, and for all men as our Christ and Lord taught us to do, enjoining us to pray even for our enemies, and to love them that hate us, and to bless them that curse us" (εὐχεσθαι καὶ ὑπὲρ τῶν ἐχθρῶν, καὶ ἀγαπᾶν τοὺς μισοῦντας, καὶ εὐλογεῖν τοὺς καταρωμένους). And again in *Apol.*, i. 14, he uses the expression that Christians pray for their enemies (ὑπὲρ τῶν ἐχθρῶν εὐχόμενοι) according to the precepts of Christ. The variation is therefore not accidental, but from a different text.

⁴ The two passages within brackets are not found in any of the oldest MSS., and are only supported by Codices D, E, and a few obscure texts. All modern critics reject them. They are omitted from the revised version.

⁵ The parallel passage in Luke vi. 32, 27, 28, presents similar variations from Matt., though not so great as those of Justin from them both.

JUSTIN.

Περὶ δὲ τοῦ στέργειν ἅπαντας, ταῦτα ἐδίδαξεν· Εἰ ἀγαπᾶτε τοὺς ἀγαπῶντας ὑμᾶς, τί καινὸν ποιεῖτε; καὶ γὰρ οἱ πόρνοι τοῦτο ποιοῦσιν. Ἐγὼ δὲ ὑμῖν λέγω· Εὐχεσθε ὑπὲρ τῶν ἐχθρῶν ὑμῶν καὶ ἀγαπᾶτε τοὺς μισοῦντας ὑμᾶς, καὶ εὐλογεῖτε τοὺς καταρωμένους ὑμῖν, καὶ εὐχεσθε ὑπὲρ τῶν ἐπηρεαζόντων ὑμᾶς.

ε. And that we should communicate to the needy and do nothing for praise, he said thus :

Give ye to every one that asketh, and from him that desireth to borrow turn not ye away ; for if ye

lend to them from whom ye hope to receive, what new thing do ye? for even the publicans do this.

But ye, lay not up for yourselves upon the earth, where moth and rust doth corrupt and robbers break through,

but lay up for yourselves in the heavens, where neither moth nor rust doth corrupt.

For what is a man profited if he shall gain the whole world, but destroy his soul? or what shall he give in exchange for it? Lay up, therefore, in the heavens, where neither moth nor rust doth corrupt.²

Εἰς δὲ τὸ κοινωνεῖν τοῖς δεομένοις, καὶ μηδὲν πρὸς δόξαν ποιεῖν, ταῦτα ἔφη,

Παντὶ τῷ αἰτοῦντι δίδοτε, καὶ τὸν βουλόμενον δανείσασθαι, μὴ ἀποστραφῆτε·

εἰ γὰρ δανείζετε παρ' ὧν ἐλπίζετε λαβεῖν, τί καινὸν ποιεῖτε; τοῦτο καὶ οἱ τελῶναι ποιοῦσιν.

Ἔμεῖς δὲ μὴ θησαυρίζετε ἑαυτοῖς ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, ὅπου σῆς καὶ βρώσις ἀφανίζει, καὶ λησται διορύσσουσι·

GOSPEL.

v. 46.

Ἐὰν γὰρ ἀγαπήσητε τοὺς ἀγαπῶντας ὑμᾶς, τίνα μισθὸν ἔχετε; οὐχὶ καὶ οἱ τελῶναι οὕτως ποιοῦσιν;

v. 44. Ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω ὑμῖν, ἀγαπᾶτε τοὺς ἐχθροὺς ὑμῶν (εὐλογεῖτε τοὺς καταρωμένους ὑμῖν, καλῶς ποιεῖτε τοῖς μισοῦσιν ὑμᾶς,) καὶ προσεύχεσθε ὑπὲρ τῶν³ (ἐπηρεαζόντων καὶ) διωκόντων ὑμᾶς.

Matt. v. 42.

Give thou to him that asketh thee, and from him that would borrow of thee turn not thou away.¹

Cf. Luke vi. 34.

And if ye lend to them from whom ye hope to receive, what thank have ye? for sinners lend, etc.

Matt. vi. 19.

Lay not up for yourselves treasures upon the earth, where moth and rust doth corrupt, and where thieves break through and steal;

vi. 20. But lay up for yourselves treasures in heaven, where neither moth nor rust doth corrupt, and where thieves do not break through nor steal.

Matt. xvi. 26. For what shall a man be profited if he shall gain the whole world, but lose his soul? or what shall a man give in exchange for his soul?

Matt. v. 42.

Τῷ αἰτοῦντί σε δός, καὶ τὸν θέλοντα ἀπὸ σοῦ δανείσασθαι, μὴ ἀποστραφῆς.

Cf. Luke vi. 34.

Καὶ ἐὰν δανίζετε παρ' ὧν ἐλπίζετε λαβεῖν, ποῖα ὑμῖν χάρις ἐστίν; καὶ ἁμαρτωλοὶ ἁμαρτωλοῖς δανίζουσιν, κ.τ.λ.

Matt. vi. 19.

Μὴ φησαυρίζετε ὑμῖν θησαυροὺς ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, ὅπου σῆς καὶ βρώσις ἀφανίζει, καὶ ὅπου κλέπται διορύσσουσιν καὶ κλέπτουσιν·

¹ In the first Gospel the subject breaks off at the end of v. 42. v. 46 may be compared with Justin's continuation, but it is fundamentally different. The parallel passages in Luke vi. 30, 34, present still greater variations. We have given vi. 34 above, as nearer Justin than Matt. v. 46. It will be remarked that to find a parallel for Justin's continuation, without break, of the subject, we must jump from Matt. v. 42, 46, to vi. 19, 20. ² See next page, note 1.

JUSTIN.

θησαυρίζετε δὲ ἑαυτοῖς ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς, ὅπου οὔτε σῆς οὔτε βρώσις ἀφανίζει.

Τί γὰρ ὠφελεῖται ἄνθρωπος, ἂν τὸν κόσμον ὅλον κερδήσῃ, τὴν δὲ ψυχὴν, αὐτοῦ ἀπολέσῃ; ἢ τί δώσει αὐτῆς ἀντάλλαγμα;

θησαυρίζετε οὖν ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς, ὅπου οὔτε σῆς οὔτε βρώσις ἀφανίζει.¹

ζ. And: Be ye kind and merciful as your Father also is kind and merciful, and maketh his sun to rise on sinners, and just and evil.²

But be not careful what ye shall eat and what ye shall put on.

Are ye not better than the birds and the beasts? And God feedeth them.

Therefore be not careful what ye shall eat, or what ye shall put on,

for your heavenly Father knoweth that ye have need of these things,

¹ This phrase, it will be observed, is also introduced higher up in the passage, and its repetition in such a manner, with the same variations, emphatically demonstrates the unity of the whole quotation.

² This passage (ζ) is repeated with the peculiar *χρηστοὶ καὶ οἰκτ.* twice in *Dial.* 96, and in connection with the same concluding words, which are quite separate in our Synoptics. In that place, however, in paraphrasing and not quoting, he adds, "and sending rain on holy and evil." Critics conjecture with much probability that the words *καὶ βρέχει ἐπὶ ὁσίους* have been omitted above after *δικαίους*, by a mistake either of the transcriber or of Justin. In the *Clementine Homilies* (iii. 57) a similar combination to that of Justin's occurs together with a duplication recalling that of Justin, although *ἀγαθοὶ* is substituted for *χρηστοὶ*. *Γίνεσθε ἀγαθοὶ καὶ οἰκτίρμονες ὡς ὁ πατήρ ὁ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς ὃς ἀνατέλλει τὸν ἥλιον ἐπ' ἀγαθοῖς, κ.τ.λ.* Epiphanius also twice makes use of a similar combination, although with variations in language; cf. *Hær.* lxvi. 22, xxxiii. 10. Origen likewise combines Matt. v. 48 and 45; cf. *de Princip.*, ii. 4, § 1. These instances confirm the indication of an ancient connection of the passage as quoted by Justin.

³ There is no parallel to this in the first Gospel. Matt. v. 48 is too remote in sense as well as language.

⁴ The first part of v. 45 is quite different from the context in Justin: "That ye may be sons of your Father which is in heaven: for he maketh," etc.

⁵ There is a complete break here in the continuity of the parallel passage.

GOSPEL.

vi. 20. θησαυρίζετε δὲ ὑμῖν θησαυροὺς ἐν οὐρανῷ, ὅπου οὔτε σῆς οὔτε βρώσις ἀφανίζει, καὶ ὅπου κλέπται οὐ διορύσσουσιν οὐδὲ κλέπτουσιν.

xvi. 26. Τί γὰρ ὠφελήσεται ἄνθρωπος, εἰάν τὸν κόσμον ὅλον κερδήσῃ, τὴν δὲ ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ ζημιωθῇ; ἢ τί δώσει ἄνθρωπος ἀντάλλαγμα τῆς ψυχῆς αὐτοῦ;

Luke vi. 36.³ Be ye merciful even as your Father also is merciful. Matt. v. 45.⁴.....for he maketh his sun to rise on evil and good and sendeth rain on just and unjust.

Matt. vi. 25.

Therefore I say unto you, Be not careful for your life what ye shall eat and what ye shall drink, nor yet for your body what ye shall put on.....

vi. 26. Behold the birds of the air that they sow not, &c., &c., yet your heavenly Father feedeth them. Are ye not much better than they?

vi. 31.⁵ Therefore be not careful, saying: what shall we eat? or what shall we drink, or with what shall we be clothed?

vi. 32. For after all these things do the Gentiles seek: for your heavenly Father knoweth that ye need all these things.

JUSTIN.

but seek ye the kingdom of the heavens, and all these things shall be added unto you,

for where the treasure is there is also the mind of the man.

Καί, Γίνεσθε δὲ χρηστοὶ καὶ οἰκτίρμονες, ὡς καὶ ὁ πατήρ ὑμῶν χρηστός ἐστι καὶ οἰκτίρμων,

καὶ τὸν ἥλιον αὐτοῦ ἀνατέλλει ἐπὶ ἁμαρτωλοῦς καὶ δικαίους καὶ πονηροῦς.

Μὴ μεριμνᾶτε δὲ, τί φάγητε, ἢ τί ἐνδύσησθε·

οὐχ ὑμεῖς τῶν πετεινῶν καὶ τῶν θηρίων διαφέρετε; καὶ ὁ θεὸς τρέφει αὐτά.

Μὴ οὖν μεριμνήσητε τί φάγητε,

ἢ τί ἐνδύσησθε.

οἶδε γὰρ ὁ πατήρ ὑμῶν ὁ οὐράνιος, ὅτι τούτων χρεῖαν ἔχετε·

ζητεῖτε δὲ τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν οὐρανῶν,

καὶ ταῦτα πάντα προστεθήσεται ὑμῖν.

Ὅπου γὰρ ὁ θησαυρὸς ἐστίν, ἐκεῖ καὶ ὁ νοῦς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου.

