

JUSTIN, DIAL. 100.	MATT. XI. 27.	LUKE X. 22.
Father, and no one knoweth (γινώσκει) the Father but the Son, nor the Son but the Father and	Father, and no one knoweth (ἐπιγινώσκει) the Son but the Father, nor knoweth (ἐπιγινώσκει) anyone the Father but the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son is minded to reveal him.	Father, and no one knoweth (γινώσκει) who the Son is but the Father, and who the Father is but the Son,
those to whomsoever the Son shall reveal him.		and he to whomsoever the Son is minded to reveal him.
Καὶ ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ δὲ γέγραπται εἰπών· Πάντα μοι παραδέδοται ὑπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ οὐδεὶς γινώσκει τὸν πατέρα εἰ μὴ ὁ υἱὸς· οὐδὲ τὸν υἱὸν εἰ μὴ ὁ πατήρ καὶ οἱς ἂν ὁ υἱὸς ἀποκαλύψῃ.	Πάντα μοι παρεδόθη ὑπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς, <sup>1</sup> καὶ οὐδεὶς ἐπιγινώσκει τὸν υἱὸν εἰ μὴ ὁ πατήρ, οὐδὲ τὸν πατέρα τις ἐπιγινώσκει εἰ μὴ ὁ υἱὸς καὶ ᾧ ἂν βούληται ὁ υἱὸς ἀποκαλύψαι.	Πάντα μοι παρεδόθη ὑπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς μου, καὶ οὐδεὶς γινώσκει τίς ἐστὶν ὁ υἱὸς εἰ μὴ ὁ πατήρ, καὶ τίς ἐστὶν ὁ πατήρ, εἰ μὴ ὁ υἱὸς καὶ ᾧ ἂν βούληται ὁ υἱὸς ἀποκαλύψαι.

It is apparent that Justin's quotation differs very materially from our Gospels in language, in construction, and in meaning. These variations, however, acquire very remarkable confirmation and significance from the fact that Justin in two other places<sup>2</sup> quotes the latter and larger part of the passage from οὐδεὶς in precisely the same way, with the sole exception that, in both of these quotations, he used the aorist ἔγνω instead of γινώσκει. This threefold repetition in the same peculiar form clearly stamps the passage as being a literal quotation from his Gospel, and the one exception to the verbal agreement of the three passages, in the substitution of the present for the aorist in the *Dialogue*, does not remove or lessen the fundamental variation of the passage from our Gospel. As the ἔγνω is twice repeated, it was probably the reading of his text. Now it is well known that the peculiar form of the quotation in Justin occurred in what came to be considered heretical Gospels, and constituted the basis of important Gnostic doctrines.<sup>3</sup> Dr. Westcott speaks of the use of this passage by the Fathers in agreement with Justin in a manner which, unintentionally we have no doubt, absolutely misrepresents important facts. He says: "The transposition of the words still remains; and how little weight can be attached to that will appear upon an examination of the various forms in which the text is quoted by Fathers like Origen, Irenæus, and Epiphanius, who admitted our Gospels exclusively. It occurs

<sup>1</sup> See last note.

<sup>2</sup> *Apol.*, i. 63.

<sup>3</sup> Dr. Westcott merely alludes to this in the briefest way in a note (*On the Canon*, p. 115, note 2).

in them as will be seen from the table of readings<sup>1</sup> with almost every possible variation. Irenæus in the course of one chapter quotes the verse first as it stands in the canonical text; then in the same order, but with the last clause like Justin's; and once again altogether as he has given it. Epiphanius likewise quotes the text seven times in the same order as Justin, and four times as it stands in the Gospels.<sup>2</sup> Now in the chapter to which reference is made in this sentence Irenæus commences by stating that the Lord had declared: "*Nemo cognoscit Filium nisi Pater; neque Patrem quis cognoscit nisi Filius, et cui voluerit Filius revelare,*"<sup>3</sup> as he says, "Thus Matthew has set it down and Luke similarly, and Mark the very same."<sup>4</sup> He goes on to state, however, that those who would be wiser than the Apostles write this verse as follows: "*Nemo cognovit Patrem nisi Filius; nec Filium nisi Pater, et cui voluerit Filius revelare.*" And he explains: "They interpret it as though the true God was known to no man before the coming of our Lord; and that God who was announced by the Prophets they affirm not to be the Father of Christ."<sup>5</sup> Now in this passage we have the *ἔγνω* of Justin in the "*cognovit,*" in contradistinction to the "*cognoscit*" of the Gospel, and his transposition of order as not by any possibility an accidental thing, but as the distinct basis of doctrines. Irenæus goes on to argue that no one can know the Father unless through the Word of God, that is through the Son, and this is why he said: "*'Nemo cognoscit Patrem nisi Filius; neque Filium nisi Pater, et quibuscunque Filius revelaverit.'* Thus teaching that he himself also is the Father, as indeed he is, in order that we may not receive any other Father except him who is revealed by the Son."<sup>6</sup> In this third quotation Irenæus alters the *ἔγνω* into *γινώσκει*, but retains the form, for the rest, of the Gnostics and of Justin, and his aim apparently is to show that, adopting his present tense instead of the aorist, the transposition of words is of no importance. A fourth time, however, in the same chapter, which in fact is wholly dedicated to this passage and to the doctrines based upon it, Irenæus quotes the saying: "*Nemo cognoscit Filium nisi Pater; neque Patrem nisi Filius, et quibuscunque Filius revelaverit.*"<sup>7</sup> Here the language and order of the

<sup>1</sup> In the few readings given in this table, Dr. Westcott does not distinguish the writers at all. Cf. *On the Canon*, p. 116, note 3.

<sup>2</sup> *On the Canon*, p. 116.

<sup>3</sup> *Adv. Hær.*, iv. 6, § 1.

<sup>4</sup> *Sic et Mathæus posuit, et Lucas similiter, et Marcus idem ipsum.* We need not point out that this is a misstatement, for our Mark has not got the passage at all.

<sup>5</sup> "*Et interpretantur, quasi a nullo cognitus sit verus Deus ante Domini nostri adventum: et eum Deum, qui a prophetis sit annuntiatus, dicunt non esse Patrem Christi.*" *Adv. Hær.*, iv. 6, § 1.

<sup>6</sup> *Docens semetipsum et Patrem, sicut est, ut alterum non recipiamus Patrem, nisi eum qui a Filio revelatur.* *Ib.*, iv. 6, § 3.

<sup>7</sup> *Adv. Hær.*, iv. 6, § 7.

Gospel are followed with the exception that "*cui voluerit revelare*" is altered to the "*quibuscunque revelaverit*" of Justin; and that this is intentional is made clear by the continuation: "For *revelaverit* was said not with reference to the future alone,"<sup>1</sup> etc.

Now, in this chapter we learn very clearly that, although the canonical Gospels, by the express declaration of Irenæus, had their present reading of the passage before us, other Gospels of considerable authority even in his time had the form of Justin, for again, in a fifth passage, he quotes the opening words: "He who was known, therefore, was not different from him who declared: 'No one knoweth the Father,' but one and the same."<sup>2</sup> With the usual alteration of the verb to the present tense, Irenæus, in this and in one of the other quotations of this passage just cited, gives some authority to the transposition of the words "Father" and "Son," although the reading was opposed to the Gospels; but he invariably adheres to *γινώσκει* and condemns *ἔγνω*, the reading maintained by those who, in the estimation of Irenæus, "would be wiser than the Apostles." Elsewhere, descanting on the passages of Scripture by which heretics attempt to prove that the Father was unknown before the advent of Christ, Irenæus, after accusing them of garbling passages of Scripture,<sup>3</sup> goes on to say of the Marcosians and others: "Besides these, they adduce a countless number of apocryphal and spurious works which they themselves have forged to the bewilderment of the foolish, and of those who are not versed in the Scriptures of truth."<sup>4</sup> He also points out passages occurring in our Gospels to which they give a peculiar interpretation, and, among these, that quoted by Justin. He says: "But they adduce as the highest testimony, and, as it were, the crown of their system, the following passage. .... 'All things were delivered to me by my Father, and no one knew (*ἔγνω*) the Father but the Son, and the Son but the Father, and he to whomsoever (*ὃν ἂν*) the Son shall reveal (*ἀποκαλύψει*).'<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Revelaverit enim, non solum in futurum dictum est, etc. ; Ib., iv. 6, § 7.*

<sup>2</sup> *Non ergo alius erat qui cognoscebatur, et alius qui dicebat: "Nemo cognoscit Patrem:" sed unus et idem, etc. ; Ib., iv. 6, § 7.* In another place Irenæus again quotes the passage in the same order, with the same careful adherence to the present tense. *Adv. Hær., ii. 6, § 1.*

<sup>3</sup> *Adv. Hær., i. 19, § 1.*

<sup>4</sup> *Πρὸς δὲ τούτοις ἀμύθητον πλῆθος ἀποκρύφων καὶ νόθων γραφῶν, ἃς αὐτοὶ ἔπλασαν, παρεισφέρουσιν εἰς κατάπληξιν τῶν ἀνοήτων καὶ τὰ τῆς ἀληθείας μὴ ἐπισταμένων γράμματα. Adv. Hær., i. 20, § 1.*

<sup>5</sup> *Adv. Hær., i. 20, § 3.* And again, referring to Valentinus and his followers, and endeavouring to show the inconsistency of their views, he says: "*Salvator ergo, secundum eos, erit mentitus, dicens: 'Nemo cognovit Patrem nisi Filius.' Si enim cognitus est vel a matre, vel a semine ejus; solutum est illud, quod, 'nemo cognovit Patrem nisi Filius.'*" *Adv. Hær., ii. 14, § 7.* Irenæus then endeavours out of their own form of the text to confute their doctrines.

In these words they assert that he clearly demonstrated that the Father of truth whom they have invented was known to no one before his coming; and they desire to interpret the words as though the Maker and Creator had been known to all, and the Lord spoke these words regarding the Father unknown to all, whom they proclaim."<sup>1</sup> Here we have the exact quotation twice made by Justin, with the ἔγνω and the same order, set forth as the reading of the Gospels of the Marcosians and other sects, and the highest testimony to their system. It is almost impossible that Justin could have altered the passage by an error of memory to this precise form, and it must be regarded as the reading of his Memoirs. The evidence of Irenæus is clear: The Gospels had the reading which we now find in them, but apocryphal Gospels, on the other hand, had that which we find twice quoted by Justin, and the passage was, as it were, the text upon which a large sect of the early Church based its most fundamental doctrine. The ἔγνω is invariably repudiated, but the transposition of the words "Father" and "Son" was apparently admitted to a certain extent, although the authority for this was not derived from the Gospels recognised by the Church, which contained the contrary order.

We must briefly refer to the use of this passage by Clement of Alexandria. He quotes portions of the text eight times, and, although with some variation of terms, he invariably follows the order of the Gospels. Six times he makes use of the aorist ἔγνω,<sup>2</sup> once of γινώσκει,<sup>3</sup> and once of ἐπιγινώσκει.<sup>4</sup> He only once quotes the whole passage;<sup>5</sup> but on this occasion, as well as six others in which he only quotes the latter part of the sentence,<sup>6</sup> he omits βούληται, and reads "and he to whom the Son shall reveal," thus supporting the ἀποκαλύψη of Justin. Twice he has "God" instead of "Father,"<sup>7</sup> and once he substitutes μηδεὶς for οὐδεὶς.<sup>8</sup> It is evident, from the loose and fragmentary way in which Clement interweaves the passage with his text, that he is more concerned with the sense than the verbal accuracy of the quotation; but the result of his evidence is that he never departs from the Gospel order of "Father" and "Son," although he frequently makes use of ἔγνω and also employs ἀποκαλύψη in agreement with Justin, and, therefore, he shows the prevalence of forms approximating to, though always presenting material difference from, the reading of Justin.

<sup>1</sup> *Adv. Hær.*, i. 20, § 3.

<sup>2</sup> *Pæd.*, i. 9, § 88; i. 5, § 20; *Strom.*, i. 28, § 178; v. 13, § 95; vii. 10, 58; *Cohort.*, i. 10.

<sup>3</sup> *Strom.*, vii. 18, § 109.

<sup>4</sup> *Quis Div. Salv.*, 9.

<sup>5</sup> *Strom.*, i. 28, § 178.

<sup>6</sup> *Coh.*, i., § 10; *Pæd.*, i. 5, § 20; *Strom.*, v. 13, § 85; vii. 10, § 58; vi. 18, § 109; *Quis Div. Salv.*, 8.

<sup>7</sup> *Coh.*, i., § 10; *Pæd.*, i. 5, § 20.

<sup>8</sup> *Strom.*, v. 13, § 85.

Epiphanius refers to this passage no less than ten times,<sup>1</sup> but he only quotes it fully five times, and upon each of these occasions with variations. Of the five times to which we refer, he thrice follows the order of the Gospels,<sup>2</sup> as he does likewise in another place where he does not complete the sentence.<sup>3</sup> On the remaining two occasions he adopts the same order as Justin, with variations from his readings, however, to which we shall presently refer;<sup>4</sup> and where he only partially quotes he follows the same order on other three occasions,<sup>5</sup> and in one other place the quotation is too fragmentary to allow us to distinguish the order.<sup>6</sup> Now, in all of these ten quotations, with one exception, Epiphanius substitutes οἶδε for ἐπιγινώσκει at the commencement of the passage in Matthew, and only thrice does he repeat the verb in the second clause as in that Gospel, and on these occasions he twice makes use of οἶδε<sup>7</sup> and once of ἔγνω.<sup>8</sup> He once uses ἔγνω with the same order as Justin, but does not complete the sentence.<sup>9</sup> Each time he completes the quotation he uses ᾧ ἐὰν with the Gospel, and ἀποκαλύψῃ with Justin;<sup>10</sup> but only once out of the five complete quotations does he insert ὁ υἱὸς in the concluding phrase. It is evident from this examination, which we must not carry further, that Epiphanius never verbally agrees with the Gospel in his quotation of this passage, and never verbally with Justin, but mainly follows a version different from both. It must be remembered, however, that he is writing against various heresies, and it does not seem to us improbable that he reproduces forms of the passage current amongst those sects.

In his work against Marcion, Tertullian says: "With regard to the Father, however, that he was never seen, the Gospel which is common to us will testify, as it was said by Christ: *Nemo cognovit patrem nisi filius*,"<sup>11</sup> but elsewhere he translates "*Nemo scit*,"<sup>12</sup> evidently not fully appreciating the difference of ἔγνω.<sup>13</sup> The passage in Marcion's Gospel reads like Justin's: οὐδεὶς ἔγνω τὸν πατέρα, εἰ μὴ ὁ υἱὸς, οὐδὲ τὸν υἱὸν τις γινώσκει, εἰ μὴ ὁ πατήρ.<sup>14</sup> The use of ἔγνω as applied to the Father and γινώσκει as regards the Son in this passage is suggestive. Origen almost

<sup>1</sup> *Hær.*, liv. 4, ed. *Petav.*, p. 466; lxiv. 9, p. 532; xlv. 6, p. 613; lxix. 43, p. 766; lxxiv. 4, p. 891, 10, p. 898; lxxvi. 7, p. 943, 29, p. 977, 32, p. 981.

<sup>2</sup> *Hær.*, lxxvi. 7, p. 943; liv. 4, p. 466; lxv. 6, p. 613.

<sup>3</sup> *Hær.*, lxvi. 9, p. 532.

<sup>4</sup> *Hær.*, lxxiv. 4, p. 891; lxxvi. 29, p. 977.

<sup>5</sup> *Hær.*, lxix. 43, p. 766; lxxiv. 10, p. 898; lxxvi. 32, p. 981.

<sup>6</sup> *Hær.*, lxxvi. 32, p. 981.

<sup>7</sup> *Hær.*, liv. 4, p. 466; lxix. 43, p. 766.

<sup>8</sup> *Hær.*, lxv. 6, p. 613.

<sup>9</sup> *Hær.*, lxxiv. 10, p. 898.

<sup>10</sup> Except once when he has ἀποκαλύπτει. *Hær.*, lxxiv. 4, p. 891.

<sup>11</sup> *Adv. Marc.*, ii. 27.

<sup>12</sup> *Ib.*, iv. 25, cf. 6.

<sup>13</sup> Cf. Hilgenfeld, *Die Evv. Justin's*, p. 202 f.

<sup>14</sup> *Dial. de recta in Deum fide*, 1; Origen, *Op.*, i., p. 817 D; Thilo, *Cod. Apocr. N. T.*, p. 433; Hahn, *Das Evang. Marcions*, p. 160.

invariably uses ἔγνω, sometimes adopting the order of the Gospels and sometimes that of Justin, and always employing ἀποκαλύψῃ.<sup>1</sup> The *Clementine Homilies* always read ἔγνω, and always follow the same order as Justin, presenting other and persistent variations from the form in the Gospels. Οὐδεὶς ἔγνω τὸν πατέρα εἰ μὴ ὁ υἱὸς, ὡς οὐδὲ τὸν υἱὸν τις εἶδεν<sup>2</sup> εἰ μὴ ὁ πατήρ, καὶ οἷς ἂν βούληται ὁ υἱὸς ἀποκαλύψαι.<sup>3</sup> This reading occurs four times. The *Clementine Recognitions* have the aorist with the order of the Gospels.<sup>4</sup>

There only remain a few more lines to add to those already quoted to complete the whole of Dr. Westcott's argument regarding this passage. He continues and concludes thus: "If, indeed, Justin's quotations were made from memory, no transposition could be more natural; and if we suppose that he copied the passage directly from a manuscript, there is no difficulty in believing that he found it so written in a manuscript of the canonical St. Matthew, since the variation is excluded by no internal improbability, while it is found elsewhere, and its origin is easily explicable."<sup>5</sup> It will be observed that Dr. Westcott does not attempt any argument, but simply confines himself to suppositions. If such explanations were only valid, there could be no difficulty in believing anything, and every embarrassing circumstance would be easily explicable.

The facts of the case may be briefly summed up as follows: Justin deliberately and expressly quotes from his Gospel, himself calling it "Gospel," be it observed, a passage whose nearest parallel in our Gospels is Matt. xi. 27. This quotation presents material variations from our canonical Gospel, both in form and language. The larger part of the passage he quotes twice in a different work, written years before, in precisely the same words as the third quotation, with the sole exception that he uses the aorist instead of the present tense of the verb. No MS. of our Gospel extant approximates to the reading in Justin, and we are expressly told by Irenæus that the present reading of our Matthew was that existing in his day. On the other hand, Irenæus states with equal distinctness that Gospels used by Gnostic sects had the reading of Justin, and that the passage was "the crown of their system," and one upon whose testimony they based their leading doctrines. Here, then, is the clear statement that Justin's quotation disagrees with the form in the Gospels, and agrees with that of other Gospels. The variations occurring in the numerous quotations of

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Griesbach, *Symb. Crit.*, ii., pp. 271, 373.