η. And: Do not these things to be seen of men, otherwise ye have no reward of your Father which is in heaven.

καί, Μὴ ποιῆτε ταῦτα πρὸς τὸ θεαθῆναι ὑπὸ τῶν ἀνθρώπων· εἰ δὲ μή γε, μισθὸν οὐκ ἔχετε παρὰ τοῦ πατρὸς ὑμῶν τοῦ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς.

Apol. i., 16.

θ. And regarding our being patient under injuries, and ready to help all,

GOSPEL.

vi. 33. But seek ye first the kingdom of God and his righteousness, and all these things shall be added unto you.

vi. 21.¹ For where thy treasure is there will thy heart be also.

Luke vi. 36. Γίνεσθε οὖν οἰκτίρμονες, καθὼς καὶ ὁ πατήρ ὑμῶν οἰκτίρμων ἐστίν.

Matt. v. 45.....ὅτι τὸν ἥλιον αὐτοῦ ἀνατέλλει ἐπὶ πονηροῦς καὶ ἀγαθοῦς καὶ βρέχει ἐπὶ δικαίους καὶ ἀδίκους.

Matt. vi. 25.

Διὰ τοῦτο λέγω ὑμῖν, μὴ μεριμνᾶτε τῇ ψυχῇ ὑμῶν τί φάγητε καὶ τί πίητε,² μηδὲ τῷ σώματι ὑμῶν τί ἐνδύσησθε.....

vi. 26. Ἐμβλέψατε εἰς τὰ πετεινὰ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, κ.τ.λ. καὶ ὁ πατήρ ὑμῶν ὁ οὐράνιος τρέφει αὐτά· οὐχ ὑμεῖς ὑἴλλον διαφέρετε αὐτῶν;

vi. 31. μὴ οὖν μεριμνήσητε λέγοντες· Τί φάγωμεν ἢ τί πίωμεν ἢ τί περιβαλώμεθα;

vi. 32. πάντα γὰρ ταῦτα τὰ ἔθνη ἐπιζητοῦσιν· οἶδεν γὰρ ὁ πατήρ ὑμῶν ὁ οὐράνιος, ὅτι χρήζετε τούτων ἀπάντων.

vi. 33. ζητεῖτε δὲ πρῶτον τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ τὴν δικαιοσύνην αὐτοῦ, καὶ ταῦτα πάντα προστεθήσεται ὑμῖν.

vi. 21. Ὅπου γὰρ ἐστίν ὁ θησαυρὸς σου, ἐκεῖ ἔσται καὶ ἡ καρδία σου.

Matt. vi. 1.

But take heed that ye do not your righteousness before men to be seen of them, otherwise ye have no reward from your Father which is in heaven.

vi. 1. Προσέχετε δὲ τὴν δικαιοσύνην ὑμῶν μὴ ποιεῖν ἔμπροσθεν³ τῶν ἀνθρώπων πρὸς τὸ θεαθῆναι αὐτοῖς· εἰ δὲ μή γε, μισθὸν οὐκ ἔχετε παρὰ τῷ πατρὶ ὑμῶν τῷ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς.

Matt. v. 39.

But I say unto you that ye resist not evil,⁴ but whosoever shall smite

¹ Cf. Luke xii. 22-34, which, however, is equally distinct from Justin's text. The difference of order will not have escaped notice.

² The *Cod. Sinaiticus* omits καὶ τί πίητε. Codices A, C, and D are defective at the part. *Cod. B* and most other MSS. have the words.

³ A few MSS. read "alms," ἐλεημοσύνην, here; but the *Cod. Sin. Vat.*, and all the older Codices, have the reading of the text which is adopted by all modern editors.

⁴ It is apparent that if Justin could have quoted this phrase it would have suited him perfectly.

JUSTIN.

and free from anger, this is what he said: Unto him striking thy cheek offer the other also; and him who carrieth off thy cloak or thy coat do not thou prevent.

But whosoever shall be angry is in danger of the fire.

But every one who compelleth thee to go a mile, follow twain.

And let your good works shine before men so that, perceiving, they may adore your Father which is in heaven.

* * * *

Τῷ τύπτοντί σου τὴν σιαγόνα, πάρεχε καὶ τὴν ἄλλην·

καὶ τὸν αἶροντά σου τὸν χιτῶνα, ἢ τὸ ἱμάτιον μὴ κωλύσης.

Ὅς δ' ἂν ὀργισθῆ, ἐνοχός ἐστιν εἰς τὸ πῦρ.

Παντὶ δὲ ἀγγαρεύοντί σοι μίλιον, ἀκολούθησον δύο.

Λαμψάτω δὲ ὑμῶν τὰ καλὰ ἔργα¹ ἔμπροσθεν τῶν ἀνθρώπων, ἵνα βλέποντες,

θαυμάζωσι τὸν πατέρα ὑμῶν τὸν ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς.

* * * *

i. And regarding our not swearing at all, but ever speaking the truth, he thus taught:—

GOSPEL.

thee on thy right cheek turn to him the other also.

v. 40. And to him who would sue thee at law and take away thy coat, let him have thy cloak also.

v. 22.² But I say unto you that every one who is angry with his brother shall be in danger of the judgment, etc.

v. 41. And whosoever shall compel thee to go a mile, go with him twain.

v. 16. Even so let your light shine before men that they may see your good works and glorify your Father which is in heaven.

Matt. v. 39.³

Ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω ὑμῖν μὴ ἀντιστῆναι τῷ πονηρῷ· ἀλλ' ὅστις σε ραπίσει ἐπὶ τὴν δεξιάν σου σιαγόνα, στρέψον αὐτῷ καὶ τὴν ἄλλην·

v. 40. καὶ τῷ θέλοντί σοι κριθῆναι καὶ τὸν χιτῶνά σου λαβεῖν, ἄφες αὐτῷ καὶ τὸ ἱμάτιον·

v. 22. Ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι πᾶς ὁ ὀργιζόμενος τῷ ἀδελφῷ αὐτοῦ⁴ ἐνοχος ἔσται τῇ κρίσει· κ.τ.λ.

v. 41. Καὶ ὅστις σε ἀγγαρεύσει μίλιον ἓν, ὑπάγε μετ' αὐτοῦ δύο.

v. 16. Οὕτως λαμψάτω τὸ φῶς ὑμῶν ἔμπροσθεν τῶν ἀνθρώπων, ὅπως ἴδωσιν ὑμῶν τὰ καλὰ ἔργα καὶ δοξάσωσιν τὸν πατέρα ὑμῶν τὸν ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς.

Matt. v. 34.

But I say unto you, Swear not at

¹ Clement of Alexandria has in one place λαμψ. σου τὰ ἔργα, and again τὰ ἀγαθὰ ὑμῶν ἔργα λαμψάτω. Cf. Griesbach, *Symb. Crit.*, ii., p. 250.

² That part of Matt. v. 22 intrudes itself between parallels found in v. 40 and 41 will not have been overlooked.

³ The parallel passage, Luke vi. 29, is closer to Justin's, but still presents distinct variations: "Unto him smiting thee on the cheek offer the other also, and from him that carrieth off thy coat do not thou withhold (μὴ κωλύσης) thy cloak also." Τῷ τύπτοντί σε ἐπὶ τὴν σιαγόνα, πάρεχε καὶ τὴν ἄλλην, καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ αἶροντός σου τὸ ἱμάτιον καὶ τὸν χιτῶνα μὴ κωλύσης. The whole context, however, excludes Luke; cf. Mayerhoff, *Einl. petr. Schr.*, p. 272.

⁴ εἰκῆ being omitted from *Cod. Sin. Vat.*, and other important MSS., we do not insert it.

JUSTIN.

Ye may not swear at all, but let your yea be yea, and your nay nay, for what is more than these (is) of the evil one.

Περὶ δὲ τοῦ μὴ ὀμνῶναι ὄλως, τὰ ληθῆ δὲ λέγειν αἰεὶ, οὕτως παρεκελεύσατο· Μὴ ὀμόσητε ὄλως·

Ἔστω δὲ ὑμῶν τὸ ναὶ ναὶ· καὶ τὸ οὐ οὐ.¹ τὸ δὲ περισσὸν τούτων ἐκ τοῦ πονηροῦ.

* * * *

κ. For not those who merely make profession, but those who do the works, as he said, shall be saved. For he spake thus :

κ 1. Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall, etc.

κ 2. For whosoever heareth me and doeth what I say, heareth him that sent me.

κ 3. But many will say to me : Lord, Lord, did we not eat and drink in thy name, and do wonders ?

κ 4. And then will I say unto them :

Depart from me, workers of iniquity.

κ 5. There shall he weeping and gnashing of teeth, when indeed the righteous shall shine as the sun, but

GOSPEL.

all, neither by heaven, etc.

v. 37. But let your speech be yea yea, nay nay, for what is more than these is of the evil one.

Matt. v. 34.

Ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω ὑμῖν μὴ ὀμόσαι ὄλως· μήτε ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ, κ.τ.λ.

v. 37. Ἔστω δὲ ὁ λόγος ὑμῶν ναὶ ναὶ, οὐ οὐ· τὸ δὲ περισσὸν τούτων ἐκ τοῦ πονηροῦ ἐστίν.

Matt. vii. 21.

Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall, etc.

Luke x. 16.² He hearing you heareth me, and he despising you, etc., and he that despiseth me, despiseth him that sent me.

Matt. vii. 22.

Many will say to me in that day : Lord, Lord, did we not prophesy in thy name? and in thy name cast out devils? and in thy name do many wonders?

vii. 23. And then will I confess unto them that : i never knew you : Depart from me, ye that work iniquity.

Matt. xiii. 42..... and shall cast them into the furnace of fire : there shall be the weeping and the gnashing of teeth.

¹ This agrees with a passage which occurs twice in the *Clementine Homilies*. The version in Ep. of James v. 12 is evidently a quotation from a source different from Matthew, and supports Justin. Clement Al. twice uses a similar expression, and Epiphanius does so once, though probably following the Ep. of James. The *Apostolic Constitutions* also quotes in similar manner. The context of the *Clementine Homilies* corresponds with that of Justin, but not so the others. We contrast all these passages below :—

James v. 12	ἦτω δὲ ὑμῶν τὸ ναὶ ναὶ, καὶ τὸ οὐ οὐ.
<i>Clem. Hom.</i> , iii. 55	ἔστω ὑμῶν τὸ ναὶ ναὶ, τὸ οὐ οὐ.
<i>Ib.</i> , xix. 2	ἔστω ὑμῶν τὸ ναὶ ναὶ, καὶ τὸ οὐ οὐ.
Justin, <i>Apol.</i> , i. 16	ἔστω δὲ ὑμῶν τὸ ναὶ ναὶ, καὶ τὸ οὐ οὐ.
<i>Clem. Al.</i> , <i>Strom.</i> , v. 14, § 100	ἔστω ὑμῶν τὸ ναὶ ναὶ, καὶ τὸ οὐ οὐ.
Epiph., <i>Hær.</i> , xix. 6	ἦτω ὑμῶν τὸ ναὶ ναὶ, καὶ τὸ οὐ οὐ.
<i>Constit. Ap.</i> , v. 12	εἶναι δὲ τὸ ναὶ ναὶ, καὶ τὸ οὐ οὐ.

² Cf. Matt. x. 40, Mark ix. 37, Luke ix. 48, which are still more remote. In Matt. vii. 24 we find : "Therefore whosoever heareth these sayings of mine and doeth them (καὶ ποιεῖ αὐτούς), I will liken him unto," etc. This, however, as the continuation of v. 21-23 quoted above immediately before this passage, is very abrupt, but it seems to indicate the existence of such a passage as we find in Justin's Memoirs.

JUSTIN.

the wicked are sent into everlasting fire.

κ 6. For many shall arrive in my name, outwardly, indeed, clothed in sheep's skins, but inwardly being ravening wolves.

κ 7. Ye shall know them from their works.

κ 8. And every tree that bringeth not forth good fruit is hewn down and cast into the fire.

κ 1. Οὐχὶ πᾶς ὁ λέγων μοι, Κύριε, κύριε, κ.τ.λ.¹

κ 2. Ὃς γὰρ ἀκούει μου, καὶ ποιεῖ ἃ λέγω, ἀκούει τοῦ ἀποστείλαντός με.²

κ 3. Πολλοὶ δὲ ἐροῦσί μοι· Κύριε, κύριε, οὐ τῷ σῷ ὀνόματι ἐφάγομεν καὶ ἐπίομεν, καὶ δυνάμεις ἐποιήσαμεν;

κ 4. Καὶ τότε ἐρῶ αὐτοῖς. Ἀποχωρεῖτε ἀπ' ἐμοῦ ἐργάται τῆς ἀνομίας.³

GOSPEL.

xiii. 43. Then shall the righteous shine forth as the sun in the kingdom of their Father.

Matt. vii. 15.

But beware of false prophets which come to you in sheep's clothing, but inwardly are ravening wolves.

vii. 16. Ye shall know them by their fruit. Do men gather grapes from thorns, or figs from thistles?

vii. 19. Every tree that bringeth not forth good fruit is hewn down and cast into the fire.

Matt. vii. 21.

Οὐ πᾶς ὁ λέγων μοι, Κύριε, κύριε, κ.τ.λ.

Luke x. 16.

Ὁ ἀκούων ὑμῶν ἐμοῦ ἀκούει, καὶ ὁ ἀθετῶν ὑμᾶς ἐμὲ ἀθετεῖ· ὁ δὲ ἐμὲ ἀθετῶν ἀθετεῖ τὸν ἄποστείλαντά με.⁴

Matt. vii. 22.

Πολλοὶ ἐροῦσίν μοι ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ, Κύριε, κύριε, οὐ τῷ σῷ ὀνόματι ἐπροφητεύσαμεν, καὶ τῷ σῷ ὀνόματι δαιμόνια ἐξεβάλομεν, καὶ τῷ σῷ ὀνόματι δυνάμεις πολλὰς ἐποιήσαμεν;

vii. 23. Καὶ τότε ὁμολογήσω αὐτοῖς ὅτι οὐδέποτε ἔγνων ὑμᾶς· ἀποχωρεῖτε

¹ This is one of the passages quoted by De Wette (*Einl. N. T.*, p. 105) as agreeing except in a single word.

² Justin repeats part of this passage, omitting "and doeth what I say," in *Apol.*, i. 63: "As our Lord himself also says: He that heareth me heareth him that sent me." Justin, however, merely quotes the portion relative to his subject. He is arguing that Jesus is the Word, and is called Angel and Apostle, for he declares whatever we require to know, "as our Lord himself also says," etc.; and therefore the phrase omitted is a mere suspension of the sense, and unnecessary.

³ In *Dial.* 76, Justin makes use of a similar passage. "And many will say to me in that day: Lord, Lord, did we not eat and drink in thy name, and prophesy and cast out devils. And I will say to them Depart from me." καὶ Πολλοὶ ἐροῦσί μοι τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ· Κύριε, κύριε, οὐ τῷ σῷ ὀνόματι ἐφάγομεν καὶ ἐπίομεν καὶ προεφητεύσαμεν καὶ δαιμόνια ἐξεβάλομεν; Καὶ ἐρῶ αὐτοῖς· Ἀναχωρεῖτε ἀπ' ἐμοῦ. This is followed by one which differs from our Gospels in agreement with one in the *Clementine Homilies*, and by others varying also from our Gospels. Although Justin may quote these passages freely, he is persistent in his departure from our Synoptics, and the freedom of quotation is towards his own peculiar source, for it is certain that neither form agrees with the Gospels.

⁴ *Cod. D.* (Bezae) reads for the last phrase ὁ δὲ ἐμοῦ ἀκούων, ἀκούει τοῦ ἀποστείλαντός με· but all the older MSS. have the above. A very few obscure MSS. and some translations add: "He hearing me, heareth him that sent me." καὶ ὁ ἐμοῦ ἀκούων, ἀκούει τοῦ ἀποστείλαντός με.

JUSTIN.

κ 5. Τότε κλαυθμὸς ἔσται καὶ βρυγμὸς τῶν ὀδόντων· ὅταν οἱ μὲν δίκαιοι λάμψωσιν ὡς ὁ ἥλιος· οἱ δὲ ἄδικοι πέμπωνται εἰς τὸ αἰώνιον πῦρ.

κ 6. Πολλοὶ γὰρ ἤξουσιν ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματί μου, ἐξωθεν μὲν ἐνδεδυμένοι δέρματα προβάτων, ἔσωθεν, δὲ ὄντες λύκοι ἄρπαγες.¹

κ 7. ἐκ τῶν ἔργων αὐτῶν ἐπιγνώσεσθε αὐτούς.

κ 8. Πᾶν δὲ δένδρον μὴ ποιῶν καρπὸν καλὸν ἐκκόπτεται καὶ εἰς πῦρ βάλλεται.

* * * *

GOSPEL.

ἀπ' ἐμοῦ οἱ ἐργαζόμενοι τὴν ἀνομίαν.²

Matt. xiii. 42.

.....καὶ βαλοῦσιν αὐτοὺς εἰς τὴν κάμινον τοῦ πυρός· ἐκεῖ ἔσται ὁ κλαυθμὸς καὶ ὁ βρυγμὸς τῶν ὀδόντων.

43. Τότε οἱ δίκαιοι ἐκλάμψουσιν³ ὡς ὁ ἥλιος ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτῶν.⁴

Matt. vii. 15.

Προσέχετε δὲ ἀπὸ τῶν ψευδοπροφητῶν, οἵτινες ἔρχονται πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἐν ἐνδύμασιν προβάτων, ἔσωθεν δὲ εἰσιν λύκοι ἄρπαγες.

16. Ἀπὸ τῶν καρπῶν αὐτῶν ἐπιγνώσεσθε αὐτούς, κ.τ.λ.

19. Πᾶν δένδρον μὴ ποιῶν καρπὸν καλὸν ἐκκόπτεται καὶ εἰς πῦρ βάλλεται.⁵

¹ Justin makes use of this passage with the same variations from our Gospel in *Dial. c. Tr.*, 35. Πολλοὶ ἐλεύσονται ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματί μου, ἐξωθεν ἐνδεδυμένοι δέρματα προβάτων, ἔσωθεν δὲ εἰσι λύκοι ἄρπαγες. With only a separating καὶ, Justin proceeds to quote a saying of Jesus not found in our Gospels at all. "And: There shall be schisms and heresies," Καὶ· Ἔσονται σχίσματα καὶ αἰρέσεις. And then, with merely another separating "And," he quotes another passage similar to the above, but differing from Matt. "And: Beware of false prophets who shall come to you outwardly clothed in sheep's skins, but inwardly are ravening wolves,"—and with the usual separating "And," he ends with another saying not found in our Gospels: "And: Many false Christs and false Apostles shall arise, and shall deceive many of the faithful, Καὶ· Ἀναστήσονται πολλοὶ ψευδόχριστοι καὶ ψευδοαπόστολοι, καὶ πολλοὺς τῶν πιστῶν πλανήσουσιν. Both passages must have been in his Memoirs, and both differ from our Gospels.

² The parallel passage, Luke xiii. 26, 27, is still more remote. Origen in four places, in Joh. xxxii. 7, 8, *Contra Cels.*, ii. 49, *de Principiis*, quotes a passage nominally from Matt., more nearly resembling Justin's: πολλοὶ ἐροῦσί μοι ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ· Κύριε, κύριε, οὐ τῷ ὀνόματί σου ἐφάγομεν, καὶ τῷ ὀνόματί σου ἐπίλομεν, καὶ τῷ ὀνόματί σου δαιμόνια ἐξεβάλομεν, κ.τ.λ. Cf. Griesbach, *Symb. Crit.*, ii., p. 61 f.; Origen may have here confused the Gospel according to the Hebrews with Matthew.

³ The *Cod. D.* (Bezae) has λάμψωσιν, and so also quotes Origen. Cf. Griesbach, *Symb. Crit.*, ii., p. 278.

⁴ The corresponding passage in Luke (xiii. 26–28) much more closely follows the order which we find in Justin, but linguistically and otherwise it is remote from his version, although in connection of ideas more similar than the passage in the first Gospel. In Luke, the weeping and gnashing of teeth are to be when the wicked see the righteous in heaven whilst they are excluded; whereas in Matt. xiii. 42, 43, the weeping, etc., are merely a characteristic of the furnace of fire, and the shining forth of the righteous is mentioned as a separate circumstance. Matt. xiii. 42, 43, has a different context, and is entirely separated from the parallel passage in Justin, which precedes, and naturally introduces this quotation.

⁵ This passage occurs in Matt. iii. 10 and Luke iii. 9, literally, as a saying of John the Baptist, so that in Matt. vii. 19 it is a mere quotation.

JUSTIN.

Apol., i. 17.

λ. As Christ declared saying: To whom God gave more, of him shall more also be demanded again.

.....ὡς ὁ Χριστὸς ἐμήνυσεν εἰπών·
Ὡτι πλεον ἔδωκεν ὁ θεός, πλεον καὶ
ἀπαιτηθήσεται παρ' αὐτοῦ.¹

* * * *

Dial. c. Tr., 105.

μ. Except your righteousness shall exceed, etc.

GOSPEL.

Luke xii. 48 (not found in Matthew).

.....For unto whom much is given, of him shall much be required: and to whom men have committed much, of him they will demand a greater amount.

Luke xii. 48.

.....Παντὶ δὲ ᾧ ἐδόθη πολὺ, πολὺ
ζητηθήσεται παρ' αὐτοῦ, καὶ ᾧ παρέθεντο
πολὸν, περισσότερον αἰτήσουσιν² αὐτόν.

Matt. v. 20.