<sup>2</sup> Credner, *Beiträge*, i., p. 250.

<sup>3</sup> *Clem. Hom.*, xvii. 4; xviii. 4, 13, 20; xviii. 11.

<sup>4</sup> *Clem. Recog.*, ii. 47.

<sup>5</sup> *On the Canon*, p. 117.

the same passage by the Fathers, which we have analysed, show that they handled it very loosely, but also indicate that there must have been various readings of considerable authority then current. It has been conjectured with much probability that the form in which Justin quotes the passage twice in his *Apology* may have been the reading of older Gospels, and that it was gradually altered by the Church to the form in which we now have it for dogmatic reasons, when Gnostic sects began to base doctrines upon it inconsistent with the prevailing interpretation.<sup>1</sup> Be this as it may, Justin's Gospel clearly had a reading different from ours, but in unison with that known to exist in other Gospels, and this express quotation only adds additional proof to the mass of evidence already adduced that the *Memoirs of the Apostles* were not our canonical Gospels.

We have already occupied so much space even with this cursory examination of Justin's quotations that we must pass over in silence passages which he quotes from the *Memoirs* with variations from the parallels in our Gospels, which are also found in the *Clementine Homilies* and other works emanating from circles in which other Gospels than ours were used. We shall now only briefly refer to a few sayings of Jesus, expressly quoted by Justin, which are altogether unknown to our Gospels. Justin says: "For the things which he foretold would take place in his name, these we see actually coming to pass in our sight. For he said: 'Many shall come,' etc.,<sup>2</sup> and 'There shall be schisms and heresies,'<sup>3</sup> and 'Beware of false prophets,'<sup>4</sup> etc., and 'Many false Christs and false Apostles shall arise and shall deceive many of the faithful.'"<sup>5</sup> Neither of the two prophecies here quoted is to be found anywhere in our Gospels, and to the second of them Justin repeatedly refers. He says in one place that Jesus "foretold that in the interval of his coming, as I previously said,<sup>6</sup> heresies and false prophets would arise in his name."<sup>7</sup> It is admitted that these prophecies are foreign to our Gospels. It is very probable that the Apostle Paul refers to the prophecy, "There shall be schisms and heresies" in 1 Cor. xi. 18-19, where it is said, ".....I hear that schisms exist amongst you; and I partly believe it. For there

<sup>1</sup> Schwegler, *Das nachap. Zeit.*, i., p. 254 ff. Cf. Credner, *Beiträge*, i., p. 250 f. Delitzsch, *N. Unters. Kan. Euv.*, p. 35 f. Scholten, *Het Paulin. Evangelie*, 1870, p. 103 f.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. p. 228, note 4, p. 238 f.

<sup>3</sup> εἶπε γάρ..... Ἔσονται σχίσματα καὶ αἵρέσεις. *Dial.* 35.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. 228, note 4, p. 238 f.

<sup>5</sup> Ἀναστήσονται πολλοὶ ψευδόχριστοι, καὶ ψευδαπόστολοι καὶ πολλοὺς τῶν πιστῶν πλανήσουσιν. *Dial.* 35.; cf. *Apol.*, i. 12. <sup>6</sup> *Dial.* 35.

<sup>7</sup> Καὶ ἐν τῷ μεταξύ τῆς παρουσίας αὐτοῦ χρόνῳ, ὡς προέφην, γενήσεσθαι αἵρέσεις καὶ ψευδοπροφήτας ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ προεμήνυσε, κ.τ.λ. *Dial.* 51; cf. 82.

must also be heresies amongst you," etc. (ἀκούω σχίσματα ἐν ὑμῖν ὑπάρχειν, καὶ μέρος τι πιστεύω. δὲ γὰρ καὶ αἱρέσεις ἐν ὑμῖν εἶναι, κ.τ.λ.) We find also, elsewhere, traces both of this saying and that which accompanies it. In the *Clementine Homilies*, Peter is represented as stating, "For there shall be, as the Lord said, *false apostles*, false prophets, *heresies*, desires for supremacy," etc. (ἔσονται γὰρ, ὡς ὁ κύριος εἶπεν, ψευδαπόστολοι, ψευδεῖς προφήται, αἱρέσεις, φιλαρχίαι, κ.τ.λ.<sup>1</sup>) We are likewise reminded of the passage in the Epistle attributed to the Roman Clement, xlv. : "Our Apostles knew through our Lord Jesus Christ that there would be contention regarding the dignity of the episcopate."<sup>2</sup> In our Gospel there is no reference anywhere to schisms and heresies, nor are false Apostles once mentioned, the reference being solely to "false Christs" and "false prophets." The recurrence here and elsewhere of the peculiar expression "false apostles" is very striking,<sup>3</sup> and the evidence for the passage as a saying of Jesus is important. Hegesippus, after enumerating a vast number of heretical sects and teachers, continues : "From these sprang the false Christs, false prophets, *false apostles*, who divided the union of the Church by corrupting doctrines concerning God and concerning his Christ."<sup>4</sup> It will be remembered that Hegesippus made use of the Gospel according to the Hebrews, and the *Clementine* literature points to the same source. In the *Apostolic Constitutions* we read : "For these are false Christs and false prophets, and *false apostles*, deceivers, and corrupters," etc.,<sup>5</sup> and in the *Clementine Recognitions* the Apostle Peter is represented as saying that the Devil, after the temptation, terrified by the final answer of Jesus, "hastened immediately to send forth into this world false prophets, and *false apostles*, and false teachers, who should speak in the name of Christ indeed, but should perform the will of the demon."<sup>6</sup> Justin's whole system forbids our recognising in these two passages mere tradition, and we must hold that we have here quotations from a Gospel different from ours.

Elsewhere, Justin says : "Out of which (affliction and fiery trial of the Devil) again Jesus, the Son of God, promised to deliver us, and to put on us prepared garments, if we do his commandments, and he is proclaimed as having provided an eternal kingdom for us."<sup>7</sup> This promise is nowhere found in our Gospel.

Immediately following the passage (κ 3 and 4) which we have discussed<sup>8</sup> as repeated in the *Dialogue* : "Many shall say to me,

<sup>1</sup> *Hom.*, xvi. 21.

<sup>2</sup> xlv. See Greek passage quoted, p. 136, note 3.

<sup>3</sup> Semisch, *Die Ap. Denkw. d. Märty. Just.*, p. 391, anm. 2.

<sup>4</sup> Eusebius, *H. E.*, iv. 22.

<sup>5</sup> *Constit. Apost.*, vi. 13; cf. vi. 18.

<sup>6</sup> *Recog.*, iv. 34.

<sup>7</sup> *Dial.* 116.

<sup>8</sup> P. 227, note 4.



etc., and I will say to them, 'Depart from me,'” Justin continues: “And in other words by which he will condemn those who are unworthy to be saved, he said that he will say: Begone into the darkness without, which the Father hath prepared for Satan and his angels.”<sup>1</sup> The nearest parallel to this is in Matt. xxv. 41: Then shall he say also unto them on the left hand: Depart from me, ye cursed, into the eternal fire which is prepared for the devil and his angels.”

## JUSTIN, DIAL. 76.

Καὶ ἐν ἄλλοις λόγοις οἷς καταδικάζειν τοὺς ἀναξίους μὴ σώζεσθαι μέλλει, ἔφη ἐρεῖν· Ὑπάγετε εἰς τὸ σκότος τὸ ἐξώτερον, ὃ ἠτοίμασεν ὁ πατήρ τῷ Σατανα καὶ τοῖς ἀγγέλοις αὐτοῦ.

## MATT. XXV. 41.

Τότε ἐρεῖ καὶ τοῖς ἐξ εὐωνύμων Πορεύεσθε ἀπ' ἐμοῦ οἱ κατηραμένοι εἰς τὸ πῦρ τὸ αἰώνιον τὸ ἠτοίμασμένον τῷ διαβόλῳ καὶ τοῖς ἀγγέλοις αὐτοῦ.

It is apparent that Justin's quotation differs very widely from the reading of our Gospel. The same reading, with the exception of a single word, is found in the *Clementine Homilies* (xix. 2); that is to say, that "Devil" is substituted for "Satan," and this variation is not important. The agreement of the rest, on the other hand, seems to establish the conclusion that the quotation is from a written Gospel different from ours, and here we have further strong indications of Justin's use of the Ebionite Gospel.

Another of the sayings of Jesus which are foreign to our Gospels is one in reference to the man who falls away from righteousness into sin, of whom Justin says: "Wherefore also our Lord Jesus Christ said: In whatsoever things I may find you, in these I shall also judge you."<sup>2</sup> (Διὸ καὶ ὁ ἡμέτερος κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς εἶπεν· "Ἐν οἷς ἂν ὑμᾶς καταλάβω, ἐν τούτοις καὶ κρινῶ.") A similar expression is used by some of the Fathers, and, in some cases, is ascribed to the prophets.<sup>3</sup> Clement of Alexandria has quoted a phrase closely resembling this without indicating the source. Ἐφ' οἷς γὰρ ἂν εὕρω ὑμᾶς, φησὶν, ἐπὶ τούτοις καὶ κρινῶ.<sup>4</sup> Grabe was of opinion that Justin derived the passage from the Gospel according to the Hebrews,<sup>5</sup> an opinion shared by the greater number of modern critics, and which we are prepared to accept from many previous instances of agreement. Even the warmest asserters of the theory that the Memoirs are identical with our Gospels are obliged to admit that this saying of Jesus is not contained in them, and that it must have been derived from an extra-canonical source.

Other passages of a similar kind might have been pointed out,

<sup>1</sup> *Dial.* 76.

<sup>2</sup> *Ib.* 47.

<sup>3</sup> Grabe, *Spicil. patr.*, i., p. 327; Fabricius, *Cod. Apocr. N. T.*, i., p. 333 f., ii., p. 524.

<sup>4</sup> *Quis Div. Salv.*, 40.

<sup>5</sup> *Spicil. Patr.*, i., p. 14, p. 327.

but we have already devoted too much space to Justin's quotations, and must hasten to a conclusion. There is one point, however, to which we must refer. We have more than once alluded to the fact that, unless in one place, Justin never mentions an author's name in connection with the *Memoirs of the Apostles*. The exception to which we referred is the following:—Justin says: "The statement also that he (Jesus) changed the name of Peter, one of the Apostles, and that this is also written in *his* Memoirs as having been done, together with the fact that he also changed the name of other two brothers, who were sons of Zebedee, to Boanerges; that is, sons of Thunder," etc.<sup>1</sup> According to the usual language of Justin, and upon strictly critical grounds, the *αὐτοῦ* in this passage must be referred to Peter; and Justin, therefore, seems to ascribe the Memoirs to that Apostle, and to speak of a Gospel of Peter.<sup>2</sup> Some critics maintain that the *αὐτοῦ* does not refer to Peter, but to Jesus, or, more probable still, that it should be amended to *αὐτῶν*, and apply to the Apostles. The great majority, however, are forced to admit the reference of the Memoirs to Peter, although they explain it, as we shall see, in different ways. It is argued by some that this expression is used when Justin is alluding to the change of name, not only of Peter, but of the sons of Zebedee, the narrative of which is only found in the Gospel according to Mark. Now, Mark was held by many of the Fathers to have been the mere mouthpiece of Peter, and to have written at his dictation;<sup>3</sup> so that, in fact, in calling the second Gospel by the name of the Apostle Peter, they argue, Justin merely adopted the tradition current in the early Church, and referred to the Gospel now known as the Gospel according to Mark. It must be evident, however, that, after admitting that Justin speaks of the Memoirs "of Peter," it is hasty in the extreme to conclude from the fact that the

<sup>1</sup> Καὶ τὸ εἰπεῖν μετωνομακέναι αὐτὸν Πέτρον ἓνα τῶν ἀποστόλων, καὶ γεγράφθαι ἐν τοῖς ἀπομνημονεύμασιν αὐτοῦ γεγενημένον καὶ τοῦτο, μετὰ τοῦ καὶ ἄλλους δύο ἀδελφούς υἱούς Ζεβεδαίου ὄντας μετωνομακέναι ὀνόματι τοῦ Βοανεργῆς, ὃ ἴστιν υἱὸς βροντῆς, κ.τ.λ. *Dial.* 106.

<sup>2</sup> In the course of explorations in Egypt in 1886–87 the fragment of a Gospel was discovered at Akhmîm, the peculiarities of which leave little doubt that it is part of a "Gospel according to Peter," and bears singular analogies to Justin's Memoirs, for it is written in the first person: "I, Simon Peter," etc. The fragment is too short to permit any considerable comparison with Justin's quotations, but some remarkable coincidences exist, and many critics, amongst whom may be mentioned Harnack, Hilgenfeld, J. Rendel Harris, Lods, and Van Manen, consider that this Gospel was used by Justin. For full particulars see *The Gospel According to Peter*, which we separately published 1894 (Longmans, Green, & Co.).

<sup>3</sup> Eusebius, *H. E.*, ii. 15, iii. 39, v. 8, vi. 14, 25; Irenæus, *Adv. Hær.*, iii. I. § 1; Tertullian, *Adv. Marc.*, iv. 5; Hieron. *De Vir. Ill.*, 1. Cf. Fabricius, *Cod. Apocr. N. T.*, i., p. 375.

mention of the sons of Zebedee being surnamed Boanerges is only recorded in Mark iii. 17, and not in the other canonical Gospels, that, therefore, the *Memoirs of Peter* and our Gospel according to Mark are one and the same. We shall, hereafter, in examining the testimony of Papias, see that the Gospel according to Mark, of which the Bishop of Hierapolis speaks, was not our canonical Mark at all. It would be very singular indeed, on this hypothesis, that Justin should not have quoted a single passage from the only Gospel whose author he names, and the number of times he seems to quote from a Petrine Gospel, which was quite different from Mark, confirms the inference that he cannot possibly here refer to our second Gospel. It is maintained, therefore, by numerous other critics that Justin refers to a Gospel according to Peter or according to the Hebrews, and not to Mark.

We learn from Eusebius that Serapion, who became Bishop of Antioch about A.D. 190, composed a book on the Gospel, called "according to Peter" (*περὶ τοῦ λεγομένου κατὰ Πέτρον εὐαγγελίου*), which he found in circulation in his diocese. At first Serapion had permitted the use of this Gospel, as it evidently was much prized, but he subsequently condemned it as a work favouring Docetic views, and containing many things superadded to the Doctrine of the Saviour.<sup>1</sup> Origen likewise makes mention of the Gospel according to Peter (*τοῦ ἐπιγεγραμμένου κατὰ Πέτρον εὐαγγελίου*) as agreeing with the tradition of the Hebrews.<sup>2</sup> But its relationship to the Gospel according to the Hebrews becomes more clear when Theodoret states that the Nazarenes made use of the Gospel according to Peter,<sup>3</sup> for we know by the testimony of the Fathers generally that the Nazarene Gospel was that commonly called the Gospel according to the Hebrews (*Εὐαγγέλιον καθ' Ἑβραίους*). The same Gospel was in use amongst the Ebionites, and in fact, as almost all critics are agreed, the Gospel according to the Hebrews, under various names, such as the Gospel according to Peter, according to the Apostles, the Nazarenes, Ebionites, Egyptians, &c., with modifications certainly, but substantially the same work, was circulated very widely throughout the early Church.<sup>4</sup> A quotation occurs in the so-called Epistle of Ignatius to the Smyrnæans, to which

<sup>1</sup> Eusebius, *H. E.*, vi. 12; cf. Hieron., *De Vir. Ill.*, 41.

<sup>2</sup> Ad. Matt. xiii. 54-56. He couples it with the Book of James, or the *Protevangelium Jacobi*.

<sup>3</sup> *Hæret. Fab.*, ii. 2; cf. Hieron. lib. vi. *Comment. in Ezech. xviii.*, in Matt. xii. 13; *De Vir. Ill.*, 2. The Marcosians also used this Gospel, and we have seen them in agreement with Justin's quotation; cf. p. 254 ff.

<sup>4</sup> Eusebius, *H. E.*, iii. 25; Epiphanius, *Hæret.*, xxx. 13; Hieron., *Adv. Pelag.*, iii. 1, ad Matt. vi. 11, xii. 13, xxiii. 35; Theodoret, *Hæret. Fab.*, ii. 2; Ambrose, *Proem. Ev. Lucae*.

we have already referred, which is said by Origen to be in the work called the Teaching of Peter<sup>1</sup> (*Διδαχὴ Πέτρου*), but Jerome states that it is taken from the Hebrew Gospel of the Nazarenes.<sup>2</sup> Delitzsch finds traces of the Gospel according to the Hebrews before A.D. 130 in the Talmud.<sup>3</sup> Eusebius<sup>4</sup> informs us that Papias narrated a story regarding a woman accused before the Lord of many sins which was contained in the Gospel according to the Hebrews.<sup>5</sup> The same writer likewise states that Hegesippus, who came to Rome and commenced his public career under Anicetus, quoted from the same Gospel.<sup>6</sup> The evidence of this "ancient and apostolic" man is very important, for, although he evidently attaches great value to tradition, does not seem to know of any canonical Scriptures of the New Testament, and, like Justin, apparently rejected the Apostle Paul, he still regarded the Gospel according to the Hebrews with respect, and probably made exclusive use of it. The best critics consider that this Gospel was the evangelical work used by the author of the *Clementine Homilies*. Cerinthus and Carpocrates made use of a form of it,<sup>7</sup> and there is good reason to suppose that Tatian, like his master Justin, used the same Gospel; indeed, his *Diatessaron*, we are told, was by some called the Gospel according to the Hebrews.<sup>8</sup> Clement of Alexandria quotes it as an authority, with quite the same respect as the other Gospels. He says: "So also in the Gospel according to the Hebrews: 'He who wonders shall reign,' it is written, 'and he who reigns shall rest.'"<sup>9</sup> A form of this Gospel, "according to the Egyptians," is quoted in the second Epistle of pseudo-Clement of Rome, as we are informed by the Alexandrian Clement, who likewise quotes the same passage.<sup>10</sup> Origen frequently made use of the Gospel according to the Hebrews,<sup>11</sup> and that it long enjoyed great consideration in

<sup>1</sup> *De Princip. Præf.*, § 8.