For I say unto you³ that except your righteousness shall exceed, etc.⁴

We have taken the whole of Justin's quotations from the Sermon on the Mount not only because, adopting so large a test, there can be no suspicion that we select passages for any special purpose, but also because, on the contrary, amongst these quotations are more of the passages claimed as showing the use of our Gospels than any series which could have been selected. It will have been observed that most of the passages follow each other in unbroken sequence in Justin, for with the exception of a short break between γ and δ the whole extract down to the end of θ is continuous, as indeed, after another brief interruption at the end of ι, it is again to the close of the very long and remarkable passage κ. With two exceptions, therefore, the whole of these quotations from the Sermon on the Mount occur consecutively in two succeeding chapters of Justin's first apology, and one passage follows in the next chapter. Only a single passage comes from a distant part of the dialogue with Trypho. These passages are bound together by clear unity of idea and context, and as, where there is a separation of sentences in his Gospel, Justin clearly marks it by καὶ, there is every reason to decide that those quotations which are continuous in form and in argument were likewise consecutive in the Memoirs. Now, the hypothesis that these

¹ Clement of Alexandria (*Stromata*, ii. 23, § 146) has this passage as follows: ᾧ πλεον ἐδόθη, οὗτος καὶ ἀπαιτηθήσεται. Cf. Griesbach, *Symb. Crit.*, ii., p. 380. This version more nearly approximates to Justin's, though still distinct from it.

² The *Codex D.* (Bezae) reads πλεον ἀπαιτήσουσιν instead of περισσότερον αἰτήσουσιν.

³ λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι are wanting in Justin.

⁴ This passage, quoted by De Wette, was referred to p. 219, and led to this examination.

quotations are from the canonical Gospels requires the assumption that Justin, with singular care, collected from distant and scattered portions of those Gospels a series of passages in close sequence to each other, forming a whole unknown to them, but complete in itself; and yet, although this is carefully performed, he at the same time, with the most systematic carelessness, misquoted and materially altered almost every precept he professes to cite. The order of the canonical Gospels is as entirely set at naught as their language is disregarded. As Hilgenfeld has pointed out, throughout the whole of this portion of his quotations the undeniable endeavour after accuracy, on the one hand, is in the most glaring contradiction with the monstrous carelessness on the other, if it be supposed that our Gospels are the source from which Justin quotes. Nothing is more improbable than the conjecture that he made use of the canonical Gospels, and we must accept the conclusion that Justin quotes with substantial correctness the expressions in the order in which he found them in his peculiar Gospel.¹

It is a most arbitrary proceeding to dissect a passage, quoted by Justin as a consecutive and harmonious whole, and finding parallels more or less approximate to its various phrases scattered up and down distant parts of our Gospels, scarcely one of which is not materially different from the reading of Justin, to assert that he is quoting these Gospels freely from memory, altering, excising, combining, and interweaving texts, and introverting their order, but nevertheless making use of them and not of others. It is perfectly obvious that such an assertion is nothing but the merest assumption. Our synoptic Gospels themselves condemn it utterly, for precisely similar differences of order and language exist in them and distinguish between them. Not only the language but the order of a quotation must have its due weight, and we have no right to dismember a passage and, discovering fragmentary parallels in various parts of the Gospels, to assert that it is compiled from them, and not derived, as it stands, from another source.²

It must have been apparent to all that, throughout his quotations from the Sermon on the Mount, Justin follows an order which is quite different from that in our synoptic Gospels; and, as might

¹ Cf. Hilgenfeld, *Die Evv. Justin's*, p. 129 f.; Credner, *Beiträge*, i., p. 259.

² For the arguments of apologetic criticism the reader may be referred to Dr. Westcott's work *On the Canon*, pp. 112-139. Dr. Westcott does not, of course, deny the fact that Justin's quotations are different from the text of our Gospels, but he accounts for his variations on grounds which seem to us purely imaginary. It is evident that, so long as there are such variations to be explained away, at least no proof of identity is possible.

have been expected, the inference of a different source, which is naturally suggested by this variation in order, is more than confirmed by persistent and continuous variations in language. If it be true that examples of confusion of quotation are to be found in the works of Clement of Alexandria, Origen, and other Fathers, it must at the same time be remembered that these are quite exceptional, and we are scarcely in a position to judge how far confusion of memory may not have arisen from reminiscences of other forms of evangelical expressions occurring in apocryphal works, with which we know the Fathers to have been well acquainted. The most vehement asserter of the identity of the Memoirs with our Gospels, however, must absolutely admit as a fact, explain it as he may, that variation from our Gospel readings is the general rule in Justin's quotations, and agreement with them the very rare exception. Now, such a phenomenon is elsewhere unparalleled in those times, when memory was more cultivated than with us in these days of cheap printed books; and it is unreasonable to charge Justin with such universal want of memory and carelessness about matters which he held so sacred, merely to support a foregone conclusion, when the recognition of a difference of source, indicated in every direction, is so much more simple, natural, and justifiable. It is argued that Justin's quotations from the Old Testament likewise present constant variation from the text. This is true to a considerable extent, but they are not so persistently inaccurate as the quotations we are examining, supposing them to be derived from our Gospels. This plea, however, is of no avail, for it is obvious that the employment of the Old Testament is not established merely by inaccurate citations; and it is quite undeniable that the use of certain historical documents out of many of closely similar, and in many parts probably identical, character cannot be proved by anonymous quotations differing from anything actually in these documents.

There are very many of the quotations of Justin which bear unmistakable marks of exactness and verbal accuracy, but which yet differ materially from our Gospels, and most of his quotations from the Sermon on the Mount are of this kind. For instance, Justin introduces the passages which we have marked α , β , γ , with the words: "He (Jesus) spoke thus of Chastity";¹ and, after giving the quotations, α , β , and γ , the first two of which, although finding a parallel in two consecutive verses (Matt. v. 28, 29), are divided by the separating $\kappa\alpha\iota$, and therefore do not appear to have been united in his Gospel, Justin continues: "Just as even those who, with the sanction of human law, contract a second marriage

¹ P. 220 f.

are sinners in the eye of our Master, so also are those who look upon a woman to lust after her. For not only he who actually commits adultery is rejected by him, but also he who desires to commit adultery, since not our acts alone are open before God, but also our thoughts."¹ Now, it is perfectly clear that Justin here professes to give the actual words of Jesus, and then moralises upon them; and both the quotation and his own subsequent paraphrase of it lose all their significance if we suppose that Justin did not correctly quote in the first instance, but actually commences by altering the text. These passages α , β , and γ , however, have all marked and characteristic variations from the Gospel text; but, as we have already shown, there is no reason for asserting that they are not accurate verbal quotations from another Gospel.

The passage δ is likewise a professed quotation,² but not only does it differ in language, but it presents deliberate transpositions in order, which clearly indicate that Justin's source was not our Gospels. The nearest parallels in our Gospels are found in Matt. v. 46, followed by 44. The same remarks apply to the next passage ϵ , which is introduced as a distinct quotation,³ but which, like the rest, differs materially, linguistically and in order, from the canonical Gospels. The whole of the passage is consecutive, and excludes the explanation of a mere patchwork of passages loosely put together, and very imperfectly quoted from memory. Justin states that Jesus taught that we should communicate to those who need, and do nothing for vain glory, and he then gives the very words of Jesus in an unbroken and clearly continuous discourse. Christians are to give to all who ask, and not merely to those from whom they hope to receive again, which would be no new thing—even the publicans do that; but Christians must do more. They are not to lay up riches on earth, but in heaven, for it would not profit a man to gain the whole world, and lose his soul; therefore, the teacher a second time repeats the injunction that Christians should lay up treasures in heaven. If the unity of thought which binds this passage so closely together were not sufficient to prove that it stood in Justin's Gospel in the form and order in which he quotes it, the requisite evidence would be supplied by the repetition at its close of the injunction: "Lay up, therefore, in the heavens," etc. It is impossible that Justin should, through defect of memory, quote a second time in so short a passage the same injunction if the passage were not thus appropriately terminated in his Gospel. The common sense of the

¹ *Apol.*, i. 15. After the passages α , β , γ , and before the above, there is another quotation compared with Matt. xix. 12, but distinctly different from it.

² P. 221.

³ P. 222.

reader must at once perceive that it is impossible that Justin, professedly quoting words of Jesus, should thus deliberately fabricate a discourse rounded off by the repetition of one of its opening admonitions, with the addition of an argumentative "therefore." He must have found it so in the Gospel from which he quotes. Nothing indeed but the difficulty of explaining the marked variations presented by this passage, on the supposition that Justin must quote from our Gospels, could lead apologists to insinuate such a process of compilation, or question the consecutive character of this passage. The nearest parallels to the dismembered parts of the quotation, presenting everywhere serious variations, however, can only be found in the following passages in the order in which we cite them:—Matt. v. 42, Luke vi. 34, Matt. vi. 19, 20, xvi. 26, and a repetition of part of vi. 20, with variations. Moreover, the expression, "What new thing do ye?" is quite peculiar to Justin. We have already met with it in the preceding section δ. "If ye love them which love you, what *new* thing do ye? for even," etc. Here, in the same verse, we have: "If ye lend to them from whom ye hope to receive, what new thing do ye? for even," etc. It is evident, both from its repetition and its distinct dogmatic view of Christianity as a new teaching in contrast to the old, that this variation cannot have been the result of defective memory, but must have been the reading of the *Memoirs*, and, in all probability, it was the original form of the teaching. Such antithetical treatment is clearly indicated in many parts of the Sermon on the Mount: for instance, Matt. v. 21, "Ye have heard that it hath been said *by them of old*.....but *I* say unto you," etc., cf. v. 33, 38, 43. It is certain that the whole of the quotation ε differs very materially from our Gospels, and there is every reason to believe that not only was the passage not derived from them, but that it was contained in the *Memoirs of the Apostles* substantially in the form and order in which Justin quotes it.

The next passage (ζ)¹ is separated from the preceding merely by the usual *καί*, and it moves on to its close with the same continuity of thought and the same peculiarities of construction which characterise that which we have just considered. Christians are to be kind and merciful (*χρηστοὶ καὶ οἰκτίρμονες*) to all as their Father is, who makes his sun to shine alike on the good and evil, and they need not be anxious about their own temporal necessities: what they shall eat and what put on; are they not better than the birds and beasts whom God feedeth? Therefore, they are not to be careful about what they are to eat and what put on, for their heavenly Father knows they have need of these

¹ P. 223.

things; but they are to seek the kingdom of heaven, and all these things shall be added: for where the treasure is—the thing he seeks and is careful about—there will also be the mind of the man. In fact, the passage is a suitable continuation of ε, inculcating, like it, abstraction from worldly cares and thoughts in reliance on the heavenly Father; and the mere fact that a separation is made where it is between the two passages ε and ζ shows further that each of those passages was complete in itself. There is absolutely no reason for the separating καὶ if these passages were a mere combination of scattered verses. This quotation, however, which is so consecutive in Justin, can only find distant parallels in passages widely divided throughout the synoptic Gospels, which have to be arranged in the following order:—Luke vi. 36, Matt. v. 45, vi. 25, 26, 31, 32, 33, vi. 21, the whole of which present striking differences from Justin's quotation. The repetition of the injunction "be not careful" again with the illative "therefore" is quite in the spirit of ε. This admonition, "Therefore, be not careful," etc., is reiterated no less than three times in the first Gospel (vi. 25, 31, 34), and confirms the characteristic repetition of Justin's Gospel, which seems to have held a middle course between Matthew and Luke, the latter of which does not repeat the phrase, although the injunction is made a second time in more direct terms. The repetition of the passage, "Be ye kind and merciful," etc., in *Dial.* 96, with the same context and peculiarities, is a remarkable confirmation of the natural conclusion that Justin quotes the passage from a Gospel different from ours. The expression *χρηστοὶ καὶ οἰκτίρμονες*, thrice repeated by Justin himself, and supported by a similar duplication in the *Clementine Homilies* (iii. 57),¹ cannot possibly be an accidental departure from our Gospels.² For the rest, it is undeniable that the whole passage ζ differs materially, both in order and language, from our Gospels, from which it cannot, without unwarrantable assumption, be maintained to have been taken either collectively or in detail, and strong internal reasons lead us to conclude that it is quoted substantially as it stands from Justin's Gospel, which must have been different from our Synoptics.

In θ, again, we have an express quotation introduced by the words: "And regarding our being patient under injuries and ready to help all, and free from anger, this is what he said"; and

¹ See p. 223, note 4.

² Delitzsch admits the very striking nature of this triple quotation, and of another (in our passage κ 3 and 4), although he does not accept them as necessarily from a different source. "*Auffällig, aber allerdings sehr auffällig sind nur folgende 2 citate γίνεσθε χρηστοὶ κ.τ.λ.*" *Apol.*, i. 15; *Dial.* 96, und *Κύριε, κύριε, κ.τ.λ.* *Apol.*, i. 16; *Dial.* 76; *Unters. u. d. Entst. d. Matth. Evang.*, 1853, p. 34.

then he proceeds to give the actual words.¹ At the close of the quotation he continues: "For we ought not to strive, neither would he have us be imitators of the wicked, but he has exhorted us by patience and gentleness to lead men from shame and the love of evil," etc.² It is evident that these observations, which are a mere paraphrase of the text, indicate that the quotation itself is deliberate and precise. Justin professes first to quote the actual teaching of Jesus, and then makes his own comments; but if it be assumed that he began by concocting out of stray texts, altered to suit his purpose, a continuous discourse, the subsequent observations seem singularly useless and out of place. Although the passage forms a consecutive and harmonious discourse, the nearest parallels in our Gospels can only be found by uniting parts of the following scattered verses:—Matt. v. 39, 40, 22, 41, 16. The Christian who is struck on one cheek is to turn the other, and not to resist those who would take away his cloak or coat; but if, on the contrary, he be angry, he is in danger of fire; if, then, he be compelled to go one mile, let him show his gentleness by going two, and thus let his good works shine before men that, seeing them, they may adore his Father which is in heaven. It is evident that the last two sentences, which find their parallels in Matt. by putting v. 16 after 41, the former verse having quite a different context in the Gospel, must have so followed each other in Justin's text. His purpose is to quote the teaching of Jesus, "regarding our being patient under injuries, and ready to help all and free from anger"; but his quotation of "Let your good works shine before men," etc., has no direct reference to his subject, and it cannot reasonably be supposed that Justin would have selected it from a separate part of the Gospel. Coming as it no doubt did in his *Memoirs* in the order in which he quotes it, it is quite appropriate to his purpose. It is difficult, for instance, to imagine why Justin further omitted the injunction in the parallel passage, Matt. v. 39, "that ye resist not evil," when supposed to quote the rest of the verse, since his express object is to show that "we ought not to strive," etc. The whole quotation presents the same characteristics as those which we have already examined, and in its continuity of thought and wide variation from the parallels in our Gospels, both in order and language, we must recognise a different and peculiar source.

The passage *ι*, again, is professedly a literal quotation, for Justin prefaces it with the words: "And regarding our not swearing at all, but ever speaking the truth, he taught thus"; and having in these words actually stated what Jesus did teach, he

¹ P. 224 f.

² *Apol.*, i. 16.

proceeds to quote his very words.¹ In the quotation there is a clear departure from our Gospel, arising, not from accidental failure of memory, but from difference of source. The parallel passages in our Gospels, so far as they exist at all, can only be found by taking part of Matt. v. 34 and joining it to v. 37, omitting the intermediate verses. The quotation in the Epistle of James v. 12, which is evidently derived from a source different from Matthew, supports the reading of Justin. This, with the passage twice repeated in the *Clementine Homilies* in agreement with Justin, and, it may be added, the peculiar version found in early ecclesiastical writings,² all tend to confirm the belief that there existed a more ancient form of the injunction which Justin no doubt found in his Memoirs. The precept, terse, simple, and direct, as it is here, is much more in accordance with Justin's own description of the teaching of Jesus, as he evidently found it in his Gospel, than the diffused version contained in the first Gospel, v. 33-37.

Another remarkable and characteristic illustration of the peculiarity of Justin's Memoirs is presented by the long passage κ , which is also throughout consecutive and bound together by clear unity of thought.³ It is presented with the context: "For not those who merely make professions, but those who do the works, as he (Jesus) said, shall be saved. For he spake thus."⁴ It does not, therefore, seem possible to indicate more clearly the deliberate intention to quote the exact expressions of Jesus, and yet not only do we find material difference from the language in the parallel passages in our Gospels, but those parallels, such as they are, can only be made by patching together the following verses in the order in which we give them:—Matt. vii. 21, Luke x. 16, Matt. vii. 22, 23, xiii. 42, 43, vii. 15, part of 16, 19. It will be remarked that the passage (κ 2), Luke x. 16, is thrust in between two consecutive verses in Matthew, and taken from a totally different context as the nearest parallel to κ 2 of Justin, although it is widely different from it, omitting altogether the most important words: "and doeth what I say." The repetition of the same phrase, "He that heareth me heareth him that sent me," in *Apol.*, i. 63,⁵ makes it certain that Justin accurately quotes his

¹ P. 225 f.

² P. 226, note 1.

³ Dr. Westcott considers that "the coincidence between Justin and the Clementine Gospel illustrates still more clearly the existence of a traditional as well as of an evangelical form of Christ's words" (*On the Canon*, p. 132). But why merely a "traditional," if by that he means oral tradition? Luke i. 1 shows how many written versions there may have been; cf. Tischendorf, *Wann wurden, u. s. w.*, p. 28 f., and anm. 1, p. 29.

⁴ P. 226 ff.

⁵ See p. 227, note 2.

Gospel, whilst the omission of the words in that place, "and doeth what I say," evidently proceeds from the fact that they are an interruption of the phrase for which Justin makes the quotation—namely, to prove that Jesus is sent forth to reveal the Father. It may be well to compare Justin's passage, κ 1-4, with one occurring in the so-called Second Epistle of Clement to the Corinthians, iv. "Let us not, therefore, only call him Lord, for that will not save us. For he saith: 'Not every one that saith to me, Lord, Lord, shall be saved, but he that worketh righteousness.'.....the Lord said: 'If ye be with me gathered together in my bosom, and do not my commandments, I will cast you off and say to you: Depart from me; I know you not whence you are, workers of iniquity.'" The expression ἐργάται ἀνομίας here strongly recalls the reading of Justin. This passage, which is foreign to our Gospels, at least shows the existence of others containing parallel discourses with distinct variations. Some of the quotations in this spurious Epistle are stated to be taken from the "Gospel according to the Egyptians,"¹ which was in all probability a version of the Gospel according to the Hebrews.² The variations which occur in Justin's repetition, in *Dial.* 76, of his quotation κ 3 are not important, because the more weighty departure from the Gospel in the words, "did we not eat and drink in thy name" (οὐ τῷ σῷ ὀνόματι ἐφάγομεν καὶ ἐπιόμεν), is deliberately repeated;³ and if, therefore, there be freedom of quotation, it is free quotation not from the canonical, but from a different Gospel. Origen's quotation⁴ does not affect this conclusion, for the repetition of the phrase (οὐ) τῷ ὀνόματι σου has the form of the Gospel, and besides, which is much more important, we know that Origen was well acquainted with the Gospel according to the Hebrews and other apocryphal works from which this may have been a reminiscence. We must add, moreover, that the passage in *Dial.* 76 appears in connection with others widely differing from our Gospels. The passage κ 5 not only materially varies from the parallel in Matt. xiii. 42, 43, in language, but in connection of ideas.⁵ Here also, upon examination, we must conclude that Justin quotes from a source different from our Gospels, and, moreover, that his Gospel gives with greater correctness the original form of the passage. The weeping and

¹ Cf. Clemens Al., *Strom.*, iii. 9, 63; 13, 93.

² Compare the quotation, *Clem. II ad Corinth.*, ii. 9, with the quotations from the Gospel according to the Hebrews in Epiphanius, *Her.*, xxx. 14.

³ Delitzsch admits the very striking character of this repetition. *Unters. Entst. Matth. Ev.*, p. 34, see back, p. 373, note 2.

⁴ Cf. p. 228, note 1.

⁵ P. 228, cf. note 3.

gnashing of teeth are distinctly represented as the consequence when the wicked see the bliss of the righteous while they are sent into everlasting fire, and not as the mere characteristics of hell. It will be observed that the preceding passages, κ 3 and 4, find parallels to a certain extent in Matt. vii. 22, 23, although Luke xiii. 26, 27, is, in some respects, closer to the reading of Justin. K 5 finds no continuation of parallel in Matt. vii., from which the context comes, but we have to seek it in xiii. 42, 43. K 5, however, does find its continuing parallel in the next verse, in Luke xiii. 28, where we have "There shall be (the) weeping and (the) gnashing of teeth when ye shall see Abraham," etc. There is here, it is evident, the connection of ideas which is totally lacking in Matt. xiii. 42, 43, where the verses in question occur as the conclusion to the exposition of the Parable of the Tares. Now, although it is manifest that Luke xiii. 28 cannot possibly have been the source from which Justin quotes, still the opening words and the sequence of ideas demonstrate the great probability that other Gospels must have given, after κ 4, a continuation which is wanting after Matt. vii. 23, but which is indicated in the parallel Luke xiii. (26, 27) 28, and is somewhat closely followed in Matt. xiii. 42, 43. When such a sequence is found in an avowed quotation from Justin's Gospel, it is certain that he must have found it there substantially as he quotes it. The passage κ 6,¹ "For many shall arrive," etc., is a very important one, and it departs emphatically from the parallel in our first Gospel. Instead of being, like the latter, a warning against false prophets, it is merely the announcement that many deceivers shall come. This passage is rendered more weighty by the fact that Justin repeats it with little variation in *Dial.* 35, and immediately after quotes a saying of Jesus of only five words which is not found in our Gospels; and then he repeats a quotation to the same effect in the shape of a warning: "Beware of false prophets," etc., like that in Matt. vii. 15, but still distinctly differing from it.² It is perfectly clear that Justin quotes two separate passages. It is impossible that he could intend to repeat the same quotation at an interval of only five words; it is equally impossible that, having quoted it in the one form, he could so immediately quote it in the other through error of memory. The simple, and very natural, conclusion is that he found both passages in his Gospel. The object for which he quotes would more than justify the quotation of both passages; the one referring to the many false Christians, and the other to the false prophets of whom he is speaking. That two passages so closely related should be found in the same Gospel is not in the least singular. There are

¹ P. 228.