<sup>2</sup> Hieron., *Proem. in Esaiæ*, xviii., *De Vir. Ill.*, 16; cf. Fabricius, *Cod. Apocr. N. T.*, i., p. 359 f. A similar passage was in the *Κήρυγμα Πέτρου*. cf. Hilgenfeld, *Die Evv. Justin's*, p. 249. Credner, *Beiträge*, i., p. 407 f.

<sup>3</sup> *Tract. Sabbath. f.* 116; Delitzsch, *N. Unters. Enst. kan. Evv.*, p. 18.

<sup>4</sup> Eusebius, *H. E.*, iii. 39.

<sup>5</sup> This is generally believed to be the episode inserted in the fourth Gospel, viii. 1-11, but not originally belonging to it.

<sup>6</sup> Eusebius, *H. E.*, iv. 22.

<sup>7</sup> Epiphanius, *Hær.*, xxvii. 5, cf. xxx. 26, xxx. 14. Cf. De Wette, *Einl. N. T.*, p. 116 f., 119; Schwegler, *Das nachap. Zeit.*, i., p. 204.

<sup>8</sup> Epiphanius, *Hær.*, xlvi. 1.

<sup>9</sup> ἢ κὰν τῷ καθ' Ἑβραίου εὐαγγελίῳ "ὁ θαυμάσας βασιλεύσει," γέγραπται, "καὶ ὁ βασιλεύσας ἀναπαυθήσεται." Clem. Al., *Strom.*, ii. 9, § 45.

<sup>10</sup> 2 *Ep. ad Corinth.*, xii.; cf. Clem. Al., *Strom.*, iii. 9, § 13.

<sup>11</sup> *Evangelium quoque, quod appellatur secundum Hebræos.....quo et Origenes sæpe utitur.* Hieron. *De Vir. Ill.*, 2; Origen, in *Joh.*, vol. iv., 63, Matt. xix. 19, vol. iii., p. 771, etc.

the Church is proved by the fact that Theodoret found it in circulation not only amongst heretics, but also amongst orthodox Christian communities;<sup>1</sup> and even in the fourth century Eusebius records doubts as to the rank of this Gospel amongst Christian books, speaking of it under the second class in which some reckoned the Apocalypse of John.<sup>2</sup> Later still Jerome translated it;<sup>3</sup> whilst Nicephorus inserts it, in his *Stichometry*, not amongst the Apocrypha, but amongst the Antilegomena, or merely doubtful books of the New Testament, along with the Apocalypse of John. In such repute was this Gospel amongst the earliest Christian communities that it was generally believed to be the original of the Greek Gospel of Matthew. Irenæus states that the Ebionites used solely the Gospel according to Matthew and reject the Apostle Paul, asserting that he was an apostate from the law.<sup>4</sup> We know from statements regarding the Ebionites<sup>5</sup> that this Gospel could not have been our Gospel according to Matthew, and besides both Clement<sup>6</sup> of Alexandria and Origen<sup>7</sup> call it the Gospel according to the Hebrews. Eusebius, however, still more clearly identifies it, as we have seen above. Repeating the statements of Irenæus, he says: "These indeed [the Ebionites] thought that all the Epistles of the Apostle [Paul] should be rejected, calling him an apostate from the law; making use only of the Gospel according to the Hebrews, they took little account of the rest."<sup>8</sup> Epiphanius calls both the Gospel of the Ebionites and of the Nazarenes the "Gospel according to the Hebrews," and also the Gospel according to Matthew,<sup>9</sup> as does also Theodoret.<sup>10</sup> Jerome translated the Gospel according to the Hebrews both into Greek and Latin,<sup>11</sup> and it is clear that his belief was that this Gospel, a copy of which he found in the library collected at Cæsarea by the Martyr Pamphilus (†309), was the Hebrew original of Matthew; and in support of this view he points out that it did not follow the version of the LXX. in its quotations from the Old Testament, but quoted directly from the

<sup>1</sup> *Fab. Hær.*, i. 20; cf. Epiphanius, *Hær.*, xlvi. 1.

<sup>2</sup> Eusebius, *H. E.*, iii. 25. It is very doubtful indeed whether he does not say that some class it amongst the *ὁμολογούμενα*, whilst himself placing it in the second class. Cf. Guericke, *Gesammtgesch. N. T.*, p. 219; Schwegler, *Das nachap. Zeitalter*, i., p. 211, anm. 1.

<sup>3</sup> *De Vir. Ill.*, 2.

<sup>4</sup> *Adv. Hær.*, i. 26, § 2; cf. iii. 12, § 7.

<sup>5</sup> Origen, *Contra Cels.*, v. 61; Eusebius, *H. E.*, iii. 27.

<sup>6</sup> *Strom.*, ii. 9, § 45.

<sup>7</sup> In *Joh.* t. ii. 6 (Op. iv., p. 63 f.), *Hom. in Jerem.*, xv. 4; cf. Hieron., in *Mich.* vii. 6; in *Es.* xl. 12, *De Vir. Ill.*, 2.

<sup>8</sup> *H. E.*, iii. 27.

<sup>9</sup> *Hær.*, xxx. 3; cf. *Hær.* xxix. 9, xxx. 14.

<sup>10</sup> *Hær. Fab.*, ii. 1.

<sup>11</sup> *Evangelium quoque, quod appellatur secundum Hebræos, et a me nuper in græcum latinumque sermonem translatum est, quo et Origenes sæpe utitur*, etc. Hieron., *De Vir. Ill.* 2; cf. *Adv. Pelag.*, 1.

Hebrew.<sup>1</sup> An attempt has been made to argue that, later, Jerome became doubtful of this view, but it seems to us that this is not the case, and certainly Jerome in his subsequent writings states that it was generally held to be the original of Matthew.<sup>2</sup> That this Gospel was not identical with the Greek Matthew is evident both from the quotations of Jerome and others, and also from the fact that Jerome considered it worth while to translate it twice. If the Greek Gospel had been an accurate translation of it, of course there could not have been inducement to make another. As we shall hereafter see, the belief was universal in the early Church that Matthew wrote his Gospel in Hebrew. Attempts have been made to argue that the Gospel according to the Hebrews was first written in Greek and then translated into Hebrew, but the reasons advanced seem quite insufficient and arbitrary, and it is contradicted by the whole tradition of the Fathers.

It is not necessary for our purpose to enter fully here into the question of the exact relation of our canonical Gospel according to Matthew to the Gospel according to the Hebrews. It is sufficient for us to point out that we meet with the latter before Matthew's Gospel, and that the general opinion of the early Church was that it was the original of the canonical Gospel. This opinion, as Schwegler<sup>3</sup> remarks, is supported by the fact that tradition assigns the origin of both Gospels to Palestine, and that both were intended for Jewish Christians, and exclusively used by them. That the two works, however originally related, had by subsequent manipulation become distinct, although still amidst much variation preserving some substantial affinity, cannot be doubted; and, in addition to the evidence already cited, we may point out that in the Stichometry of Nicephorus the Gospel according to Matthew is said to have 2,500 στίχοι, whilst that according to the Hebrews has only 2,200.

Whether this Gospel formed one of the writings of the πολλοί of Luke it is not our purpose to inquire; but enough has been

<sup>1</sup> Porro ipsum hebraicum (Matthæi) habetur usque hodie in Cæsariensi bibliotheca quam Pamphilus martyr studiosissime confecit, mihi quoque a Nazaræis qui in Berœa, urbe Syriæ hoc volumine utuntur, describendi facultas fuit, in quo animadvertendum, quod ubicunque Evangelista sive ex persona Domini Salvatoris veteris Scripturæ testimoniis utitur, non sequatur LXX translatorum auctoritatem sed hebraicam, etc. *De Vir. Ill.*, 3.

<sup>2</sup> In Evangelio juxta Hebræos quod Chaldaico quidem Syroque sermone sed hebraicis literis scriptum est, quo utuntur usque hodie Nazareni secundum Apostolos, sive ut plerique autumant juxta Matthæum quod et in Cæsariensi habetur Bibliotheca, narrat historia, etc. Hieron., *Adv. Pelag.*, iii. 2; cf. *Comment. in Esaïæ*, xi. 2, ad. Matt. xii. 13.

<sup>3</sup> *Das nachap. Zeitalter*, i., p. 241.

said to prove that it was one of the most ancient and most valued evangelical works, and to show the probability that Justin Martyr, a Jewish Christian living amongst those who are known to have made exclusive use of this Gospel, may well, like his contemporary Hegesippus, have used the Gospel according to the Hebrews; and this probability is, as we have seen, greatly strengthened by the fact that many of his quotations agree with passages which we know to have been contained in it; whilst, on the other hand, almost all differ from our Gospels, presenting generally, however, a greater affinity to the Gospel according to Matthew, as we might expect, than to the other two. It is clear that the title "Gospel according to the Hebrews" cannot have been its actual superscription, but merely was a name descriptive of the readers for whom it was prepared, or amongst whom it chiefly circulated, and it is most probable that it originally bore no other title than "The Gospel" (τὸ εὐαγγέλιον), to which were added the different designations under which we find it known amongst different communities.<sup>1</sup> We have already seen that Justin speaks of "The Gospel," and seems to refer to the *Memoirs of Peter*, both distinguishing appellations of this Gospel; but there is another of the names borne by the "Gospel according to the Hebrews," which singularly recalls the *Memoirs of the Apostles*, by which Justin prefers to call his evangelical work. It was called the *Gospel according to the Apostles* (εὐαγγέλιον κατὰ τοὺς ἀποστόλους), and, in short, comparing Justin's *Memoirs* with this Gospel, we find at once similarity of contents, and even of name.<sup>2</sup>

It is not necessary, however, for the purposes of this examination to dwell more fully upon the question as to what specific Gospel, now no longer extant, Justin employed. We have shown that there is no evidence that he made use of any of our Gospels, and he cannot, therefore, be cited even to prove their existence, and much less to attest the authenticity and character of records whose authors he does not once name. On the other hand, it has been made evident that there were other Gospels, now lost, but which then enjoyed the highest consideration, from which his quotations might have been, and probably were, taken. We have seen that Justin's *Memoirs of the Apostles* contained facts of Gospel history unknown to our Gospels, which were contained in apocryphal works, and notably in the Gospel according to the Hebrews;

<sup>1</sup> Schwegler, *Das nachap. Zeitalter*, i., p. 202; Baur, *Unters. kan. Evv.*, p. 573.

<sup>2</sup> Schwegler rightly remarks that if it can be shown that Justin even once made use of the Gospel according to the Hebrews, or any other uncanonical source, there is no ground for asserting that he may not always have done so. *Das nachap. Zeit*, i., p. 229 f.; Credner, *Beiträge*, i., p. 229; Hilgenfeld, *Die Evv. Justin's*, p. 256 f.

---

that they further contained matter contradictory to our Gospels, and sayings of Jesus not contained in them; and that his quotations, although so numerous, systematically vary from similar passages in our Gospels. No theory of quotation from memory can satisfactorily account for these phenomena, and the reasonable conclusion is that Justin did not make use of our Gospels, but quoted from another source. In no case can the testimony of Justin afford the requisite support to the Gospels as records of miracles and of a Divine Revelation.



## CHAPTER IV.

### HEGESIPPUS—PAPIAS OF HIERAPOLIS

WE now turn to Hegesippus, one of the contemporaries of Justin, and, like him, a Palestinian Jewish Christian. Most of our information regarding him is derived from Eusebius, who fortunately gives rather copious extracts from his writings. Hegesippus was born in Palestine, of Jewish parents,<sup>1</sup> and in all probability belonged to the primitive community of Jerusalem. In order to make himself thoroughly acquainted with the state of the Church, he travelled widely and came to Rome when Anicetus was Bishop. Subsequently he wrote a work of historical Memoirs, *ὑπομνήματα*, in five books, and thus became the first ecclesiastical historian of Christianity. This work is lost, but portions have been preserved to us by Eusebius, and one other fragment is also extant. It must have been, in part at least, written after the succession of Eleutherus to the Roman bishopric (A.D. 177-193), as that event is mentioned in the book itself, and his testimony is allowed by all critics to date from an advanced period of the second half of the second century.

The testimony of Hegesippus is of great value, not only as that of a man born near the primitive Christian tradition, but also as that of an intelligent traveller amongst many Christian communities. Eusebius evidently held him in high estimation as recording the unerring tradition of the Apostolic preaching in the most simple style of composition,<sup>2</sup> and as a writer of authority who was "contemporary with the first successors of the Apostles"<sup>3</sup> (*ἐπὶ τῆς πρώτης τῶν ἀποστόλων γένόμενος διαδοχῆς*). Any indications, therefore, which we may derive from information regarding him, and from the fragments of his writings which survive, must be of peculiar importance for our inquiry.

As might have been expected from a convert from Judaism<sup>4</sup> (*πεπιστευκὸς ἐξ Ἑβραίων*), we find in Hegesippus manifest evidences of general tendency to the Jewish side of Christianity. For him, "James, the brother of the Lord," was the chief of the

<sup>1</sup> Eusebius, *H. E.*, iv. 22.

<sup>2</sup> *τὴν ἀπλανῆ παράδοσιν τοῦ ἀποστολικοῦ κηρύγματος ἀπλουστάτη συντάξει γραφῆς ὑπομνηματισάμενος, κ.τ.λ.* Eusebius, *H. E.*, iv. 8.

<sup>3</sup> Eusebius, *H. E.*, ii. 23: cf. Hieron. *De Vir. Ill.*, 22.

<sup>4</sup> Eusebius, *H. E.*, iv. 22.

Apostles, and he states that he had received the government of the Church after the death of Jesus.<sup>1</sup> The account which he gives of him is remarkable. "He was holy from his mother's womb. He drank neither wine nor strong drink, nor ate he any living thing. A razor never went upon his head, he anointed not himself with oil, and did not use a bath. He alone was allowed to enter into the Holies. For he did not wear woollen garments, but linen. And he alone entered into the Sanctuary, and was wont to be found upon his knees seeking forgiveness on behalf of the people; so that his knees became hard like a camel's, through his constant kneeling in supplication to God, and asking for forgiveness for the people. In consequence of his exceeding great righteousness he was called Righteous and 'Oblias,' that is, Protector of the people and Righteousness, as the prophets declare concerning him,"<sup>2</sup> and so on. Throughout the whole of his account of James, Hegesippus describes him as a mere Jew, and as frequenting the temple, and even entering the Holy of Holies as a Jewish High Priest. Whether the account be apocryphal or not is of little consequence here; it is clear that Hegesippus sees no incongruity in it, and that the difference between the Jew and the Christian was extremely small. The head of the Christian community could assume all the duties of the Jewish High Priest,<sup>3</sup> and his Christian doctrines did not offend more than a small party amongst the Jews.

We are not, therefore, surprised to find that his rule (*κανών*) of orthodoxy in the Christian communities which he visited was "the Law, the Prophets, and the Lord." Speaking of the result of his observations during his travels, and of the succession of Bishops in Rome, he says: "The Corinthian Church has continued in the true faith until Primus, now Bishop of Corinth. I conversed with him on my voyage to Rome, and stayed many days with the Corinthians, during which time we were refreshed together with true doctrine. Arrived in Rome, I composed the succession until Anicetus, whose deacon was Eleutherus. After Anicetus succeeded Soter, and afterwards Eleutherus. But with every succession, and in every city, that prevails which the Law, and the Prophets, and the Lord enjoin."<sup>4</sup> The test of true doctrine (*ὀρθὸς λόγος*) with Hegesippus, as with Justin, therefore, is no New Testament Canon, which does not yet exist for him, but the Old Testament, the only Holy Scriptures which he acknowledges, and the words of the Lord himself, which, as in the case of

<sup>1</sup> Eusebius, *H. E.*, ii. 23.

<sup>2</sup> Euseb., *H. E.*, ii. 23.

<sup>3</sup> Epiphanius also has the tradition that James alone, as High Priest, once a year went into the Holy of Holies. *Her.*, lxxviii. 13; cf. 14; xxix. 4.

<sup>4</sup> Eusebius, *H. E.*, iv. 22.

Jewish Christians like Justin, were held to be established by, and in direct conformity with, the Old Testament. He carefully transmits the unerring tradition of apostolic preaching (τὴν ἀπλανῆ παράδοσιν τοῦ ἀποστολικοῦ κηρύγματος), but he apparently knows nothing of any canonical series even of apostolic epistles.

The care with which Eusebius searches for information regarding the books of the New Testament in early writers, and his anxiety to produce any evidence concerning their composition and authenticity, render his silence upon the subject almost as important as his distinct utterance when speaking of such a man as Hegesippus. Now, while Eusebius does not mention that Hegesippus refers to any of our canonical Gospels or Epistles, he very distinctly states that he made use in his writings of the "Gospel according to the Hebrews" (ἐκ τε τοῦ καθ' Ἑβραίους εὐαγγελίου.....τινὰ τίθησιν). It may be well, however, to give his remarks in a consecutive form. "He sets forth some matters from the Gospel according to the Hebrews and the Syriac, and particularly from the Hebrew language, showing that he was a convert from among the Hebrews, and other things he records as from unwritten Jewish tradition. And not only he, but also Irenæus, and the whole body of the ancients, called the Proverbs of Solomon: all-virtuous Wisdom. And regarding the so-called Apocrypha, he states that some of them had been forged in his own timē by certain heretics."<sup>1</sup>

It is clear that Eusebius, who quotes with so much care the testimony of Papias, a man of whom he speaks disparagingly, regarding the composition of the first two Gospels, would not have neglected to have availed himself of the evidence of Hegesippus, for whom he has so much respect, had that writer furnished him with any opportunity, and there can be no doubt that he found no facts concerning the origin and authorship of our Gospels in his writings. It is, on the other hand, reasonable to infer that Hegesippus exclusively made use of the Gospel according to the Hebrews, together with unwritten tradition. In the passage regarding the Gospel according to the Hebrews, as even Lardner<sup>2</sup> conjectures, the text of Eusebius is in all probability confused, and he doubtless said what Jerome later found to be the fact, that "the Gospel according to the Hebrews is written in the Chaldaic and Syriac (or Syro-Chaldaic) language, but with Hebrew characters."<sup>3</sup> It is in this sense that Rufinus translates it. It

<sup>1</sup> *H. E.*, iv. 22.

<sup>2</sup> *Credibility*, etc., Works, ii., p. 144.

<sup>3</sup> *In Evangelio juxta Hebræos quod Chaldaico quidem Syroque sermone sed hebraicis literis scriptum est*, etc. *Adv. Pelag.*, iii. 1.

MS. T. 4. 1. 1. 1.

Gospel acc. to the Hebrews.

Note // may not be inappropriate to point out that fragments of the Gospel according to the Hebrews which have been preserved show the same tendency to give some pre-eminence to James amongst the Apostles which we observe in Hegesippus.<sup>1</sup> It has been argued by a few that the words, "and regarding the so-called Apocrypha, he states that some of them had been forged in his own times by certain heretics," are contradictory to his attributing authority to the Gospel according to the Hebrews, or at least that they indicate some distinction amongst Christians between recognised and apocryphal works. The apocryphal works referred to, however, are clearly Old Testament Apocrypha.<sup>2</sup> The words are introduced by the statement that Hegesippus records matters "as from unwritten Jewish tradition," and then proceeds, "and not only he, but also Irenæus and the whole body of the ancients, called the Proverbs of Solomon: all-virtuous wisdom." Then follow the words, "And with regard to the *so-called* Apocrypha," etc., evidently passing from the work just mentioned to the Old Testament Apocrypha, several of which stand also in the name of Solomon, and it is not improbable that amongst these were included the *Ascensio Esaiaë* and the *Apocalypsis Eliæ*, to which is referred a passage which Hegesippus, in a fragment preserved by Photius,<sup>3</sup> strongly repudiates. As Hegesippus does not, so far as we know, mention any canonical work of the New Testament, but takes as his rule of faith the Law, the Prophets, and the words of the Lord, probably as he finds them in the Gospel according to the Hebrews, quotes also Jewish tradition and discusses the Proverbs of Solomon, the only possible conclusion at which we can reasonably arrive is that he spoke of Old Testament Apocrypha. There cannot be a doubt that Eusebius would have recorded his repudiation of New Testament "Apocrypha," regarding which he so carefully collects information, and his consequent recognition of New Testament canonical works implied in such a distinction.

Note. // We must now see how far in the fragments of the works of Hegesippus which have been preserved to us there are references to assist our inquiry. In his account of certain surviving members of the family of Jesus who were brought before Domitian, Hegesippus says: "For Domitian feared the appearing of the Christ as much as Herod."<sup>4</sup> It has been argued that this may be an allusion to the massacre of the children by Herod related in

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Hieron. *De Vir. Ill.*, 2.

<sup>2</sup> Even Dr. Westcott admits: "There is indeed nothing to show distinctly that he refers to the apocryphal books of the New Testament, but there is nothing to limit his words to the Old" (*On the Canon*, p. 184).

<sup>3</sup> *Bibl.*, 232; cf. Routh, *Reliq. Sacra*, 1846, i., p. 281 f.

<sup>4</sup> ἔφοβείτο γὰρ τὴν παρουσίαν τοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὡς καὶ Ἡρώδης. Euseb., *H. E.*, iii. 20.

Matt. ii., more especially as it is doubtful whether the parallel account to that contained in the first two chapters of the first Gospel existed in the oldest forms of the Gospel according to the Hebrews.<sup>1</sup> But the tradition which has been preserved in our first Synoptic may have formed part of many other evangelical works, in one shape or another, and certainly cannot be claimed with reason exclusively for that Gospel. This argument, therefore, has no weight, and it obviously rests upon the vaguest conjecture.

The principal passages which apologists<sup>2</sup> adduce as references to our Gospels occur in the account which Hegesippus gives of the martyrdom of James the Just. The first of these is the reply which James is said to have made to the Scribes and Pharisees: "Why do ye ask me concerning Jesus the Son of Man? He sits in heaven on the right hand of great power, and is about to come on the clouds of heaven."<sup>3</sup> This is compared with Matt. xxvi. 64: "From this time ye shall see the Son of Man sitting on the right hand of power and coming on the clouds of heaven."<sup>4</sup> It is not necessary to point out the variations between these two passages, which are obvious. If we had not the direct intimation that Hegesippus made use of the Gospel according to the Hebrews, which no doubt contained this passage, it would be apparent that a man who valued tradition so highly might well have derived it from that source. This is precisely one of those sayings which were most current in the early Church, whose hope and courage were sustained amid persecution and suffering by such Chiliastic expectations, with which, according to the apostolic injunction, they comforted each other.<sup>5</sup> In any case, the words do not agree with the passage in the first Gospel; and with such discrepancy, without any evidence that Hegesippus knew anything of our Gospels, but, on the contrary, with the knowledge that he made use of the Gospel according to the Hebrews, we must decide that any such quotations must rather be derived from it than from our Gospels.

It is scarcely necessary to say anything regarding the phrase, "for we and all the people testify to thee that thou art just, and that thou respectest not persons."<sup>6</sup> Dr. Westcott points out

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Epiphanius, *Her.*, xxix. 9; Hieron., *De Vir. Ill.*, 8, *Comm. ad Matt.* ii. 6, xii. 13, *ad Es.* xi. 1; *ad Habac.*, iii. 3.

<sup>2</sup> Westcott, *On the Canon*, p. 182, note 4.

<sup>3</sup> Τί με ἐπερωτᾶτε περὶ Ἰησοῦ τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου; καὶ αὐτὸς κάθηται ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ ἐκ δεξιῶν τῆς μεγάλης δυνάμεως, καὶ μέλλει ἔρχεσθαι ἐπὶ τῶν νεφελῶν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ. Euseb., *H. E.*, ii. 23.

<sup>4</sup> ἀπ' ἄρτι ὄψεσθε τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου καθήμενον ἐκ δεξιῶν τῆς δυνάμεως καὶ ἐρχόμενον ἐπὶ τῶν νεφελῶν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ. Matt. xxvi. 64.

<sup>5</sup> 1 Thess. iv. 18.

<sup>6</sup> Euseb., *H. E.*, ii. 23.

that *καὶ οὐ λαμβάνεις πρόσωπον* only occurs in Luke xx. 21, and Galatians ii. 6;<sup>1</sup> but the similarity of this single phrase, which is not given as a quotation, but in a historical form put into the mouth of those who are addressing James, cannot be accepted as evidence of a knowledge of Luke. The episode of the tribute money is generally ascribed to the oldest form of the Gospel history, and, although the other two Synoptics<sup>2</sup> read *βλέπεις εἰς* for *λαμβάνεις*, there is no ground for asserting that some of the *πολλοί* who preceded Luke did not use the latter form, and as little for asserting that it did not so stand, for instance, in the Gospel according to the Hebrews. The employment of the same expression in the Epistle, moreover, at once deprives the Gospel of any individuality in its use.

Hegesippus represents the dying James as kneeling down and praying for those who were stoning him: "I beseech (thee), Lord God Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do" (*Παρακαλῶ, κύριε Θεὲ πάτερ, ἄφες αὐτοῖς· οὐ γὰρ οἶδασιν τί ποιοῦσιν*).<sup>3</sup> This is compared with the prayer which Luke<sup>4</sup> puts into the mouth of Jesus on the cross: "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do" (*Πάτερ, ἄφες αὐτοῖς· οὐ γὰρ οἶδασιν τί ποιοῦσιν*), and it is assumed from this partial coincidence that Hegesippus was acquainted with the third of our canonical Gospels. We are surprised to see an able and accomplished critic like Hilgenfeld adopting such a conclusion without either examination or argument of any kind.<sup>5</sup> Such a deduction is totally unwarranted by the facts of the case, and if the partial agreement of a passage in such a Father with a historical expression in a Gospel which, alone out of many previously existent, has come down to us can be considered evidence of the acquaintance of the Father with that particular Gospel, the function of criticism is at an end.

It may here be observed that the above passage of Luke xxiii. 34 is omitted altogether from the Vatican MS. and *Codex D* (Bezae), and in the *Codex Sinaiticus* its position is of a very doubtful character.<sup>6</sup> The *Codex Alexandrinus* which contains it

<sup>1</sup> *On the Canon*, p. 182, note 4.

<sup>2</sup> Matt. xxii. 16; Mark xii. 14.

<sup>3</sup> Euseb., *H. E.*, ii. 23.

<sup>4</sup> xxiii. 34.

<sup>5</sup> *Zeitschr. wiss. Theol.*, 1863, p. 354, p. 360, anm. 1; *Die Evv. Justin's*, p. 369; *Der Kanon*, p. 28. In each of these places the bare assertion is made, and the reader is referred to the other passages. In fact, there is merely a circle of references to mere unargued assumptions. Bunsen (*Bibelwerk*, viii., p. 543) repeats the assertion of Hilgenfeld, and refers to the passages above, where, however, as we have stated, no attempt whatever is made to establish the truth of the assumption. Cf. Scholten, *Die ält. Zeugnisse*, p. 19; *Het Paulin. Evangelie*, p. 3.

<sup>6</sup> The passage is put within brackets by Lachmann, and within double brackets by Westcott and Hort.

omits the word *πάτερ*.<sup>1</sup> Luke's Gospel was avowedly composed after many other similar works were already in existence, and we know from our Synoptics how closely such writings often followed each other, and drew from the same sources.<sup>2</sup> If any historical character is conceded to this prayer of Jesus, it is natural to suppose that it must have been given in at least some of these numerous Gospels which have unfortunately perished. No one could reasonably assert that our third Gospel is the only one which ever contained the passage. It would be unwarrantable to affirm, for instance, that it did not exist in the Gospel according to the Hebrews, which Hegesippus employed. On the supposition that the passage is historical, which apologists at least will not dispute, what could be more natural or probable than that such a prayer, "emanating from the innermost soul of Jesus,"<sup>3</sup> should have been adopted under similar circumstances by James his brother and successor, who certainly could not have derived it from Luke. The tradition of such words, expressing so much of the original spirit of Christianity, setting aside for the moment written Gospels, could scarcely fail to have remained fresh in the mind of the early Church, and more especially in the primitive community among whom they were uttered, and of which Hegesippus was himself a later member; and they would certainly have been treasured by one who was so careful a collector and transmitter of "the unerring tradition of the apostolic preaching." No saying is more likely to have been preserved by tradition, both from its own character, brevity, and origin, and from the circumstances under which it was uttered, and there can be no reason for limiting it amongst written records to Luke's Gospel. The omission of the prayer from very important codices of Luke further weakens the claim of that Gospel to the passage. Beyond these general considerations, however, there is the important and undoubted fact that the prayer which Hegesippus represents James as uttering does not actually agree with the prayer of Jesus in the third Gospel. So far from proving the use of Luke, therefore, this merely fragmentary and partial agreement, on the contrary, rather proves that he did not know that Gospel, for on the supposition of his making use of the third Synoptic at all for such a purpose, and not simply giving the prayer which James may in reality have uttered, why did he not quote the prayer as he actually found it in Luke?

<sup>1</sup> The *Clementine Homilies* give the prayer of Jesus: Πάτερ, ἄφες αὐτοῖς τὰς ἁμαρτίας αὐτῶν, κ.τ.λ. *Hom.*, xi. 20.

<sup>2</sup> The passage we are considering was certainly not an original addition by the author of our present third gospel, but was derived from earlier sources. Cf. Ewald, *Die drei ersten Ewv.*, p. 150.

<sup>3</sup> "Ganz aus dem innersten Geiste Jesus' geschöpft." Ewald, *Die drei erst. Ewv.*, p. 361.

We have still to consider a fragment of Hegesippus preserved to us by Stephanus Gobarus, a learned monophysite of the sixth century, which reads as follows: "That the good things prepared for the righteous neither eye saw, nor ear heard, nor entered they into the heart of man. Hegesippus, however, an ancient and apostolic man, how moved I know not, says in the fifth book of his Memoirs that these words are vainly spoken, and that those who say these things give the lie to the divine writings and to the Lord, saying: 'Blessed are your eyes that see, and your ears that hear,'" etc. (Μακάριοι οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ ὑμῶν οἱ βλέποντες, καὶ τὰ ὦτα ὑμῶν τὰ ἀκούοντα, καὶ τὰ ἐξῆς).<sup>1</sup> We believe that we have here an expression of the strong prejudice against the Apostle Paul and his teaching, which continued for so long to prevail amongst Jewish Christians, and which is apparent in many writings of that period. The quotation of Paul, 1 Cor. ii. 9, differs materially from the Septuagint version of the passage in Isaiah lxiv. 4, and, as we have seen, the same passage quoted by Clement of Rome,<sup>2</sup> differs both from the version of the LXX. and from the epistle, although closer to the former. Jerome, however, found the passage in the apocryphal work called *Ascensio Esaiæ*,<sup>3</sup> and Origen, Jerome, and others, likewise ascribe it to the *Apocalypsis Eliæ*.<sup>4</sup> This, however, does not concern us here, and we have merely to examine the "saying of the Lord," which Hegesippus opposes to the passage: "Blessed are your eyes that see and your ears that hear." This is compared with Matt. xiii. 16, "But blessed are your eyes, for they see, and your ears, for they hear" (ὑμῶν δὲ μακάριοι οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ ὅτι βλέπουσιν, καὶ τὰ ὦτα ὑμῶν ὅτι ἀκούουσιν), and also with Luke x. 23, "Blessed are the eyes which see the things that ye see," etc. We need not point out that the saying referred to by Hegesippus, whilst conveying the same sense as that in the two Gospels, differs from them both as they do from each other, and as we might expect a quotation taken from a different though kindred source, like the Gospel according to the Hebrews, to do. The whole of the passages which we have examined, indeed, exhibit the same natural variation.

We have already referred to the expressions of Hegesippus regarding the heresies in the early Church: "From these sprang the false Christs, and false prophets, and *false apostles*, who divided the unity of the Church by corrupting doctrines concerning God and his Christ."<sup>5</sup> We have shown how this recalls quotations in Justin of sayings of Jesus foreign to our Gospels, in common with similar expressions in the *Clementine Homilies*,<sup>6</sup> *Apostolic*

<sup>1</sup> Photius, *Bibl. Cod.*, 232, col. 893.

<sup>2</sup> *Ep. ad Corinth.* xxxiv.

<sup>3</sup> *Comm. Es.*, lxiv. 4.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Cotelerius, *Patr. Apost.*, in *notis ad. Constit. Apost.*, vi. 16.

<sup>5</sup> Euseb., *H. E.*, iv. 22.

<sup>6</sup> xvi. 21.



*Constitutions*,<sup>1</sup> and *Clementine Recognitions*,<sup>2</sup> and we need not discuss the matter further. This community of reference, in a circle known to have made use of the Gospel according to the Hebrews, to matters foreign to our Synoptics, furnishes collateral illustration of the influence of that Gospel.

Tischendorf, who so eagerly searches for every trace, real or imaginary, of the use of our Gospels and of the existence of a New Testament Canon, passes over in silence, with the exception of a short note<sup>3</sup> devoted to the denial that Hegesippus was opposed to Paul, this first writer of Christian Church history, whose evidence, could it have been adduced, would have been so valuable. He does not pretend that Hegesippus made use of the canonical Gospels, or knew of any other Holy Scriptures than those of the Old Testament; but, on the other hand, he does not mention that he possessed, and quoted from, the Gospel according to the Hebrews. There is no reason for supposing that Hegesippus found a New Testament Canon in any of the Christian communities which he visited, and such a rule of faith certainly did not yet exist in Rome in A.D. 160-170. There is no evidence to show that Hegesippus recognised any other evangelical work than the Gospel according to the Hebrews, as the written source of his knowledge of the words of the Lord. || n.

The testimony of Papias is of great interest and importance in connection with our inquiry, inasmuch as he is the first ecclesiastical writer who mentions the tradition that Matthew and Mark composed written records of the life and teaching of Jesus; but no question has been more continuously contested than that of the identity of the works to which he refers with our actual canonical Gospels. Papias was Bishop of Hierapolis, in Phrygia,<sup>4</sup> in the first half of the second century, and is said to have suffered martyrdom under Marcus Aurelius about A.D. 164-167.<sup>5</sup> About the middle of the second century he wrote a work in five books, entitled "Exposition of the Lord's Oracles"<sup>6</sup> (*Λογίων κυριακῶν ἐξηγήσεις*), which, with the exception of a few fragments preserved to us chiefly by Eusebius and Irenæus, is, unfortunately, no longer extant. In the preface to his book he stated: "But I shall not hesitate also to set beside my interpretations all that I rightly learnt from the Presbyters, and rightly remembered, earnestly testifying to their truth; for I was not, like the multitude, taking pleasure in those who speak much, but in those who teach

<sup>1</sup> vi. 18; cf. 18.

<sup>2</sup> iv. 34.

<sup>3</sup> *Wann wurden, u. s. w.*, p. 19.

<sup>4</sup> Eusebius, *H. E.*, iii. 36, 39; Hieron., *De Vir. Ill.*, 18.

<sup>5</sup> *Chron. Pasch.*, i. 481.

<sup>6</sup> Euseb., *H. E.*, iii. 39.

the truth; nor in those who relate alien commandments, but in those who record those delivered by the Lord to the faith, and which come from the truth itself. If it happened that anyone came who had followed the Presbyters, I inquired minutely after the words of the Presbyters, what Andrew or what Peter said, or what Philip or what Thomas or James, or what John or Matthew, or what any other of the disciples of the Lord, and what Aristion and the Presbyter John, the disciples of the Lord, say; for I held that what was to be derived from books did not so profit me as that from the living and abiding voice" (Οὐ γὰρ τὰ ἐκ τῶν βιβλίων τοσοῦτόν με ὠφελεῖν ὑπελάμβανον, ὅσον τὰ παρὰ ζώσης φωνῆς καὶ μενούσης). It is clear from this that Papias preferred tradition to any written works with which he was acquainted, that he attached little or no value to any Gospels with which he had met,<sup>2</sup> and that he knew nothing of canonical Scriptures of the New Testament. His work was evidently intended to furnish a collection of the discourses of Jesus completed from oral tradition, with his own expositions; and this is plainly indicated, both by his own words and by the statements of Eusebius, who, amongst other things, mentions that Papias sets forth strange parables of the Saviour, and teachings of his from unwritten tradition (ἐκ παραδόσεως ἀγράφου).<sup>3</sup> It is not, however, necessary to discuss more closely the nature of the work, for there is no doubt that written collections of discourses of Jesus existed before it was composed, of which it is probable he made use.