² Cf. p. 228, note 1.

numerous instances of the same in our Synoptics.¹ The actual facts of the case, then, are these: Justin quotes in the *Dialogue*, with the same marked deviations from the parallel in the Gospel, a passage quoted by him in the *Apology*, and after an interval of only five words he quotes a second passage to the same effect, though with very palpable difference in its character, which likewise differs from the Gospel, in company with other texts which still less find any parallels in the canonical Gospels. The two passages, by their differences, distinguish each other as separate, whilst, by their agreement in common variations from the parallel in Matthew, they declare their common origin from a special Gospel, a result still further made manifest by the agreement between the first passage in the *Dialogue* and the quotations in the *Apology*. In κ 7² Justin's Gospel substitutes ἔργων for καρπῶν, and is quite in the spirit of the passage θ. "Ye shall know them from their *works*" is the natural reading. The Gospel version clearly introduces "fruit" prematurely, and weakens the force of the contrast which follows. It will be observed, moreover, that, in order to find a parallel to Justin's passage κ 7, 8, only the first part of Matt. vii. 16 is taken, and the thread is only caught again at vii. 19, κ 8 being one of the two passages indicated by de Wette which we are considering, and it agrees with Matt. vii. 19, with the exception of the single word δέ. We must again point out, however, that this passage in Matt. vii. 19 is repeated no less than three times in our Gospels, a second time in Matt. iii. 10, and once in Luke iii. 19. Upon two occasions it is placed in the mouth of John the Baptist, and forms the second portion of a sentence, the whole of which is found in literal agreement both in Matt. iii. 10 and Luke iii. 9, "But now the axe is laid unto the root of the trees, therefore every tree," etc. The passage pointed out by de Wette as the parallel to Justin's anonymous quotation, Matt. vii. 19—a selection which is, of course, obligatory from the context—is itself a mere quotation by Jesus of part of the saying of the Baptist, presenting, therefore, double probability of being well known; and as we have three instances of its literal reproduction in the Synoptics, it would, indeed, be arbitrary to affirm that it was not likewise given literally in other Gospels.

The passage λ³ is very emphatically given as a literal quotation

¹ Cf. Matt. v. 29, 30, with xviii. 8, 9.
 xix. 30 with xx. 16.
 xiii. 12 ,, xxv. 29.
 iii. 10 ,, vii. 19.
 xx. 16 ,, xxii. 14; and viii. 12, xiii. 42, 50, xxii. 13, xxiv. 51,
 and xxv. 30, together; Luke xiv. 11 with xviii. 14, etc.

² P. 228.

³ P. 229.

of the words of Jesus, for Justin cites it directly to authenticate his own statements of Christian belief. He says: "But if you disregard us both when we entreat, and when we set all things openly before you, we shall not suffer loss, believing, or rather being fully persuaded, that everyone will be punished by eternal fire, according to the desert of his deeds, and in proportion to the faculties which he received from God will his account be required, as Christ declared when he said: 'To whom God gave more, of him shall more also be demanded again.'" This quotation has no parallel in the first Gospel, but we add it here as part of the Sermon on the Mount. The passage in Luke xii. 48, it will be perceived, presents distinct variation from it, and that Gospel cannot for a moment be maintained as the source of Justin's quotation.

The last passage, μ ,¹ is one of those advanced by de Wette which led to this examination.² It is, likewise, clearly a quotation; but, as we have already shown, its agreement with Matt. v. 20 is no evidence that it was actually derived from that Gospel. Occurring, as it does, as one of numerous quotations from the Sermon on the Mount, whose general variation, both in order and language, from the parallels in our Gospel points to the inevitable conclusion that Justin derived them from a different source, there is no reason for supposing that this sentence also did not come from the same Gospel.

No one who has attentively considered the whole of these passages from the Sermon on the Mount, and still less those who are aware of the general rule of variation in his mass of quotations as compared with parallels in our Gospels, can fail to be struck by the systematic departure from the order and language of the Synoptics. The hypothesis that they are quotations from our Gospels involves the accusation against Justin of an amount of carelessness and negligence which is quite unparalleled in literature. Justin's character and training, however, by no means warrant any such aspersion,³ and there are no grounds for it. Indeed, but for the attempt arbitrarily to establish the identity of the *Memoirs of the Apostles* with our Gospels, such a charge would never have been thought of. It is unreasonable to suppose that avowed and deliberate quotations of sayings of Jesus, made for the express purpose of furnishing authentic written proof of Justin's statements regarding Christianity, can, as an almost invariable rule, be so singularly incorrect, more especially when it is considered that these quotations occur in an elaborate apology for Christianity addressed to the Roman emperors, and in a careful and studied

¹ P. 229.

² Cf. p. 219.

³ Cf. Eusebius, *H. E.*, iv. 11-18.

controversy with a Jew in defence of the new faith. The simple and natural conclusion, supported by many strong reasons, is that Justin derived his quotations from a Gospel which was different from ours, although naturally, by subject and design, it must have been related to them. His Gospel, in fact, differs from our Synoptics as they differ from each other.

We now return to Tischendorf's statements with regard to Justin's acquaintance with our Gospels. Having examined the supposed references to the first Gospel, we find that Tischendorf speaks much less positively with regard to his knowledge of the other two Synoptics. He says: "There is the greatest probability that in several passages he also follows Mark and Luke."¹ First taking Mark, we find that the only example which Tischendorf gives is the following. He says: "Twice (*Dial.* 76 and 100) he quotes as an expression of the Lord: 'The Son of Man must suffer many things, and be rejected by the Scribes and Pharisees (ch. 100, by the 'Pharisees and Scribes'), and be crucified, and the third day rise again.'² This agrees better with Mark viii. 31 and Luke ix. 22 than with Matt. xvi. 21, only in Justin the 'Pharisees' are put instead of the 'Elders and Chief Priests' (so Matthew, Mark, and Luke), likewise 'be crucified' instead of 'be killed.'³ This is the only instance of similarity with Mark that Tischendorf can produce, and we have given his own remarks to show how weak his case is. The passage in Mark viii. 31 reads: "And he began to teach them that the Son of Man must suffer many things, and be rejected by the Elders and the Chief Priests (ὕπὸ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων καὶ τῶν ἀρχιερέων) and the Scribes, and be killed (καὶ ἀποκτανθῆναι), and after three days (καὶ μετὰ τρεῖς ἡμέρας) rise again." And the following is the reading of Luke ix. 22: "Saying that the Son of man must suffer many things, and be rejected by the Elders and Chief Priests (ἀπὸ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων καὶ ἀρχιερέων) and Scribes, and be killed (καὶ ἀποκτανθῆναι), and the third day rise again." It will be perceived that, different as it also is, the passage in Luke is nearer than that of Mark, which cannot in any case have been the source of Justin's quotation. Tischendorf, however, does not point out that Justin, elsewhere, a third time refers to this very passage in the very same terms. He says: "And Christ.....having comeand himself also preached, saying.....that he must suffer many things from the Scribes and Pharisees and be crucified, and

¹ *Wann Wurden*, u. s. w., p. 28.

² Δεῖ τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου πολλὰ παθεῖν, καὶ ἀποδοκιμασθῆναι ὑπὸ τῶν Γραμματέων καὶ Φαρισαίων, καὶ σταυρωθῆναι, καὶ τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ ἀναστῆναι. *Dial.* 76 (c. 100, Φαρισαίων καὶ Γραμματέων).

³ *Wann wurden*, u. s. w., p. 28, anm. 1.

the third day rise again."¹ Although this omits the words "and be rejected," it gives the whole of the passage literally as before. And thus there is the very remarkable testimony of a quotation three times repeated, with the same marked variations from our Gospels, to show that Justin found those very words in his Memoirs. The persistent variation clearly indicates a different source from our Synoptics. We may, in reference to this reading, compare Luke xxiv. 6: "He is not here, but is risen: remember how he spake unto you when he was yet in Galilee (v. 7), saying that the Son of Man must be delivered up into the hands of sinful men, *and be crucified*, and the third day rise again." This reference to words of Jesus, in which the words *καὶ σταυρωθῆναι* occurred, as in Justin, indicates that, although our Gospels do not contain it, some others may well have done so. In one place Justin introduces the saying with the following words: "For he exclaimed before the crucifixion, the Son of Man," etc.,² both indicating a time for the discourse and also quoting a distinct and definite saying in contradistinction to this report of the matter of his teaching, which is the form in which the parallel passage occurs in the Gospels. In Justin's Memoirs it no doubt existed as an actual discourse of Jesus, which he verbally and accurately quoted.

With regard to the third Gospel, Tischendorf says: "It is in reference to Luke (xxii. 44) that Justin recalls in the Dialogue (103) the falling drops of the sweat of agony on the Mount of Olives, and certainly with an express appeal to the 'Memoirs composed by his Apostles and their followers.'"³ Now we have already seen⁴ that Justin, in the passage referred to, does not make use of the peculiar expression which gives the whole of its character to the account in Luke, and that there is no ground for affirming that Justin derived his information from that Gospel. The only other reference to passages proving the "probability" of Justin's use of Luke or Mark is that which we have just discussed—"The Son of Man must," etc. From this the character of Tischendorf's assumptions may be inferred. De Wette does not advance any instances of verbal agreement either with Mark or Luke.⁵ He says, moreover: "The historical references are much freer still (than quotations), and combine in part the accounts of Matthew and Luke; some of the kind, however, are not found at

¹ ὅτι δεῖ αὐτὸν πολλὰ παθεῖν ἀπὸ τῶν Γραμματέων καὶ Φαρισαίων, καὶ σταυρωθῆναι, καὶ τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ ἀναστῆναι. *Dial.* 51.

² *Dial.* 76.

³ *Wann wurden, u. s. w.*, p. 28, anm. 1.

⁴ P. 208 f.

⁵ We may point out, however, that he says: "*Andere wörtliche Uebereinstimmungen kommen mitten unter Abweichungen vor, wie Apol., ii., p. 75, vgl. Matt. i. 21, wo Luc. i. 35, damit combinirt ist.*" *Einl., N. T.*, p. 105; but a single phrase combined with a passage very like one in a different Gospel is a very poor argument.

all in our canonical Gospels."¹ This we have already sufficiently demonstrated.