The most interesting part of the work of Papias which is preserved to us is that relating to Matthew and Mark. After stating that Papias had inserted in his book accounts of Jesus given by Aristion, of whom nothing is known, and by the Presbyter John, Eusebius proceeds to extract a tradition regarding Mark communicated by the latter. There has been much controversy as to the identity of the Presbyter John, some affirming him to have been

<sup>1</sup> Eusebius, *H. E.*, iii. 39.

<sup>2</sup> With reference to the last sentence of Papias, Tischendorf asks: "What books does he refer to here, perhaps our Gospels? According to the expression this is not impossible, but from the whole character of the book in the highest degree improbable" (*Wann wurden, u. s. w.*, p. 109). We know little or nothing of the "whole character" of the book, and what we do know is contradictory to our Gospels. The natural and only reasonable course is to believe the express declaration of Papias, more especially as it is made, in this instance, as a prefatory statement of his belief.

<sup>3</sup> *H. E.*, iii. 39. Bleek (*Einl. N. T.*, 1866, p. 94), Credner (*Beiträge*, i., p. 23 f.; *Gesch. N. T. Kan.*, p. 27 f.), and others, consider that Papias used oral tradition solely or mainly in his work. Hilgenfeld (*Zeitschr. w. Theol.*, 1875, p. 238 f.; *Einl. N. T.*, 1875, p. 53 ff.) and others suppose that the Hebrew λόγια of Matthew were the basis of his Exposition, together with tradition, but that he did not use any of our Gospels.

remark the word "presbyter"

very not "older" of important

Note

the Apostle, but the great majority of critics deciding that he was a totally different person. Irenæus, who, sharing the Chiliastic opinions of Papias, held him in high respect, boldly calls him "the hearer of John" (meaning the Apostle) "and a companion of Polycarp" (ὁ Ἰωάννου μὲν ἀκουστῆς, Πολυκάρπου δὲ ἑταῖρος γεγονώς);<sup>1</sup> but this is expressly contradicted by Eusebius, who points out that, in the preface to his book, Papias by no means asserts that he was himself a hearer of the Apostles, but merely that he received their doctrines from those who had personally known them;<sup>2</sup> and, after making the quotation from Papias which we have given above, he goes on to point out that the name of John is twice mentioned—once together with Peter, James, and Matthew and the other Apostles, "evidently the Evangelist," and the other John he mentions separately, ranking him amongst those who are not Apostles, and placing Aristion before him, distinguishing him clearly by the name of Presbyter.<sup>3</sup> He further refers to the statement of the great Bishop of Alexandria, Dionysius,<sup>4</sup> that at Ephesus there were two tombs, each bearing the name of John, thereby leading to the inference that there were two men of the name.<sup>5</sup> There can be no doubt that Papias himself, in the passage quoted, mentions two persons of the name of John, distinguishing the one from the other, and classing the one amongst the Apostles and the other after Aristion, an unknown "disciple of the Lord," and, but for the phrase of Irenæus, so characteristically uncritical and assumptive, there probably never would have been any doubt raised as to the meaning of the passage. The question is not of importance to us, and we may leave it with the remark that a writer who suffered martyrdom under Marcus Aurelius, c. A.D. 165, can scarcely have been a hearer of the Apostles.<sup>6</sup>

The account which the Presbyter John is said to have given of Mark's Gospel is as follows: "This also the Presbyter said: Mark, having become the interpreter of Peter, wrote accurately whatever he remembered, though he did not arrange in order the

<sup>1</sup> *Adv. Hær.*, v. 33, § 4.

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

<sup>3</sup> Euseb., *H. E.*, iii. 39. Cf. Hieron. *De Vir. Ill.*, 18.

<sup>4</sup> *Ib.*, *H. E.*, vii. Proem.

<sup>5</sup> *Ib.*, vii. 25. Cf. Hieron. *De Vir. Ill.*, 9.

<sup>6</sup> Ewald, *Gesch. Volkes Isr.*, vii., p. 226, anm. 1; Tischendorf, *Wann wurden, u. s. w.*, p. 105. Dr. Lightfoot argues that the *Chronicon Paschale*, from which this date is derived, has inserted the name of Papias in mistake for Papyrus, which stands in the *History of Eusebius* (iv. 15), from which, he contends, the author of the *Chronicle* derived his information. He, therefore, concludes that the above date may henceforth be dismissed, and at once proceeds in a singularly arbitrary manner to fix dates for the career of Papias which he considers more acceptable. The matter does not require elaborate argument here. Cf. Lightfoot, *Contemp. Rev.*, 1875, p. 381 ff.

evident.  
clear.

things which were either said or done by Christ. For he neither heard the Lord, nor followed him; but afterwards, as I said,<sup>1</sup> accompanied Peter, who adapted his teaching to the occasion, and not as making a consecutive record of the Lord's oracles. Mark, therefore, committed no error in thus writing down some things as he remembered them. For of one point he was careful, to omit none of the things which he heard, and not to narrate any of them falsely.' These facts Papias relates concerning Mark."<sup>2</sup> The question to decide is, whether the work here described is our canonical Gospel or not.

The first point in this account is the statement that Mark was the interpreter of Peter (ἐρμηνευτῆς Πέτρου). Was he merely the secretary of the Apostle, writing in a manner from his dictation, or does the passage mean that he translated the Aramaic narrative of Peter into Greek? The former is the more probable supposition, and that which is most generally adopted; but the question is not material here. The connection of Peter with the Gospel according to Mark was generally affirmed in the early Church, as was also that of Paul with the third Gospel,<sup>3</sup> with the evident purpose of claiming apostolic origin for all the canonical Gospels.<sup>4</sup> Irenæus says: "After their (Peter and Paul) decease, Mark, the disciple and interpreter of Peter, delivered to us in writing that which had been preached by Peter."<sup>5</sup> Eusebius quotes a similar tradition from Clement of Alexandria, embellished, however, with further particulars. He says: ".....The cause for which the Gospel according to Mark was written was this: When Peter had

<sup>1</sup> Dr. Lightfoot (*Contemp. Rev.*, 1875, p. 842), in the course of a highly fanciful argument, says, in reference to this "as I said": "It is quite clear that Papias had already said something of the relations existing between St. Peter and St. Mark previously to the extract which gives an account of the Second Gospel, for he there refers back to a preceding notice." It is quite clear that he refers back, but only to the preceding sentence, in which he "had already said something of the relations" in stating the fact that "Mark, having become the interpreter of Peter, wrote, etc."

<sup>2</sup> "Καὶ τοῦθ' ὁ πρεσβύτερος ἔλεγε. Μάρκος μὲν ἐρμηνευτῆς Πέτρου γενομένος ὅσα ἐμνημόνευσεν, ἀκριβῶς ἔγραψεν, οὐ μὲν τοι τάξει τὰ ὑπὸ τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἢ λεχθέντα ἢ πραχθέντα. Οὔτε γὰρ ἤκουσε τοῦ Κυρίου, οὔτε παρηκολούθησεν αὐτῷ· ὕστερον δὲ, ὡς ἔφην, Πέτρῳ, ὃς πρὸς τὰς χεῖρας ἐποιεῖτο τὰς διδασκαλίας, ἀλλ' οὐχ ὡσπερ σύνταξιν τῶν κυριακῶν ποιούμενος λόγων, ὥστε οὐδὲν ἤμαρτε Μάρκος, οὕτως ἐνια γράψας ὡς ἀπεμνημόνευσεν. Ἐνὸς γὰρ ἐποίησατο πρόνοιαν, τοῦ μηδὲν ὧν ἤκουσε παραλιπεῖν, ἢ ψεύσασθαι τι ἐν αὐτοῖς." Ταῦτα μὲν οὖν ἱστορήται τῆ Παπία περὶ τοῦ Μάρκου. Euseb., *H. E.*, iii. 39.

<sup>3</sup> Irenæus, *Adv. Her.*, iii. 1; cf. Eusebius, *H. E.*, v. 8; Tertullian, *Adv. Marc.*, iv. 5; Origen, *ap. Euseb.*, *H. E.*, vi. 25; Eusebius, *H. E.*, iii. 4; Hieron. *De Vir. Ill.*, 7.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Tertullian, *Adv. Marc.*, iv. 5.

<sup>5</sup> Μετὰ δὲ τὴν τούτων ἐξοδον, Μάρκος ὁ μαθητῆς καὶ ἐρμηνευτῆς Πέτρου, καὶ αὐτὸς τὰ ὑπὸ Πέτρου κηρυσσόμενα ἐγγράφως ἡμῖν παραδέδωκε. *Adv. Her.*, iii. 1, § 1; Euseb., *H. E.*, v. 8.

publicly preached the word at Rome, and proclaimed the Gospel by the Spirit, those who were present, being many, requested Mark, as he had followed him from afar, and remembered what he had said, to write down what he had spoken; and, when he had composed the Gospel, he gave it to those who had asked it of him; which, when Peter knew, he neither absolutely hindered nor encouraged it."<sup>1</sup> Tertullian repeats the same tradition. He says: "And the Gospel which Mark published may be affirmed to be Peter's, whose interpreter Mark was.....for it may rightly appear that works which disciples publish are of their masters."<sup>2</sup> We have it again from Origen: "The second (Gospel) is according to Mark, written as Peter directed him."<sup>3</sup> Eusebius gives a more detailed and advanced version of the same tradition. "So much, however, did the effulgence of piety illuminate the minds of those (Romans) who heard Peter that it did not content them to hear but once, nor to receive only the unwritten doctrine of the divine teaching; but, with reiterated entreaties, they besought Mark, to whom the Gospel is ascribed, as the companion of Peter, that he should leave them a written record of the doctrine thus orally conveyed. Nor did they cease their entreaties until they had persuaded the man, and thus became the cause of the writing of the Gospel called according to Mark. They say, moreover, that the Apostle (Peter), having become aware, through revelation to him of the Spirit, of what had been done, was delighted with the ardour of the men, and ratified the work, in order that it might be read in the churches. This narrative is given by Clement in the sixth book of his *Institutions*, whose testimony is supported by that of Papias, the Bishop of Hierapolis."<sup>4</sup> The account given by Clement, however, by no means contained these details, as we have seen. In his *Demonstration of the Gospel*, Eusebius, referring to the same tradition, affirms that it was the modesty of Peter which prevented his writing a Gospel himself.<sup>5</sup> Jerome almost repeats the preceding account of Eusebius: "Mark, the disciple and interpreter of Peter, being entreated by the brethren of Rome, wrote a short Gospel according to what he had

<sup>1</sup> Τὸ δὲ κατὰ Μάρκον ταύτην ἐσχηκέναι τὴν οἰκονομίαν. Τοῦ Πέτρου δημοσίᾳ ἐν Ῥώμῃ κηρύξαντος τὸν λόγον, καὶ Πνεύματι τὸ εὐαγγέλιον ἐξειπόντος, τοὺς παρόντας πολλοὺς ὄντας παρακαλέσαι τὸν Μάρκον, ὡς ἂν ἀκολουθήσαντα αὐτῷ πόρρωθεν καὶ μεμνημένον τῶν λεχθέντων, ἀναγράψαι τὰ εἰρημένα ποιήσαντα δὲ τὸ εὐαγγέλιον, μεταδοῦναι τοῖς δεομένοις αὐτοῦ. Ὅπερ ἐπιγόντα τὸν Πέτρον, προτρεπτικῶς μῆτε κωλύσαι μῆτε προτρέψασθαι. Euseb., *H. E.*, vi. 14.

<sup>2</sup> Licet et Marcus quod edidit Petri affirmetur, cujus interpres Marcus .....Capit majistrorum videri, quæ discipuli promulgarint. *Adv. Marc.*, iv. 5.

<sup>3</sup> δεύτερον δὲ τὸ κατὰ Μάρκον, ὡς Πέτρος ὑφηγήσατο αὐτῷ, ποιήσαντα. Comment. in Matt. Euseb., *H. E.*, vi. 25.

<sup>4</sup> Euseb., *H. E.*, ii. 15.

<sup>5</sup> *Demonstr. Evang.*, iii. 5.

received from Peter, which, when Peter heard, he approved, and gave his authority for its being read in the churches, as Clement writes in the sixth book of his *Institutions*,<sup>1</sup> etc. Jerome, moreover, says that Peter had Mark for an interpreter, "whose Gospel was composed: Peter narrating and he writing" (*cujus evangelium Petro narrante et illo scribente compositum est*).<sup>2</sup> It is evident that all these writers merely repeat with variations the tradition regarding the first two Gospels which Papias originated. Irenæus dates the writing of Mark after the death of Peter and Paul in Rome. Clement describes Mark as writing during Peter's life, the Apostle preserving absolute neutrality. By the time of Eusebius, however, the tradition has acquired new and miraculous elements, and a more decided character; Peter is made aware of the undertaking of Mark through a revelation of the Spirit, and, instead of being neutral, is delighted, and lends the work the weight of his authority. Eusebius refers to Clement and Papias as giving the same account, which they do not, however, and Jerome merely repeats the story of Eusebius without naming him; and the tradition which he had embellished thus becomes endorsed and perpetuated. Such is the growth of tradition;<sup>3</sup> it is impossible to overlook the mythical character of the information we possess as to the origin of the second canonical Gospel.

In a Gospel so completely inspired by Peter as the tradition of Papias and of the early Church indicates we may reasonably expect to find unmistakable traces of Petrine influence; but, on examination, it will be seen that these are totally wanting. Some of the early Church did not fail to remark this singular discrepancy between the Gospel and the tradition of its dependence on Peter, and, in reply, Eusebius adopts an apologetic tone.<sup>4</sup> For instance, in the brief account of the calling of Simon in Mark, the distinguishing addition, "called Peter," of the first Gospel is omitted,<sup>5</sup> and, still more notably, the whole narrative of the miraculous draught of fishes which gives the event such prominence in the third Gospel.<sup>6</sup> In Matthew, Jesus goes into the house of "Peter" to cure his wife's mother of a fever, whilst in Mark it is "into the

<sup>1</sup> *De Vir. Ill.*, 8.

<sup>2</sup> *Ad Hedib.*, c. 2.

<sup>3</sup> A similar discrepancy of tradition is to be observed as to the place in which the Gospel was written, Irenæus and others dating it from Rome, and others (as Chrysostom, in *Matt. Homil.*, i.) assigning it to Egypt. Indeed, some MSS. of the second Gospel have the words *ἐγράφη ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ* in accordance with this tradition as to its origin. Cf. Scholz, *Einl. N. T.*, i., p. 201. Various critics have argued for its composition at Rome, Alexandria, and Antioch. We do not go into the discussion as to whether Peter ever was in Rome.

<sup>4</sup> *Dem. Ev.*, iii. 3.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. Mark i. 16, 17; Matt. iv. 18.

<sup>6</sup> Luke v. 1-11.

house of Simon and Andrew," the less honourable name being still continued.<sup>1</sup> Matthew commences the catalogue of the twelve by the pointed indication: "The first, Simon, who is called Peter,"<sup>2</sup> thus giving him precedence, whilst Mark merely says, "And Simon he surnamed Peter."<sup>3</sup> The important episode of Peter's walking on the sea, of the first Gospel,<sup>4</sup> is altogether ignored by Mark. The enthusiastic declaration of Peter, "Thou art the Christ,"<sup>5</sup> is only followed by the chilling injunction to tell no one, in the second Gospel,<sup>6</sup> whilst Matthew not only gives greater prominence to the declaration of Peter, but gives the reply of Jesus, "Blessed art thou, Simon Bar-jona," &c.—of which Mark apparently knows nothing—and then proceeds to the most important episode in the history of the Apostle, the celebrated words by which the surname of Peter was conferred upon him: "And I say unto thee, that thou art Peter, and upon this rock will I build my Church," etc.<sup>7</sup> The Gospel supposed to have been inspired by Peter, however, totally omits this most important passage, as it also does the miracle of the finding the tribute money in the fish's mouth, narrated by the first Gospel.<sup>8</sup> Luke states that "Peter and John" are sent to prepare the Passover, whilst Mark has only "two disciples";<sup>9</sup> and in the account of the last Supper, Luke gives the address of Jesus to Peter: "Simon, Simon, behold Satan hath desired to have you (all) that he may sift you as wheat; but I have prayed for thee that thy faith fail not; and when thou art converted, strengthen thy brethren."<sup>10</sup> Of this Mark does not say a word. Again, after the denial, Luke reads: "And the Lord turned and looked upon Peter, and Peter remembered the word of the Lord, etc., and Peter went out and wept bitterly";<sup>11</sup> whereas Mark omits the reproachful look of Jesus, and makes the penitence of Peter depend merely on the second crowing of the cock, and further modifies the penitence by the omission of "bitterly"—"And when he thought thereon, he wept."<sup>12</sup> There are other instances to which we need not refer. Not only are some of the most important episodes in which Peter is represented by the other Gospels as a principal actor altogether omitted, but throughout the Gospel there is a total absence of anything which is specially characteristic of Petrine influence and teaching. The argument that these omissions are due to the modesty of Peter is quite untenable, for not only does Irenæus, the most ancient authority

<sup>1</sup> Mark i. 29.

<sup>3</sup> Mark iii. 16.

<sup>5</sup> Matt. adds, "the son of the living God,"

<sup>6</sup> Mark viii. 27-30; cf. Baur, *Das Markus Ev.*, p. 133.

<sup>7</sup> Matt. xvi. 16-19.

<sup>9</sup> Luke xxii. 8; Mark xiv. 13.

<sup>11</sup> *Ib.*, 61, 62; cf. Matt. xxvi. 75.

<sup>2</sup> Matt. x. 2.

<sup>4</sup> Matt. xiv. 22-33.

xvi. 16.

<sup>8</sup> Matt. xvii. 24-27.

<sup>10</sup> Luke xxii. 31, 32.

<sup>12</sup> Mark xiv. 27.

on the point, state that this Gospel was only written after the death of Peter,<sup>1</sup> but also there is no modesty in omitting passages of importance in the history of Jesus, simply because Peter himself was in some way concerned in them, or, for instance, in decreasing his penitence for such a denial of his master, which could not but have filled a sad place in the Apostle's memory. On the other hand, there is no adequate record of special matter, which the intimate knowledge of the doings and sayings of Jesus possessed by Peter might have supplied, to counterbalance the singular omissions. There is much more of the spirit of Peter in the first Gospel than there is in the second. The whole internal evidence, therefore, shows that this part of the tradition of the Presbyter John transmitted by Papias does not apply to our Gospel.

*important* | The discrepancy is still more marked when we compare with our actual second Gospel the account of the work of Mark which Papias received from the Presbyter. Mark wrote down from memory some parts (*ἐνία*) of the teaching of Peter regarding the life of Jesus, but as Peter adapted his instructions to the actual circumstances (*πρὸς τὰς χρείας*), and did not give a consecutive report (*σύνταξις*) of the sayings or doings of Jesus, Mark was only careful to be accurate, and did not trouble himself to arrange in historical order (*τάξις*) his narrative of the things which were said and done by Jesus, but merely wrote down facts as he remembered them. This description would lead us to expect a work composed of fragmentary reminiscences of the teaching of Peter, without regular sequence or connection. The absence of orderly arrangement is the most prominent feature in the description, and forms the burden of the whole. Mark writes "what he remembered"; "he did not arrange in order the things that were either said or done by Christ." And then follow the apologetic expressions of explanation—he was not himself a hearer or follower of the Lord, but derived his information from the occasional preaching of Peter, who did not attempt to give a consecutive narrative. Now, it is impossible in the work of Mark, here described, to recognise our present second Gospel, which does not depart in any important degree from the order of the other two Synoptics, and which throughout has the most evident character of orderly arrangement. Each of the Synoptics compared with the other two would present a similar degree of variation, but none of them could justly be described as not arranged in order, or as not being consecutive. The second Gospel opens formally, and, after presenting John the Baptist as the messenger sent to prepare the way of the Lord, proceeds to

*Note this.*

<sup>1</sup> *Adv. Har.*, iii. 1, § 1; Euseb., *H. E.*, v. 8. See quot., p. 279, note 5.



the baptism of Jesus, his temptation, his entry upon public life, and his calling of the disciples. Then, after a consecutive narrative of his teaching and works, the history ends with a full account of the last events in the life of Jesus, his trial, crucifixion, and resurrection. There is in the Gospel every characteristic of artistic and orderly arrangement, from the striking introduction by the prophetic voice crying in the wilderness to the solemn close of the marvellous history.<sup>1</sup> The great majority of critics, therefore, are agreed in concluding that the account of the Presbyter John recorded by Papias does not apply to our second canonical Gospel at all. Many of those who affirm that the description of Papias may apply to our second Gospel do so with hesitation, and few maintain that we now possess the original work without considerable subsequent alteration. Some of these critics, however, feeling the difficulty of identifying our second Gospel with the work here described, endeavour to reconcile the discrepancy by a fanciful interpretation of the account of Papias. They suggest that the first part, in which the want of chronological order is pointed out, refers to the rough notes which Mark made during the actual preaching and lifetime of Peter, and that the latter part applies to our present Gospel, which he later remodelled into its present shape. This most unreasonable and arbitrary application of the words of Papias is denounced even by apologists.

It has been well argued that the work here described as produced by Mark in the character of ἑρμηνευτῆς Πέτρου is much more one of the same family as the *Clementine Homilies* than of our Gospels. The work was no systematic narrative of the history of Jesus, nor report of his teaching, but the dogmatic preaching of the Apostle, illustrated and interspersed with passages from the discourses of Jesus, or facts from his life. Of this character seems actually to have been that ancient work, *The Preaching of Peter* (Κήρυγμα Πέτρου), which was used by Heracleon,<sup>2</sup> and by Clement<sup>3</sup> of Alexandria, as an authentic canonical work,<sup>4</sup> denounced by Origen<sup>5</sup> on account of the consideration in which it was held by many, but still quoted with respect by Gregory of Nazianzum.<sup>6</sup> There can be no doubt that the Κήρυγμα Πέτρου, although it failed to obtain a permanent place in the canon, was

<sup>1</sup> Augustine calls Mark the follower and abbreviator of Matthew. "*Tanquam pedisequus et breviator Matthæi.*" *De Consensu Evang.*, i. 2.

<sup>2</sup> Origen, *Comment. in Joan.*, xiii. 17.

<sup>3</sup> *Strom.*, i. 29, § 182, vi. 5, § 39, 6, § 48, 15, § 128.

<sup>4</sup> The work is generally quoted by the latter with the introduction, "Peter in the Preaching says:" Πέτρος ἐν τῷ κήρυγματι λέγει, κ.τ.λ.

<sup>5</sup> *De Princip. Præf.*, 8.

<sup>6</sup> *Ep. xvi. (ad Cæsar., i.)*. Cf. Fabricius, *Cod. Apocr. N. T.*, i., p. 812.

one of the most ancient works of the Christian Church, dating probably from the first century, and, like the work described by Papias, it also was held to have been composed in Rome in connection with the preaching there of Peter and Paul. It must be noted, moreover, that Papias does not call the work ascribed to Mark a Gospel, but merely a record of the preaching of Peter.

It is not necessary for us to account for the manner in which the work referred to by the Presbyter John disappeared, and the present Gospel according to Mark became substituted for it. The merely negative evidence that our actual Gospel is not the work described by Papias is sufficient for our purpose. Any one acquainted with the thoroughly uncritical character of the Fathers, and with the literary history of the early Christian Church, will readily conceive the facility with which this can have been accomplished. The great mass of intelligent critics are agreed that our Synoptic Gospels have assumed their present form only after repeated modifications by various editors of earlier evangelical works. These changes have not been effected without traces being left by which the various materials may be separated and distinguished; but the more primitive Gospels have entirely disappeared, naturally supplanted by the later and amplified versions. The critic, however, who distinguishes between the earlier and later matter is not bound to perform the now impossible feat of producing the originals, or accounting in any but a general way for the disappearance of the primitive Gospel.

Tischendorf asks: "How then has neither Eusebius nor any other theologian of Christian antiquity thought that the expressions of Papias were in contradiction with the two Gospels (Mt. and Mk.)?"<sup>1</sup> The absolute credulity with which those theologians accepted any fiction, however childish, which had a pious tendency, and the frivolous character of the only criticism in which they indulged, render their unquestioning application of the tradition of Papias to our Gospels anything but singular, and it is only surprising to find their silent acquiescence elevated into an argument. We have already, in the course of these pages, seen something of the singularly credulous and uncritical character of the Fathers, and we cannot afford space to give instances of the absurdities with which their writings abound. No fable could be too gross, no invention too transparent, for their unsuspecting acceptance, if it assumed a pious form or tended to edification. No period in the history of the world ever produced so many spurious works as the first two or three centuries of our era. The

<sup>1</sup> *Wann wurden, u. s. w.*, p. 107.

name of every Apostle, or Christian teacher, not excepting that of the great Master himself, was freely attached to every description of religious forgery. False gospels, epistles, acts, martyrologies, were unscrupulously circulated, and such pious falsification was not even intended, or regarded, as a crime, but perpetrated for the sake of edification. It was only slowly and after some centuries that many of these works, once, as we have seen, regarded with pious veneration, were excluded from the canon; and that genuine works shared this fate, while spurious ones usurped their places, is one of the surest results of criticism. The Fathers omitted to inquire critically when such investigation might have been of value, and mere tradition credulously accepted and transmitted is of no critical value.<sup>1</sup> In an age when the multiplication of copies of any work was a slow process, and their dissemination a matter of difficulty and even danger, it is easy to understand with what facility the more complete and artistic Gospel could take the place of the original notes as the work of Mark.

The account given by Papias of the work ascribed to Matthew is as follows: "Matthew composed the oracles in the Hebrew dialect, and every one interpreted them as he was able."<sup>2</sup> Critics are divided in opinion as to whether this tradition was, like that regarding Mark, derived from the Presbyter John, or is given merely on the authority of Papias himself. Eusebius joins the account of Mark to that given by Matthew merely by the following words: "These facts Papias relates concerning Mark; but regarding Matthew he has said as follows:"<sup>3</sup> Eusebius distinctly states that the account regarding Mark is derived from the Presbyter, and the only reason for ascribing to him also that concerning Matthew is that it is not excluded by the phraseology of Eusebius; and, the two passages being given by him consecutively—however they may have stood in the work of Papias—it is reasonable enough to suppose that the information was derived from the same source. The point is not of much importance, but it is clear that there is no absolute right to trace this statement to the Presbyter John, as there is in the case of the tradition about Mark.

This passage has excited even more controversy than that regarding Mark, and its interpretation and application are still

<sup>1</sup> Dr. Westcott himself admits that "the proof of the Canon is rendered more difficult by the uncritical character of the first two centuries." He says: "The spirit of the ancient world was essentially uncritical" (*On the Canon*, p. 7 f.).

<sup>2</sup> Ματθαῖος μὲν οὖν Ἑβραϊδὶ διαλέκτῳ τὰ λόγια συνεγράψατο. Ἑρμήνευσε δ' αὐτὰ ὡς ἦν δυνατὸς ἕκαστος. Euseb., *H. E.*, iii. 39.

<sup>3</sup> Ταῦτα μὲν οὖν ἰστορεῖται τῷ Παπία περὶ τοῦ Μάρκου. Περὶ δὲ τοῦ Ματθαίου ταῦτ' εἴρηται. Euseb., *H. E.*, iii. 39.

mtl. v.  
p. 100  
Q.

Q.

keenly debated. The intricacy and difficulty of the questions which it raises are freely admitted by some of the most earnest defenders of the canonical Gospels, but the problem, so far as our examination is concerned, can be solved without much trouble. The dilemma in which apologists find themselves when they attempt closely to apply the description of this work given by Papias to our canonical Gospel is the great difficulty which complicates the matter and prevents a clear and distinct solution of the question. We shall avoid minute discussion of details, contenting ourselves with the broader features of the argument, and seeking only to arrive at a just conclusion as to the bearing of the evidence of Papias upon the claim to authenticity of our canonical Gospel.

*obviously* The first point which we have to consider is the nature of the work which is here described. Matthew is said to have composed the Λόγια or Oracles, and there can be little doubt from the title of his own book, *Exposition of the Lord's Oracles* (Λογίων κυριακῶν ἐξήγησις), that these oracles referred to by Papias were the Discourses of Jesus. Does the word λόγια, however, mean strictly oracles or discourses alone, or does it include within its fair signification also historical narrative? Were the "Λόγια" here referred to a simple collection of the discourses of Jesus, or a complete Gospel like that in our canon bearing the name of Matthew? That the natural interpretation of the word is merely "oracles" is indirectly admitted, even by the most thorough apologists, when they confess the obscurity of the expression—obscurity, however, which simply appears to exist from the difficulty of straining the word to make it apply to the Gospel. "In these sentences," says Tischendorf, referring to the passage about Matthew, "there is much obscurity; for instance, it is doubtful whether we have rightly translated 'Discourses of the Lord,'"<sup>1</sup> and he can only extend the meaning to include historical narrative by leaving the real meaning of the word, and interpreting it by supposed analogy.

There can be no doubt that the direct meaning of the word λόγια anciently and at the time of Papias was simply—words or oracles of a sacred character, and, however much the signification became afterwards extended, that it was not then at all applied to doings as well as sayings. There are many instances of this original and limited signification in the New Testament;<sup>2</sup> and

<sup>1</sup> *Wann wurden, u. s. w.*, p. 106 f.

<sup>2</sup> "They were entrusted with the oracles of God," τὰ λόγια τοῦ Θεοῦ, Rom. iii. 2. "The first principles of the oracles of God," τῶν λογίων τοῦ Θεοῦ, Heb. v. 12. "Let him speak as the oracles of God," ὡς λόγια Θεοῦ, 1 Pet. iv. 11. Cf. Suicer, *Thes. Eccles.*, ii., p. 247 f. Dr. Lightfoot (*Contemp. Rev.*, 1875, p. 400 f.) argues that in the first of the above passages

there is no linguistic precedent for straining the expression used at that period to mean anything beyond a collection of sayings of Jesus which were estimated as oracular or divine, nor is there any reason for thinking that τὰ λόγια was here used in any other sense. It is argued, on the other hand, that in the preceding passage upon Mark a more extended meaning of the word is indicated. The Presbyter John says that Mark, as the interpreter of Peter, wrote, without order, "the things which were either said or done by Christ" (τὰ ὑπὸ τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἢ λεχθέντα ἢ πραχθέντα), and then, apologising for him, he goes on to say that Peter, whom he followed, adapted his teaching to the occasion, "and not as making a consecutive record of the oracles (λογίων) of the Lord." Here, it is said, the word λογίων is used in reference both to sayings and doings, and, therefore, in the passage on Matthew τὰ λόγια must not be understood to mean only λεχθέντα, but also includes, as in the former case, the πραχθέντα. For these and similar reasons—in very many cases largely influenced by the desire to see in these λόγια our actual Gospel according to Matthew—many critics have maintained that τὰ λόγια in this place may be understood to include historical narrative as well as discourses. The arguments by which they arrive at this conclusion, however, seem to us to be based upon thorough misconception of the direct meaning of the passage. Few, or none, of these critics would deny that the simple inter-

Paul's expression, "the oracles of God," can mean nothing else than the O. T. Scriptures, and, therefore, includes the historical books of Genesis, Joshua, Samuel, etc. We must maintain that Paul certainly does not refer to a collection of writings, but to the communications or revelations of God, and, as the context shows, probably more immediately to the Messianic prophecies. The advantage of the Jews, in fact, according to Paul here, was that to them were first communicated the divine oracles: that they were made the medium of God's utterances to mankind. There seems almost an echo of the expression in Acts vii. 38, where Stephen is represented as saying to the Jews of their fathers on Mount Sinai: "who received living oracles (λόγια ζώντα) to give unto us." Of this nature were "the oracles of God" entrusted to the Jews. Further, the phrase, "the first principles of the oracles of God" (Heb. v. 12), is no application of the term to narrative, as is argued, however much the author may illustrate his own teaching by O. T. history; but the writer of the Epistle clearly explains his own meaning in the first and second verses of his letter, when he says: "God having spoken to the fathers in time past in the prophets, at the end of these days spake unto us in his Son." Dr. Lightfoot also urges that Philo applies the term "oracle" (λόγιον) to the narrative in Gen. iv. 15, etc. The fact is, however, that Philo considered almost every part of the O. T. as allegorical, and held that narrative or descriptive phrases frequently veiled divine oracles. When he applies the term "oracle" to any of these, it is not to the narrative, but to the divine utterance which he believes to be mystically contained in it, and which he extracts and expounds in the usual extravagant manner of Alexandrian typologists.

pretation of τὰ λόγια, at that period, was oracular sayings.<sup>1</sup> Papias shows his preference for discourses in the very title of his lost book, *Exposition of the λογίων of the Lord*, and in the account which he gives of the works attributed to Mark and Matthew the discourses evidently attracted his chief interest. Now, in the passage regarding Mark, instead of λογίων being made the equivalent of λεχθέντα and πραχθέντα, the very reverse is the fact. The Presbyter says Mark wrote what he remembered of the things which were said or done by Christ, although not in order, and he apologises for his doing this on the ground that he had not himself been a *hearer* of the Lord, but merely reported what he had heard from Peter, who adapted his teaching to the occasion, and did *not* attempt to give a consecutive record of the oracles (λογίων) of the Lord. Mark, therefore, could not do so either. Matthew, on the contrary, he states, did compose the oracles (τὰ λόγια). There is an evident contrast made—Mark wrote ἢ λεχθέντα ἢ πραχθέντα because he had not the means of writing the oracles; but Matthew composed the λόγια. Papias clearly distinguishes the work of Mark, who had written reminiscences of what Jesus had said and done from that of Matthew, who had made a collection of his discourses.

It is impossible upon any but arbitrary grounds, and from a foregone conclusion, to maintain that a work commencing with a detailed history of the birth and infancy of Jesus, his genealogy, and the preaching of John the Baptist, and concluding with an equally minute history of his betrayal, trial, crucifixion, and resurrection; which relates all the miracles, and has for its evident aim throughout the demonstration that Messianic prophecy was fulfilled in Jesus, could be entitled τὰ λόγια: the oracles or discourses of the Lord.

Partly for these, but also for other important reasons, some of which shall presently be referred to, the great majority of critics deny that the work described by Papias can be the same as the Gospel in our canon bearing the name of Matthew. Whilst of those who suppose that the (Aramaic) original of which Papias speaks may have been substantially similar to it in construction, very few affirm that the work did not receive much subsequent

<sup>1</sup> Tischendorf himself, in a note, says: "Rufinus translates the word λόγια, according to the old linguistic usage, by *oracula*. It is in the highest degree probable that in fact the book of Papias, according to the Millenarian standing-point of the man, was dedicated specially to prophecies of the Lord. Christian linguistic usage, however, gave the word a wider signification, so that the sayings of the Lord and of the Apostles, even when they had not the particular character of prophecy, were so called, and Holy Scripture was designated θεῖα λόγια" (*Wann wurden, u. s. w.*, p. 102, note 1).

manipulation, addition, and alteration, necessarily including translation, before it assumed the form in which the Gospel now lies before us; and many of them altogether deny its actual apostolic origin.

The next most important and obvious point is that the work described in this passage was written by Matthew in the Hebrew or Aramaic dialect, and each one who did not understand that dialect was obliged to translate as best he could. Our Gospel according to Matthew, however, is in Greek. Tischendorf, who is obliged to acknowledge the Greek originality of our actual Gospel, and that it is not a translation from another language, recognises the inevitable dilemma in which this fact places apologists, and has, with a few other critics, no better argument with which to meet it than the simple suggestion that Papias must have been mistaken in saying that Matthew wrote in Hebrew.<sup>1</sup> Just as much of the testimony as is convenient or favourable is eagerly claimed by such apologists, and the rest, which destroys its applicability to our Gospel, is set aside as a mistake. Tischendorf perceives the difficulty, but, not having arguments to meet it, he takes refuge in feeling. "In this," he says, "there lies before us one of the most complicated questions, whose detailed treatment would here not be in place. For our part, we are fully at rest concerning it, in the conviction that the assumption by Papias of a Hebrew original text of Matthew, which already in his time cannot have been limited to himself and was soon repeated by other men, arises only from a misunderstanding."<sup>2</sup> It is difficult to comprehend why it should be considered out of place, in a work specially written to establish the authenticity of the Gospels, to discuss fully so vital a point; and its deliberate evasion in such a manner alone can be deemed out of place.<sup>3</sup>

We may here briefly remark that Tischendorf and others<sup>4</sup> repeat with approval the disparaging expressions against Papias which Eusebius, for dogmatic reasons, did not scruple to use, and in this way they seek somewhat to depreciate his testimony, or at least indirectly to warrant their free handling of it. It is true that Eusebius says that Papias was a man of very limited comprehension<sup>5</sup> (σφόδρα γάρ τοι σμικρὸς ὢν τὸν νοῦν), but this is

<sup>1</sup> Tischendorf, *Wann wurden*, u. s. w., p. 107 f.