We might now well terminate the examination of Justin's quotations, which has already taken up too much of our space; but before doing so it may be very advisable briefly to refer to another point. In his work, *On the Canon*, Dr. Westcott adopts a somewhat singular course. He evidently feels the very great difficulty in which any one who asserts the identity of the source of Justin's quotations with our Gospels is placed by the fact that, as a rule, these quotations differ from parallel passages in our Gospels; and whilst on the one hand maintaining that the quotations generally are from the canonical Gospels, he on the other endeavours to reduce the number of those which profess to be quotations at all. He says: "To examine in detail the whole of Justin's quotations would be tedious and unnecessary. It will be enough to examine (1) those which are alleged by him as quotations, and (2) those also which, though anonymous, are yet found repeated with the same variations either in Justin's own writings or (3) in heretical works. It is evidently on these quotations that the decision hangs."² Now under the first category Dr. Westcott finds very few. He says: In seven passages only, as far as I can discover, does Justin profess to give the exact words recorded in the Memoirs; and in these, if there be no reason to the contrary, it is natural to expect that he will preserve the exact language of the Gospels which he used, just as in anonymous quotations we may conclude that he is trusting to memory."³ Before proceeding further, we may point out the straits to which an apologist is reduced who starts with a foregone conclusion. We have already seen a number of Justin's professed quotations; but here, after reducing the number to seven only, our critic prepares a way of escape even out of these. It is difficult to understand what "reason to the contrary" can possibly justify a man "who professes to give the exact words recorded in the Memoirs" for not doing what he professes; and, further, it passes our comprehension to understand why, in anonymous quotations, "we may conclude that he is trusting to memory." The cautious exception is as untenable as the gratuitous assumption. Dr. Westcott continues, as follows, the passage which we have just interrupted: "The result of a first view of the passages is striking. Of the seven, five agree verbally with the text of St. Matthew or St. Luke, exhibiting indeed three slight various readings not elsewhere found, but such as are easily explicable; the sixth is a compound summary of words related by St. Matthew; the seventh

¹ *Einl.*, N. T., p. 111.

² *On the Canon*, p. 112 f.

³ *Ib.*, 114.

alone *presents an important variation in the text of a verse*, which is, however, otherwise very uncertain."¹ The italics of course are ours. The "first view" of the passages and of the above statement is indeed striking. It is remarkable how easily difficulties are overcome under such an apologetic system. The striking result, to summarise Dr. Westcott's own words, is this: out of seven professed quotations from the *Memoirs*, in which he admits we may expect to find the exact language preserved, five present three variations; one is a compressed summary, and does not agree verbally at all; and the seventh presents an important variation. Dr. Westcott, on the same easy system, continues: "Our inquiry is thus confined to the two last instances, and it must be seen whether their disagreement from the synoptic Gospel is such as to outweigh the agreement of the remaining five."² Before proceeding to consider these seven passages admitted by Dr. Westcott, we must point out that, in a note to the statement of the number, he mentions that he excludes other two passages as "not merely quotations of words, but concise narratives."³ But surely this is a most extraordinary reason for omitting them, and one the validity of which cannot be admitted. As Justin introduces them deliberately as quotations, why should they be excluded simply because they are combined with a historical statement? We shall produce them. The first is in *Apol.*, i. 66: "For the Apostles, in the *Memoirs* composed by them which are called Gospels,⁴ handed down that it was thus enjoined on them that Jesus, having taken bread and given thanks, said: 'This do in remembrance of me. This is my body.' And similarly, having taken the cup and given thanks, he said: 'This is my blood,' and delivered it to them alone."⁵ This passage, it will be remembered, occurs in an elaborate apology for Christianity addressed to the Roman emperors, and Justin is giving an account of the most solemn sacrament of his religion. Here, if ever, we might reasonably expect accuracy and care; and Justin, in fact, carefully indicates the source of the quotation he is going to make. It is difficult to understand any ground upon which so direct a quotation from the *Memoirs of the Apostles* could be set aside by Dr. Westcott. Justin distinctly states that the Apostles in these *Memoirs* have "thus" (*οὕτως*) transmitted what was enjoined on us by Jesus, and then gives the precise quotation. Had the quotation agreed with our Gospels, would it not have been claimed as a professedly accurate quotation from them? Surely no one can reasonably pretend, for instance, that when Justin, after this preamble, states that, having taken bread, etc., *Jesus said*: "This

¹ *On the Canon*, p. 113 f.

² *Ib.*, p. 114.

³ *Ib.*, p. 113, note 1.

⁴ We have already discussed these words, p. 185 f.

⁵ *Apol.*, i. 66.

do in remembrance of me: this is my body"; or, having taken the cup, etc., *he said*: "This is my blood"—Justin does not deliberately mean to quote what Jesus actually did say? Now, the account of the episode in Luke is as follows (xxii. 17): "And he took a cup, gave thanks, and said: "Take this and divide it among yourselves. 18. For I say unto you, I will not drink of the fruit of the vine until the Kingdom of God shall come. 19. And he took bread, gave thanks, brake it, and gave it unto them, saying: This is my body which is given for you: this do in remembrance of me. 20. And in like manner the cup after supper, saying: This is the new covenant in my blood, which is shed for you."¹ Dr. Westcott, of course, only compares this passage of Justin with Luke, to which, and the parallel in 1 Cor. xi. 24, wide as the difference is, it is closer than to the accounts in the other two Gospels. That Justin professedly quoted literally from the Memoirs is evident, and is rendered still more clear by the serious context with which the quotation is introduced, the intention being to authenticate his explanations by actual written testimony. His dogmatic views, moreover, are distinctly drawn from a Gospel, which, in a more direct way than our Synoptics do, gave the expressions: "This is my body," and "This is my blood," and it must have been observed that Luke, with which Justin's reading alone is compared, not only has not: *Τοῦτ' ἐστὶ τὸ αἷμά μου*, at all, but makes use of a totally different expression: "This cup is the new covenant in my blood, which is shed for you."

The second quotation from the Memoirs which Dr. Westcott passes over is that in *Dial.* 103, compared with Luke xxii. 42, 43,² on the Agony in the Garden, which we have already examined³ and found at variance with our Gospel, and without the peculiar and distinctive expressions of the latter.

We now come to the seven passages which Dr. Westcott admits to be professed quotations from the Memoirs, and in which "it is natural to expect that he will preserve the exact words of the Gospels which he used." The first of these is a passage in the *Dialogue*, part of which has already been discussed in connection with the fire in Jordan and the voice at the Baptism, and found to be from a source different from our Synoptics.⁴ Justin says: "For even he, the devil, at the time when he also (Jesus) went up from the river Jordan when the voice said to Him: 'Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee,' is recorded in the *Memoirs of the Apostles* to have come to him and tempted him even so far as

¹ Luke xxii. 17-20; cf. Matt. xxvi. 26 ff.; Mark xiv. 22 ff.

² *On the Canon*, p. 113, note 1.

³ P. 208 f.

⁴ P. 200 ff.

saying to him: 'Worship me'; and Christ answered him (*καὶ ἀποκρίνασθαι αὐτῷ τὸν Χριστὸν*), 'Get thee behind me, Satan' (*Ὑπάγε ὀπίσω μου, Σατανᾶ*), 'thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and Him only shalt thou serve.'"¹ This passage is compared with the account of the temptation in Matt. iv. 9, 10: "And he said unto him, All these things will I give thee, if thou wilt fall down and worship me. 10. Then saith Jesus unto him (*τότε λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς*), Get thee hence, Satan (*Ὑπάγε Σατανᾶ*): *it is written*, Thou shalt worship," etc. All the oldest *Codices*, it should be stated, omit the *ὀπίσω μου*, as we have done, but *Cod. D.* (Bezae) and a few others of infirm authority insert these two words. Dr. Westcott, however, justly admits them to be "probably only a very early interpolation."² We have no reason for supposing that they existed in Matthew during Justin's time. The oldest *Codices* omit the whole phrase from the parallel passage, Luke iv. 8, but *Cod. A.* is an exception, and reads: *Ὑπάγε ὀπίσω μου, Σατανᾶ*. The best modern editions, however, reject this as a mere recent addition to Luke. A comparison of the first and third Gospels with Justin clearly shows that the Gospel which he used followed the former more closely than Luke. Matthew makes the climax of the temptation the view of all the kingdoms of the world, and the offer to give them to Jesus if he will fall down and worship Satan. Luke, on the contrary, makes the final temptation the suggestion to throw himself down from the pinnacle of the temple. Justin's Gospel, as the words, "so far as saying to him" (*μέχρι τοῦ εἰπεῖν αὐτῷ*), etc., clearly indicate, had the same climax as Matthew. Now, the following points must be observed. Justin makes the words of Satan, "Worship me" (*Προσκύνησόν μοι*), a distinct quotation; the Gospel makes Satan offer all that he had shown "if thou wilt fall down and worship me" (*εἰὰν πεσὼν προσκυνήσης μοι*). Then Justin's quotation proceeds: "And Christ answered him" (*καὶ ἀποκρίνασθαι αὐτῷ τὸν Χριστὸν*); whilst Matthew has: "Then Jesus saith to him" (*τότε λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς*), which is a marked variation.³ The *ὀπίσω μου* of Justin, as we have already said, is not found in any of the older *Codices* of Matthew. Then the words, "it is written," which form part of the reply of Jesus in our Gospels, are omitted in Justin's; but we must add that in *Dial.* 125, in again referring to the temptation, he has, "it is written." Still, in that passage he also inserts the whole phrase, "Get thee behind me, Satan," and commences: "For he answered him: It is written, Thou shalt worship," etc.

¹ *Dial.* 103.

² *On the Canon*, p. 113, note 2, i.

³ Luke iv. 12 reads, *καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς αὐτῷ εἶπεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς*.

We must, however, again point out the most important fact that this account of the temptation is directly connected with another which is foreign to our Gospels. The Devil is said to come at the time Jesus went up out of the Jordan and the voice said to him: "Thou art my son, this day have I begotten thee"—words which do not occur at all in our Gospels, and which are again bound up with the incident of the fire in Jordan. It is altogether unreasonable to assert that Justin could have referred the fact which he proceeds to quote from the Memoirs to the time those words were uttered, if they were not to be found in the same Memoirs. The one incident was most certainly not derived from our Gospels, inasmuch as they do not contain it, and there are the very strongest reasons for asserting that Justin derived the account of the temptation from a source which contained the other. Under these circumstances every variation is an indication, and those which we have pointed out are not accidental, but clearly exclude the assertion that the quotation is from our Gospels.

The second of the seven passages of Dr. Westcott is one of those from the Sermon on the Mount, *Dial.* 105, compared with Matt. v. 20, adduced by de Wette, which we have already considered.¹ With the exception of the opening words, λέγω γὰρ ὑμῖν ὅτι, the two sentences agree, but this is no proof that Justin derived the passage from Matthew; while, on the contrary, the persistent variation of the rest of his quotations from the Sermon on the Mount, both in order and language, forces upon us the conviction that he derived the whole from a source different from our Gospels.