<sup>2</sup> *Wann wurden*, u. s. w., p. 107 f.

<sup>3</sup> Dr. Westcott scarcely refers to the subject at all, and indeed on other points which are inconvenient in the evidence of Papias regarding Matthew's work he preserves almost complete silence, and assumes, with hardly a hint of doubt or uncertainty, the orthodox conclusions (*On the Canon*, pp. 59-62; 4th ed., p. 68 ff.).

<sup>4</sup> Tischendorf, *Wann wurden*, u. s. w., pp. 106-111.

<sup>5</sup> *H. E.*, iii. 39. The passage (iii. 36) in which, on the contrary, Papias is called "a man in all respects most learned" (ἀνὴρ τὰ πάντα ὅτι μάλιστα

acknowledged to be on account of his Millenarian opinions, to which Eusebius was vehemently opposed. It must be borne in mind, however, that the Chiliastic passage from Papias quoted by Irenæus, and in which he certainly saw nothing foolish, is given on the authority of the Presbyter John, to whom, and not to Papias, any criticism upon it must be referred. If the passage be not of a very elevated character, it is quite in the spirit of that age. The main point, however, is that in regard to the testimony of Papias we have little to do with his general ability, for all that was requisite was the power to see, hear, and accurately state very simple facts. He repeats what is told him by the Presbyter, and, in such matters, we presume that the Bishop of Hierapolis must be admitted to have been competent.

There is no point, however, on which the testimony of the Fathers is more invariable and complete than that the work of Matthew was written in Hebrew or Aramaic. The first mention of any work ascribed to Matthew occurs in the account communicated by Papias, in which, as we have seen, it is distinctly said that Matthew wrote "in the Hebrew dialect." Irenæus, the next writer who refers to the point, says: "Matthew also produced a written Gospel amongst the Hebrews in their own dialect," and that he did not derive his information solely from Papias may be inferred from his going on to state the epoch of Matthew's writings: "when Peter and Paul were preaching and founding the Church in Rome."<sup>1</sup> The evidence furnished by Pantænus is certainly independent of Papias. Eusebius states, with regard to him: "Of these Pantænus is said to have been one, and to have penetrated as far as India (Southern Arabia), where it is reported that he found the Gospel according to Matthew, which had been delivered before his arrival to some who had the knowledge of Christ, to whom Bartholomew, one of the Apostles, as it is said, had preached, and left them that writing of Matthew in Hebrew letters" (*αὐτοῖς τε Ἑβραίων γράμμασι τὴν τοῦ Ματθαίου καταλείψαι γραφὴν*).<sup>2</sup> Jerome gives a still more circumstantial account of this: "Pantænus found that Bartholomew, one of the twelve Apostles, had there (in India) preached the advent of our Lord Jesus Christ according to the Gospel of Matthew, which was written in Hebrew letters (*quod Hebraicis literis scriptum*), and

*λογιώτατος*) is doubtful, as it is not found in the St. Petersburg Syriac edition, nor in several other old Greek MSS.; but, treated even as an ancient note by some one acquainted with the writings of Papias, it may be mentioned here.

<sup>1</sup> Ὁ μὲν δὴ Ματθαῖος ἐν τοῖς Ἑβραίοις τῇ ἰδίᾳ αὐτῶν διαλέκτῳ καὶ γραφὴν ἐξήνεγκεν εὐαγγελίου, τοῦ Πέτρου καὶ τοῦ Παύλου ἐν Ῥώμῃ εὐαγγελιζομένων καὶ θεμελιούντων τὴν ἐκκλησίαν. *Adv. Hier.*, iii. 1, § 1; Euseb., *H. E.*, v. 8.

<sup>2</sup> Euseb., *H. E.*, v. 10.



which, on returning to Alexandria, he brought with him."<sup>1</sup> It is quite clear that this was no version specially made by Bartholomew, for had he translated the Gospel according to Matthew from the Greek, for the use of persons in Arabia, he certainly would not have done so into Hebrew. Origen, according to Eusebius, "following the ecclesiastical canon," states what he has understood from tradition (ἐν παραδόσει) of the Gospels, and says: "The first written was that according to Matthew, once a publican, but afterwards an Apostle of Jesus Christ, who delivered it to the Jewish believers, composed in the Hebrew language."<sup>2</sup> Eusebius, in another place, makes a similar statement in his own name: "Matthew, having first preached to the Hebrews, when he was about to go also to others delivered to them his Gospel written in their native language, and thus compensated those from whom he was departing for the want of his presence by the writing."<sup>3</sup> Cyril of Jerusalem says: "Matthew, who wrote the Gospel, wrote it in the Hebrew language."<sup>4</sup> Epiphanius, referring to the fact that the Nazarenes called the only Gospel which they recognised the "Gospel according to the Hebrews," continues: "As in very truth we can affirm that Matthew alone, in the New Testament, set forth and proclaimed the Gospel in the Hebrew language and in Hebrew characters";<sup>5</sup> and elsewhere he states that "Matthew wrote the Gospel in Hebrew."<sup>6</sup> The same tradition is repeated by Chrysostom,<sup>7</sup> Augustine,<sup>8</sup> and others.

Whilst the testimony of the Fathers was thus unanimous as to the fact that the Gospel ascribed to Matthew was originally written in Hebrew, no question ever seems to have arisen in their minds as to the character of the Greek version; much less was any examination made with the view of testing the accuracy of the translation. "Such inquiries were not in the spirit of Christian learned men generally of that time,"<sup>9</sup> as Tischendorf remarks in connection with the belief current in the early Church, and afterwards shared by Jerome, that the Gospel according to the Hebrews was the original of the Greek Gospel according to Matthew. The first who directly refers to the point, frankly confessing the total ignorance which generally prevailed, was Jerome. He states: "Matthew, who was also called Levi, who, from a publican,

<sup>1</sup> *De Vir. Ill.*, 36.    <sup>2</sup> Euseb., *H. E.*, vi. 25.    <sup>3</sup> Euseb., *H. E.*, iii. 24.

<sup>4</sup> Ματθαῖος ὁ γράψας τὸ εὐαγγέλιον, Ἑβραϊδὶ γλώσσῃ τοῦτο ἔγραψεν. *Cat.* 14.

<sup>5</sup> ὡς τὰ ἀληθῆ ἐστὶν εἰπεῖν ὅτι Ματθαῖος μόνος Ἑβραϊστὶ καὶ Ἑβραϊκοῖς γράμμασιν ἐν τῇ καινῇ διαθήκῃ ἐποίησατο τὴν τοῦ εὐαγγελίου ἔκθεσιν τε καὶ κήρυγμα. *Hæc.*, xxx. 3: *ed. Petav.*, p. 127.

<sup>6</sup>.....ὁ Ματθαῖος Ἑβραϊκοῖς γράμμασι γράφει τὸ εὐαγγέλιον, κ.τ.λ. *Hæc.*, li. 5; *ed. Pet.*, p. 426.

<sup>7</sup> *Hom. in Matth.*, i.

<sup>8</sup> *De Consensu Evang.*, i. 2.

<sup>9</sup> Tischendorf, *Wann wurden*, u. s. w., p. 108.

became an Apostle, was the first who wrote a Gospel of Christ in Judæa in Hebrew language and letters, on account of those from amongst the circumcision who had believed; but who afterwards translated it into Greek is not sufficiently certain."<sup>1</sup> It was only at a much later period, when doubt began to arise, that the translation was wildly ascribed to the Apostles John, James, and others.<sup>2</sup>

The expression in Papias that "everyone interpreted them (the *λόγια*) as he was able" (*ἠρμήνευσε δ' αὐτὰ ὡς ἦν δυνατὸς ἕκαστος*) has been variously understood by different critics, like the rest of the account. Schleiermacher explained the *ἠρμήνευσε* as translation by enlargement—Matthew merely collected the *λόγια*, and everyone added the explanatory circumstances of time and occasion as best he could.<sup>3</sup> This view, however, has not been largely adopted. Others consider that the expression refers to the interpretation which was given on reading it at the public meetings of Christians for worship; but there can be no doubt that, coming after the statement that the work was written in the Hebrew dialect, *ἑρμηνεύειν* can only mean simple translation. Some maintain that the passage implies the existence of many written translations, amongst which very probably was ours; whilst others affirm that the phrase merely signifies that, as there was no recognised translation, each one who had but an imperfect knowledge of the language, yet wished to read the work, translated the Hebrew for himself as best he could. Some consider that Papias or the Presbyter uses the verb in the past tense, *ἠρμήνευσε*, as contrasting the time when it was necessary for each to interpret as best he could with the period when, from the existence of a recognised translation, it was no longer necessary for them to do so, whilst others deny that any written translation of an authentic character was known to Papias at all. Now, the words in Papias are merely: "Matthew composed the *λόγια* in the Hebrew dialect,<sup>4</sup> and everyone interpreted them as he was able." The statement is perfectly simple and direct, and it is, at least, quite clear that it conveys the fact that when the work was composed transla-

<sup>1</sup> *Matthæus, qui et Levi, ex publicano apostolus, primus in Judæa, propter eos qui ex circumcissione crediderant, evangelium Christi Hebraicis litteris verbisque composuit: quod quis postea in Græcum transtulerit, non satis certum est.* Hieron. *De Vir. Ill.*, 3.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Theophylact, *Com. in Matth.*, *Præm.*; *Auctor Synops. Script. Sacr.*; Athanasius, *Opp. Paris.*, ii., p. 155; *Evang. sec. Matth. ed. Matthæi*, p. 10.

<sup>3</sup> *Th. Studien u. Krit.*, 1832, p. 735 f.

<sup>4</sup> In connection with this it may be of interest to remember that, in the account of his conversion and the vision which he saw on his way to Damascus which Paul gives to King Agrippa in the Acts of the Apostles, he states that Jesus spoke to him "in the Hebrew dialect" (*Ἑβραϊδὶ διαλέκτῳ*), Acts xxvi. 14.

tion was requisite, and, as each one translated "as he was able," that no recognised translation existed to which all might have recourse. There is no contrast either necessarily or probably implied in the use of the past tense. The composition of the *λόγια* being, of course, referred to in the past tense, the same tense is simply continued in completing the sentence. The purpose is obviously to convey the fact that the work was composed in the Hebrew language. But even if it be taken that Papias intentionally uses the past tense in reference to the time when translations did not exist, nothing is gained. Papias may have known of many translations, but there is absolutely not a syllable which warrants the conclusion that he was acquainted with an authentic Greek version, although it is possible that he may have known of the existence of some Greek translations of no authority. The words used, however, imply that, if he did, he had no respect for any of them.

Thus the account of Papias, supported by the perfectly unanimous testimony of the Fathers, declares that the work composed by Matthew was written in the Hebrew or Aramaic dialect. The only evidence which asserts that Matthew wrote any work at all distinctly asserts that he wrote it in Hebrew. It is quite impossible to separate the statement of the authorship from that regarding the language. The two points are so indissolubly united that they stand or fall together. If it be denied that Matthew wrote in Hebrew, it cannot be asserted that he wrote at all. It is therefore perfectly certain from this testimony that Matthew cannot be declared the direct author of the Greek canonical Gospel bearing his name. At the very best it can only be a translation, by an unknown hand, of a work the original of which was early lost. None of the earlier Fathers ever ventured a conjecture as to how, when, or by whom the translation was effected. Jerome explicitly states that the translator of the work was unknown. The deduction is clear: our Greek Gospel, in so far as it is associated with Matthew at all, cannot at the utmost be more than a translation, but as the work of an unknown translator there cannot, in the absence of the original, or of satisfactory testimony of its accuracy, be any assurance that the translation faithfully renders the work of Matthew, or accurately conveys the sense of the original. All its Apostolical authority is gone. Even Michaelis long ago recognised this: "If the original text of Matthew be lost, and we have nothing but a Greek translation, then, frankly, we cannot ascribe any divine inspiration to the words; yea, it is possible that in various places the true meaning of the Apostle has been missed by the translator."<sup>1</sup> This was felt and argued by the Manicheans in the

<sup>1</sup> *Einl. N. T.*, ii., p. 997, cf. p. 1,003.

fourth century,<sup>1</sup> and by the Anabaptists at the time of the Reformation.<sup>2</sup> A wide argument might be opened out as to the dependence of the other two Gospels on this unauthenticated work.

The dilemma, however, is not yet complete. It was early remarked that our first canonical Gospel bears no real marks of being a translation at all, but is evidently an original, independent Greek work. Even men like Erasmus, Calvin, Cajetan, and Œcolampadius began to deny the statement that our Gospels showed any traces of Hebrew origin, and the researches of later scholars have so fully confirmed their doubts that few now maintain the primitive belief in a translation. We do not propose here to enter fully into this argument. It is sufficient to say that the great majority of competent critics declare that our first canonical Gospel is no translation, but an original Greek text; whilst of those who consider that they find in it traces of translation and of Hebrew origin, some barely deny the independent originality of the Greek Gospel, and few assert more than substantial agreement with the original, with more or less variation and addition often of a very decided character. The case, therefore, stands thus: The whole of the evidence which warrants our believing that Matthew wrote any work at all, distinctly, invariably, and emphatically asserts that he wrote that work in Hebrew or Aramaic; a Greek Gospel, therefore, as connected with Matthew, can only be a translation by an unknown hand, whose accuracy we have not, and never have had, the means of verifying. Our Greek Gospel, however, being an independent original Greek text, there is no ground whatever for ascribing it even indirectly to Matthew at all, the whole evidence of antiquity being emphatically opposed, and the Gospel itself laying no claim, to such authorship.

One or other of these alternatives must be adopted for our first Gospel, and either is absolutely fatal to its direct Apostolic origin. Neither as a translation from the Hebrew nor as an original Greek text can it claim Apostolic authority. This has been so well recognised, if not admitted, that some writers, with greater zeal than discretion, have devised fanciful theories to obviate the difficulty. These maintain that Matthew himself wrote both in Hebrew and in Greek, or at least that the translation was made during his own lifetime and under his own eye, and so on. There is not, however, a particle of evidence for any of these assertions, which are merely the arbitrary and groundless conjectures of embarrassed apologists.

It is manifest that upon this evidence both those who assert the

<sup>1</sup> Augustine, *Contra Faust.*, 32, 2; 33, 3.

<sup>2</sup> Sixtus Senensis, *Bibl. Sancta*, vii. 2, p. 924.

tion was requisite, and, as each one translated "as he was able," that no recognised translation existed to which all might have recourse. There is no contrast either necessarily or probably implied in the use of the past tense. The composition of the *Λόγια* being, of course, referred to in the past tense, the same tense is simply continued in completing the sentence. The purpose is obviously to convey the fact that the work was composed in the Hebrew language. But even if it be taken that Papias intentionally uses the past tense in reference to the time when translations did not exist, nothing is gained. Papias may have known of many translations, but there is absolutely not a syllable which warrants the conclusion that he was acquainted with an authentic Greek version, although it is possible that he may have known of the existence of some Greek translations of no authority. The words used, however, imply that, if he did, he had no respect for any of them.

Thus the account of Papias, supported by the perfectly unanimous testimony of the Fathers, declares that the work composed by Matthew was written in the Hebrew or Aramaic dialect. The only evidence which asserts that Matthew wrote any work at all distinctly asserts that he wrote it in Hebrew. It is quite impossible to separate the statement of the authorship from that regarding the language. The two points are so indissolubly united that they stand or fall together. If it be denied that Matthew wrote in Hebrew, it cannot be asserted that he wrote at all. It is therefore perfectly certain from this testimony that Matthew cannot be declared the direct author of the Greek canonical Gospel bearing his name. At the very best it can only be a translation, by an unknown hand, of a work the original of which was early lost. None of the earlier Fathers ever ventured a conjecture as to how, when, or by whom the translation was effected. Jerome explicitly states that the translator of the work was unknown. The deduction is clear: our Greek Gospel, in so far as it is associated with Matthew at all, cannot at the utmost be more than a translation, but as the work of an unknown translator there cannot, in the absence of the original, or of satisfactory testimony of its accuracy, be any assurance that the translation faithfully renders the work of Matthew, or accurately conveys the sense of the original. All its Apostolical authority is gone. Even Michaelis long ago recognised this: "If the original text of Matthew be lost, and we have nothing but a Greek translation, then, frankly, we cannot ascribe any divine inspiration to the words; yea, it is possible that in various places the true meaning of the Apostle has been missed by the translator."<sup>1</sup> This was felt and argued by the Manicheans in the

<sup>1</sup> *Einl. N. T.*, ii., p. 997, cf. p. 1,003.

fourth century,<sup>1</sup> and by the Anabaptists at the time of the Reformation.<sup>2</sup> A wide argument might be opened out as to the dependence of the other two Gospels on this unauthenticated work.

The dilemma, however, is not yet complete. It was early remarked that our first canonical Gospel bears no real marks of being a translation at all, but is evidently an original, independent Greek work. Even men like Erasmus, Calvin, Cajetan, and Ecolampadius began to deny the statement that our Gospels showed any traces of Hebrew origin, and the researches of later scholars have so fully confirmed their doubts that few now maintain the primitive belief in a translation. We do not propose here to enter fully into this argument. It is sufficient to say that the great majority of competent critics declare that our first canonical Gospel is no translation, but an original Greek text; whilst of those who consider that they find in it traces of translation and of Hebrew origin, some barely deny the independent originality of the Greek Gospel, and few assert more than substantial agreement with the original, with more or less variation and addition often of a very decided character. The case, therefore, stands thus: The whole of the evidence which warrants our believing that Matthew wrote any work at all, distinctly, invariably, and emphatically asserts that he wrote that work in Hebrew or Aramaic; a Greek Gospel, therefore, as connected with Matthew, can only be a translation by an unknown hand, whose accuracy we have not, and never have had, the means of verifying. Our Greek Gospel, however, being an independent original Greek text, there is no ground whatever for ascribing it even indirectly to Matthew at all, the whole evidence of antiquity being emphatically opposed, and the Gospel itself laying no claim, to such authorship.