The third passage of Dr. Westcott is that regarding the sign of Jonas the prophet, Matt. xii. 39, compared with *Dial.* 107, which was the second instance adduced by Tischendorf. We have already examined it,² and found that it presents distinct variations from our first Synoptic, both linguistically and otherwise, and that many reasons lead to the conclusion that it was quoted from a Gospel different from ours.

The fourth of Dr. Westcott's quotations is the following, to part of which we have already had occasion to refer:³ "For which reason our Christ declared on earth to those who asserted that Elias must come before Christ: Elias indeed shall come (Ἡλίας μὲν ἐλεύσεται), and shall restore all things: but I say unto you that Elias is come already, and they knew him not, but did unto him (αὐτῷ) whatsoever they listed. And it is written that then the disciples understood that he spoke to them of John the Baptist."⁴ The "express quotation" in this passage, which is compared with Matt. xvii. 11-13, is limited by Dr. Westcott to

¹ Cf. pp. 219, 240 f.

² P. 217 f.

³ P. 200.

⁴ *Dial.* 49.

the last short sentence¹ corresponding with Matt. xvii. 13, and he points out that Credner admits that it must have been taken from Matthew. It is quite true that Credner considers that if any passage of Justin's quotations proves a necessary connection between Justin's Gospels and the Gospel according to Matthew, it is this sentence: "And it is written that then the disciples," etc. He explains his reason for this opinion as follows: "These words can only be derived from our Matthew, with which they literally agree; for it is thoroughly improbable that a remark of so special a description could have been made by two different and independent individuals so completely in the same way."² We totally differ from this argument, which is singularly opposed to Credner's usual clear and thoughtful mode of reasoning. No doubt, if such Gospels could be considered to be absolutely distinct and independent works, deriving all their matter from individual and separate observation of the occurrences narrated by their authors and personal report of the discourses given, there might be greater force in the argument, although even in that case it would have been far from conclusive here, inasmuch as the observation we are considering is the mere simple statement of a fact necessary to complete the episode, and it might well have been made in the same terms by separate reporters. Now, such an expression as Matt. xvii. 13 in some early record of the discourse might have been transferred to a dozen of other Christian writings. Ewald assigns the passage to the oldest Gospel, Matthew, in its present form, being fifth in descent.³

Our three canonical Gospels are filled with instances in which expressions still more individual are repeated, and these show that such phrases cannot be limited to one Gospel; but, if confined in the first instance to one original source, may have been transferred to many subsequent evangelical works. Take, for instance, a passage in Matt. vii. 28, 29: ".....the multitudes were astonished at his teaching: for he taught them as having authority, and not as their scribes."⁴ Mark i. 22 has the very same passage,⁵ with the mere omission of "the multitude" (οἱ ὄχλοι), which does not in the least affect the argument; and Luke iv. 32: "And they were astonished at his teaching: for his word was power."⁶

¹ *On the Canon*, p. 114, note 4.

² Credner, *Beiträge*, i., p. 237.

³ *Die drei ersten Evangelien*, p. 34, cf. p. 1; *Jahrb. bibl. Wiss.*, 1849, p. 190 ff.

⁴.....ἐξεπλήσσοντο οἱ ὄχλοι ἐπὶ τῇ διδαχῇ αὐτοῦ· ἦν γὰρ διδάσκων αὐτοὺς ὡς ἐξουσίαν ἔχων, καὶ οὐχ ὡς οἱ γραμματεῖς αὐτῶν. Matt. vii. 28, 29.

⁵ The final αὐτῶν is omitted from the end of the passage in Matthew in many MSS., and added by others in Mark.

⁶ καὶ ἐξεπλήσσοντο ἐπὶ τῇ διδαχῇ αὐτοῦ, ὅτι ἐν ἐξουσίᾳ ἦν ὁ λόγος αὐτοῦ. Luke iv. 32.

Although the author of the third Gospel somewhat alters the language, it is clear that he follows the same original, and retains it in the same context as the second Gospel. Now the occurrence of such a passage as this in one of the Fathers, if either the first or second Gospels were lost, would, on Credner's grounds, be attributed undoubtedly to the survivor, although in reality derived from the Gospel no longer extant, which likewise contained it. Another example may be pointed out in Matt. xiii. 34: "All these things spake Jesus unto the multitudes in parables; and *without a parable spake he not unto them*," compared with Mark iv. 33, 34, "And with many such parables spake he the word unto them..... and without a parable spake he not unto them." The part of this very individual remark which we have italicised is literally the same in both Gospels, as a personal comment at the end of the parable of the grain of mustard seed. Then, for instance, in the account of the sleep of the three disciples during the Agony in the Garden (Matt. xxvi. 43, Mark xiv. 40), the expression, "and he found them asleep, *for their eyes were heavy*," which is equally individual, is literally the same in the first two Gospels. Another special remark of a similar kind regarding the rich young man, "He went away sorrowful, for he had great possessions," is found both in Matt. xix. 22 and Mark x. 22. Such examples¹ might be multiplied, and they show that the occurrence of passages of the most individual character cannot, in Justin's time, be limited to any single Gospel.

Now, the verse we are discussing, Matt. xvii. 13, in all probability, as Ewald supposes, occurred in one or more of the older forms of the Gospel from which our Synoptics, and many other similar works, derived their matter, and nothing is more likely than that the Gospel according to the Hebrews, which in many respects was nearly related to Matthew, may have contained it. At any rate, we have shown that such sayings cannot, however apparently individual, be considered evidence of the use of a particular Gospel simply because it happens to be the only one now extant which contains it. Credner, however, whilst expressing the opinion which we have quoted, likewise adds his belief that by the expression, *καὶ γέγραπται*, Justin seems expressly to indicate that this sentence is taken from a different work from what precedes it, and he has proved that the preceding part of the quotation was not derived from our Gospels.² We cannot, however, coincide with this opinion either. It seems to us that the expression, "and

¹ Cf. Matt. iii. 3, Mark i. 2, 3, Luke iii. 4; Matt. iii. 5, 6, Mark i. 5; Matt. xiv. 3, 4, Mark vi. 17, 18; Matt. xiv. 9, Mark vi. 26; Matt. xxviii. 14, Mark xv. 5; Matt. xxvii. 39, Mark xv. 29, etc.

² Credner, *Beiträge*, i., p. 237.

it is written," simply was made use of by Justin to show that the identification of Elias with John the Baptist is not his, but was the impression conveyed at the time by Jesus to his disciples. Now, the whole narrative of the baptism of John in Justin bears characteristic marks of being from a Gospel different from ours,¹ and in the first part of this very quotation we find distinct variation. Justin first affirms that Jesus in his teaching had proclaimed that Elias should also come (καὶ Ἡλίαν ἐλεύσεσθαι), and then further on he gives the actual words of Jesus: Ἡλίας μὲν ἐλεύσεται, κ.τ.λ., which we have before us, whilst in Matthew the words are: Ἡλίας μὲν ἔρχεται, and there is no MS. which reads ἐλεύσεται for ἔρχεται; and yet, as Credner remarks, the whole force of the quotation rests upon the word, and Justin is persistent in his variation from the text of our first Synoptic. It is unreasonable to say that Justin quotes loosely the important part of his passage, and then about a few words at the close pretends to be so particularly careful. Considering all the facts of the case, we must conclude that this quotation also is from a source different from our Gospels.

Another point, however, must be noted. Dr. Westcott claims this passage as an express quotation from the Memoirs, apparently for no other reason than that the few words happen to agree with Matt. xvii. 13, and that he wishes to identify the Memoirs with our Gospels. Justin, however, does not once mention the Memoirs in this chapter; it follows, therefore, that Dr. Westcott, who is so exceedingly strict in his limitation of express quotations, assumes that all quotations of Christian history and words of Jesus in Justin are to be considered as derived from the Memoirs, whether they be mentioned by name or not. We have already seen that amongst these there are not only quotations differing from the Gospels, and contradicting them, but others which have no parallels at all in them.

The fifth of Dr. Westcott's express quotations occurs in *Dial.* 105, where Justin says: "For when he (Jesus) was giving up his spirit on the cross he said: 'Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit,' as I have also learned from the Memoirs." This short sentence agrees with Luke xxiii. 46, it is true; but, as we have already shown,² Justin's whole account of the Crucifixion differs so materially from that in our Gospels that it cannot have been derived from them.

We see this forcibly in examining the sixth of Dr. Westcott's quotations, which is likewise connected with the Crucifixion. "For they who saw him crucified also wagged their heads, each one of them, and distorted their lips, and sneeringly, and in scornful

¹ P. 200 ff.

² P. 213 f.

irony, repeated among themselves those words which are also written in the *Memoirs of his Apostles*: He declared himself the son of God: (let him) come down, let him walk about: let God save him."¹ We have ourselves already quoted and discussed this passage,² and need not further examine it here. Dr. Westcott has nothing better to say regarding this quotation, in an examination of the accuracy of parallel passages, than this: "These exact words do not occur in our Gospels, but we do find there others so closely connected with them that few readers would feel the difference"³ When criticism descends to language like this, the case is, indeed, desperate. It is clear that, as Dr. Westcott admits, the words are expressly declared to be a quotation from the *Memoirs of the Apostles*, but they do not exist in our Gospels, and consequently our Gospels are not identical with the *Memoirs*. Dr. Westcott refers to the taunts in Matthew, and then, with commendable candour, he concludes his examination of the quotation with the following words: "No manuscript or Father (so far as we know) has preserved any reading of the passage more closely resembling Justin's quotation; and if it appear not to be deducible from our Gospels, due allowance being made for the object which he had in view, its source must remain concealed."⁴ We need only add that it is futile to talk of making "due allowance" for the object which Justin had in view. His immediate object was accurate quotation, and no allowance can account for such variation in language and thought as is presented in this passage. That this passage, though a professed quotation from the *Memoirs*, is not taken from our Gospels is certain, both from its own variations and the differences in other parts of Justin's account of the Crucifixion, an event whose solemnity and importance might well be expected to secure reverential accuracy. It is impossible to avoid the conclusion that Justin's *Memoirs of the Apostles* were not identical with our Gospels, and the systematic variation of his quotations thus receives its natural and reasonable explanation.

The seventh and last of Dr. Westcott's express quotations is, as he states,—“more remarkable.” We subjoin the passage in contrast with the parallel texts of the first and third Gospels:—

JUSTIN, DIAL. 100.	MATT. XI. 27.	LUKE X. 22.
And in the Gospel it is written that he said:	All things were delivered to me by the ⁵	All things were delivered to me by my
All things have been delivered to me by the		

¹ *Dial.* 101.

³ *On the Canon*, p. 114 f.

² P. 211 f.

⁴ *Ib.*, p. 115.

⁵ Most Codices read “my,” but the *Cod. Sin.* having “the,” we give it as more favourable.