One or other of these alternatives must be adopted for our first Gospel, and either is absolutely fatal to its direct Apostolic origin. Neither as a translation from the Hebrew nor as an original Greek text can it claim Apostolic authority. This has been so well recognised, if not admitted, that some writers, with greater zeal than discretion, have devised fanciful theories to obviate the difficulty. These maintain that Matthew himself wrote both in Hebrew and in Greek, or at least that the translation was made during his own lifetime and under his own eye, and so on. There is not, however, a particle of evidence for any of these assertions, which are merely the arbitrary and groundless conjectures of embarrassed apologists.

It is manifest that upon this evidence both those who assert the

<sup>1</sup> Augustine, *Contra Faust.*, 32, 2; 33, 3.

<sup>2</sup> Sixtus Senensis, *Bibl. Sancta*, vii. 2, p. 924.

Hebrew original of Matthew's work and those who maintain that our Gospel is not a translation, but an original Greek composition, should logically deny its apostolicity. We need not say that this is not done, and that for dogmatic and other foregone conclusions many profess belief in the Apostolic authorship of the Gospel, although in doing so they wilfully ignore the facts, and in many cases merely claim a substantial, but not absolute, Apostolic origin for the work. A much greater number of the most able and learned critics, however, both from external and internal evidence, deny the Apostolic origin of our first canonical Gospel.

There is another fact to which we may briefly refer, which, from another side, shows that the work of Matthew, with which Papias was acquainted, was different from our Gospel. In a fragment from the fourth book of his lost work, which is preserved to us by Œcumenius and Theophylact, Papias relates the circumstances of the death of Judas Iscariot in a manner which is in contradiction to the account in the first Gospel. In Matthew xxvii. 5 the death of the traitor is thus related: "And he cast down the pieces of silver in the temple, and departed and went and hanged himself."<sup>1</sup> The narrative in Papias is as follows: "Judas walked about in this world a great example of impiety; for his body having swollen so that, on an occasion when a waggon was moving on its way he could not pass it, he was crushed by the waggon, and his bowels gushed out."<sup>2</sup> Theophylact, in connection with this passage, adds other details, also apparently taken from the work of Papias; as, for instance, that, from his excessive corpulency, the eyes of Judas were so swollen that they could not see, and so sunk in his head that they could not be perceived even by the aid of the optical instruments of physicians; and that the rest of his body was covered with running sores and maggots, and so on in the manner of the early Christian ages, whose imagination conjured up the wildest "special providences" to punish the enemies of the faith. As Papias expressly states that he eagerly inquired what the Apostles and, amongst them, what Matthew said, we may conclude that he would not have deliberately contradicted the account given by that Apostle had he been acquainted with any work attributed to him which contained it.

It has been argued, from some very remote and imaginary resemblance between the passage from the preface to the work of Papias quoted by Eusebius with the prologue to Luke, that Papias was acquainted with that Gospel; but nothing could be more groundless than such a conclusion based upon such

<sup>1</sup> In Acts i. 18 f. an account is given which again contradicts both Matthew and the version of Papias.

<sup>2</sup> Œcumenius, *Comm. in Acta Apost.*, cap. ii.

evidence, and there is not a word in our fragments of Papias which warrants such an assertion. Eusebius does not mention that Papias knew either the third or fourth Gospel. Is it possible to suppose that if Papias had been acquainted with those Gospels he would not have asked for information about them from the Presbyters, or that Eusebius would not have recorded it as he did that regarding the works ascribed to Matthew and Mark? Eusebius states, however, that Papias "made use of testimonies from the first Epistle of John and, likewise, from that of Peter."<sup>1</sup> As Eusebius, however, does not quote the passages from Papias, we must remain in doubt whether he did not, as elsewhere, assume from some similarity of wording that the passages were quotations from these Epistles, whilst in reality they might not be. Andrew, a Cappadocian bishop of the fifth century, mentions that Papias, amongst others of the Fathers, considered the Apocalypse inspired.<sup>2</sup> No reference is made to this by Eusebius, but, although from his Millenarian tendencies it is very probable that Papias regarded the Apocalypse with peculiar veneration as a prophetic book, this evidence is too vague and isolated to be of much value.

We find, however, that Papias, like Hegesippus and others of the Fathers, was acquainted with the Gospel according to the Hebrews. Eusebius says: "He (Papias) has likewise related another history of a woman accused of many sins before the Lord, which is contained in the Gospel according to the Hebrews."<sup>3</sup> This is generally believed to be the episode inserted in the later MSS. of the fourth Gospel, viii. 1-11.

Whatever books Papias knew, however, it is certain, from his own express declaration, that he ascribed little importance to them, and preferred tradition as a more beneficial source of information regarding evangelical history. "For I held that what was to be derived from books," he says, "did not so profit me as that from the living and abiding voice."<sup>4</sup> If, therefore, it could even have been shown that Papias was acquainted with any of our canonical Gospels, it must, at the same time, have been admitted that he did not recognise them as authoritative documents. It is manifest from the evidence adduced, however, that Papias did not know our Gospels. It is not possible that he could have found it better to inquire "what John or Matthew, or what any other of the disciples of the Lord.....say" if he had known of Gospels such as ours, and believed them to have been actually written by those Apostles, deliberately telling him what they had to say.

<sup>1</sup> Euseb., *H. E.*, iii. 39.

<sup>2</sup> *Proleg. Comment. in Apocalypsin*; Routh, *Reliq. Sacrae*, 1846, i., p. 15.

<sup>3</sup> *H. E.*, iii. 39.

<sup>4</sup> Euseb., *H. E.*, iii. 39.



The work of Matthew, which he mentions, being, however, a mere collection of discourses of Jesus, he might naturally inquire what the Apostle<sup>1</sup> himself said of the history and teaching of the Master. The evidence of Papias is, in every respect, most important. He is the first writer who mentions that Matthew and Mark were believed to have written any works at all; but, whilst he shows that he does not accord any canonical authority even to the works attributed to them, his description of those works and his general testimony come with crushing force against the pretensions made on behalf of our Gospels to Apostolic origin and authenticity.

perhaps of importance

<sup>1</sup> We may merely remark that Papias does not call the Matthew who wrote the *λόγια* an Apostle. In this sentence he speaks of the Apostle, but he does not distinctly identify him with the Matthew of the other passage.

## CHAPTER V.

### THE CLEMENTINES—THE EPISTLE TO DIOGNETUS

WE must now as briefly as possible examine the evidence furnished by the apocryphal religious romance generally known by the name of "The Clementines," and assuming, falsely of course, to be the composition of the Roman Clement. The Clementines are composed of three principal works, the *Homilies*, *Recognitions*, and a so-called *Epitome*. The *Homilies*, again, are prefaced by a pretended epistle addressed by the Apostle Peter to James, and another from Clement. These *Homilies* were only known in an imperfect form till 1853, when Dressel<sup>1</sup> published a complete Greek text. Of the *Recognitions* we only possess a Latin translation by Rufinus (A.D. 402). Although there is much difference of opinion regarding the claims to priority of the *Homilies* and *Recognitions*, many critics assigning that place to the *Homilies*, whilst others assert the earlier origin of the *Recognitions*, all are agreed that the one is merely a version of the other, the former being embodied almost word for word in the latter, whilst the *Epitome* is a blending of the other two, probably intended to purge them from heretical doctrine. These works, which are generally admitted to have emanated from the Ebionitic party of the early Church, are supposed to be based upon older Petrine writings, such as the "Preaching of Peter" (Κήρυγμα Πέτρου), and the "Travels of Peter" (Περίοδοι Πέτρου). It is not necessary for our purpose to go into any analysis of the character of the Clementines. It will suffice to say that they mainly consist of discussions between the Apostle Peter and Simon the Magician regarding the identity of the true Mosaic and Christian religions. Peter follows the Magician from city to city for the purpose of exposing and refuting him, the one, in fact, representing Apostolic doctrine and the other heresy; and in the course of these discussions occur the very numerous quotations of sayings of Jesus and of Christian history which we have to examine.

The *Clementine Recognitions*, as we have already remarked, are only known to us through the Latin translation of Rufinus; and, from a comparison of the evangelical quotations occurring in

<sup>1</sup> *Clementis R. quæ feruntur Homiliæ xx. nunc primum integræ.* Ed. A. R. M. Dressel.

that work with the same in the *Homilies*, it is evident that Rufinus has assimilated them, in the course of translation, to the parallel passages of our Gospels. It is admitted, therefore, that no argument regarding the source of the quotations can rightly be based upon the *Recognitions*, and that work may, consequently, be entirely set aside, and the *Clementine Homilies* alone occupy our attention.

We need scarcely remark that, unless the date at which these *Homilies* were composed can be ascertained, their value as testimony for the existence of our Synoptic Gospels is seriously affected. The difficulty of arriving at a correct conclusion regarding this point, great under almost any circumstances, is increased by the fact that the work is altogether apocryphal, and most certainly not held by any one to have been written by the person whose name it bears. There is, in fact, nothing but internal evidence by which to fix the date, and that evidence is of a character which admits of very wide extension down the course of time, although a sharp limit is set beyond which it cannot mount upwards. Of external evidence there is almost none, and what little exists does not warrant an early date. Origen, it is true, mentions *Περίοδοι Κλήμεντος*,<sup>1</sup> which, it is conjectured, may either be the same work as the *Ἀναγνωρισμός*, or *Recognitions*, translated by Rufinus, or related to it, and Epiphanius and others refer to *Περίοδοι Πέτρου*;<sup>2</sup> but our *Clementine Homilies* are not mentioned by any writer before pseudo-Athanasius.<sup>3</sup> The work, therefore, can at the best afford no substantial testimony to the antiquity and apostolic origin of our Gospels. Hilgenfeld, following in the steps of Baur, arrives at the conclusion that the *Homilies* are directed against the Gnosticism of Marcion (and also, as we shall hereafter see, against the Apostle Paul), and he, therefore, necessarily assigns to them a date subsequent to A.D. 160. As Reuss, however, inquires: upon this ground, why should a still later date not be named, since even Tertullian wrote vehemently against the same Gnosis?<sup>4</sup> There can be little doubt that the author was a representative of Ebionitic Gnosticism, which had once been the purest form of primitive Christianity; but later, through its own development, though still more through the rapid growth around it of Paulinian doctrine, had assumed a position closely verging upon heresy. It is not necessary for us, however, to enter upon any exhaustive discussion of the date at which the

<sup>1</sup> *Comment. in Genesin Philoc.*, 22.

<sup>2</sup> Hilgenfeld considers *Recog.* iv.–vi., *Hom.* vii.–xi., a version of the *Περίοδοι Πέτρου* *Die ap. Vater*, p. 291 ff.; Ritschl does not consider that this can be decidedly proved, *Entst. Altk. Kirche*, p. 204 f.; so also Uhlhorn, *Die Hom. u. Recog.*, p. 71 ff.

<sup>3</sup> *Synops. Sacr. Script.*, *sub finem*.

<sup>4</sup> *Gesch. N. T.*, p. 254.

imp.

Clementines were written ; it is sufficient to show that there is no certain ground upon which a decision can be based, and that even an approximate conjecture can scarcely be reasonably advanced. Critics variously date the composition of the original *Recognitions* from about the middle of the second century to the end of the third, though the majority are agreed in placing them at least in the latter century. They assign to the *Homilies* an origin at different dates within a period commencing about the middle of the second century, and extending to one or two centuries later.

In the *Homilies* there are very numerous quotations of sayings of Jesus and of Gospel history, which are generally placed in the mouth of Peter, or introduced with such formulæ as : "The teacher said," "Jesus said," "He said," "The prophet said"; but in no case does the author name the source from which these sayings and quotations are derived. That he does, however, quote from a written source, and not from tradition, is clear from the use of such expressions as "in another place (*ἄλλη πον*)<sup>1</sup> he has said," which refer not to other localities or circumstances, but another part of a written history. There are in the *Clementine Homilies* upwards of a hundred quotations of sayings of Jesus or references to his history, too many for us to examine in detail here ; but, notwithstanding the number of these passages, so systematically do they vary, more or less, from the parallels in our canonical Gospels that, as in the case of Justin, apologists are obliged to have recourse to the elastic explanation, already worn so threadbare, of "free quotation from memory" and "blending of passages" to account for the remarkable phenomena presented. It must be evident that the necessity for such an apology shows the insufficiency of the evidence furnished by these quotations. De Wette says: "The quotations of evangelical works and histories in the pseudo-Clementine writings, from their nature free and inaccurate, permit only an uncertain conclusion to be drawn as to their written source."<sup>2</sup> Critics have maintained very different and conflicting views regarding that source. Apologists, of course, assert that the quotations in the *Homilies* are taken from our Gospels only. Others ascribe them to our Gospels, with a supplementary apocryphal work : the Gospel according to the Hebrews, or the Gospel according to Peter. Some, whilst admitting a subsidiary use of some of our Gospels, assert that the author of the *Homilies* employs, in preference, the Gospel according to Peter ; whilst others, recognising also the similarity of the features presented by these quotations with those of Justin's, conclude that the author does not quote our Gospels at all, but makes use of the Gospel

<sup>1</sup> See several instances, *Hom.* xix. 2.

<sup>2</sup> *Einl. N. T.*, p. 115.

according to Peter, or the Gospel according to the Hebrews.<sup>1</sup> Evidence permitting of such divergent conclusions manifestly cannot be of a decided character. We may affirm that few of those who are willing to admit the use of our Synoptics by the author of the *Homilies*, along with other sources, make that concession on the strength of the isolated evidence of the *Homilies* themselves, but they are generally moved by antecedent views on the point. In an inquiry like that which we have undertaken, however, such easy and indifferent judgment would obviously be out of place, and the point we have to determine is not whether an author may have been acquainted with our Gospels, but whether he furnishes testimony that he actually was in possession of our present Gospels and regarded them as authoritative.

We have already mentioned that the author of the *Clementine Homilies* never names the source from which his quotations are derived. Of these very numerous quotations we must again distinctly state that only two or three, of a very brief and fragmentary character, literally agree with our Synoptics, whilst all the rest differ more or less widely from the parallel passages in those Gospels. Some of these quotations are repeated more than once with the same persistent and characteristic variations, and in several cases, as we have already stated, they agree more or less closely with quotations of Justin from the *Memoirs of the Apostles*. Others, again, have no parallels at all in our Gospels, and even apologists are consequently compelled to admit the collateral use of an apocryphal Gospel. As in the case of Justin, therefore, the singular phenomenon is presented of a vast number of quotations of which only one or two brief phrases, too fragmentary to avail as evidence, perfectly agree with our Gospels; whilst of the rest, which all vary more or less, some merely resemble combined passages of two Gospels, others only contain the sense, some present variations likewise found in other writers or in various parts of the *Homilies*, and are repeatedly quoted with the same variations, and others are not found in our Gospels at all. Such characteristics cannot be fairly accounted for by any mere theory of imperfect memory or negligence. The systematic variation from our Synoptics, variation proved by repetition not to be accidental, coupled with quotations which have no parallels at all in our Gospels, more naturally point to the use of a different Gospel. In no case can the *Homilies* be accepted as furnishing evidence even of the existence of our Gospels.

As it is impossible here to examine in detail all of the quotations

<sup>1</sup> Credner, Schwegler, Hilgenfeld, Volkmar, Zeller, and others, consider that the author uses the same Gospel as Justin.

in the *Clementine Homilies*, we must content ourselves with this distinct statement of their character, and merely illustrate the different classes of quotations, exhausting, however, those which literally agree with passages in the Gospels. The most determined of recent apologists do not afford us an opportunity of testing the passages upon which they base their assertion of the use of our Synoptics, for they simply assume that the author used them without producing instances.<sup>1</sup>

The first quotation agreeing with a passage in our Synoptics occurs in *Hom.* iii. 52: "And he cried, saying: Come unto me all ye that are weary," which agrees with the opening words of Matt. xi. 28; but the phrase does not continue, and is followed by the explanation, "that is, who are seeking the truth and not finding it."<sup>2</sup> It is evident that so short and fragmentary a phrase cannot prove anything.

The next passage occurs in *Hom.* xviii. 15: "For Isaiah said: I will open my mouth in parables, and I will utter things that have been kept secret from the foundation of the world."<sup>3</sup> This passage, with a slightly different order of words, is found in Matt. xiii. 35. After giving a series of parables, the author of the Gospel says (v. 34): "All these things spake Jesus unto the multitudes in parables; and without a parable spake he not unto them; (v. 35) That it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophet (Isaiah), saying: I will open my mouth in parables, &c." There are two peculiarities which must be pointed out in this passage. It is not found in Isaiah, but in Psalm lxxviii. 2,<sup>4</sup> and it presents a variation from the version of the lxx. Both the variation and the erroneous reference to Isaiah, therefore, occur also in the Homily, and it is upon this similarity of mistake that the apologetic argument mainly rests. The first part of the sentence agrees with, but the latter part is quite different from, the Greek of the lxx., which reads: "I will utter problems from the beginning," φθέγγξομαι προβλήματα ἀπ' ἀρχῆς.<sup>5</sup>

The Psalm from which the quotation is really taken is, by its superscription, ascribed to Asaph, who, in the Septuagint version

<sup>1</sup> Tischendorf only devotes a dozen lines, with a note, to the *Clementines*, and only in connection with our fourth Gospel, which shall hereafter have our attention (*Wann wurden u. s. w.*, p. 90). In the same way Dr. Westcott passes them over in a short paragraph, merely asserting the allusions to our Gospels to be "generally admitted," and only directly referring to one supposed quotation from Mark which we shall presently examine, and one which he affirms to be from the fourth Gospel (*On the Canon*, p. 251 f. In the 4th edition he has enlarged his remarks, p. 282 ff.).

<sup>2</sup> *Hom.* iii. 52.

<sup>3</sup> *Hom.* xviii. 15.

<sup>4</sup> The Vulgate reads: *aperiam in parabolis os meum: loquar propositiones ab initio.* Ps. lxxvii. 2.

<sup>5</sup> Ps. lxxvii. 2.

of 2 Chronicles xxix. 30, is called a prophet. It was, therefore, early asserted that the original reading of Matthew was "Asaph," instead of "Isaiah." Porphyry, in the third century, twitted Christians with this erroneous ascription by their inspired evangelist to Isaiah of a passage from a Psalm, and reduced the Fathers to great straits. Eusebius, in his commentary on this verse of the Psalm, attributes the insertion of the words, "by the prophet Isaiah," to unintelligent copyists, and asserts that in accurate MSS. the name is not added to the word prophet. Jerome likewise ascribes the insertion of the name Isaiah for that of Asaph, which was originally written, to an ignorant scribe,<sup>1</sup> and in the commentary on the Psalms, generally, though probably falsely, ascribed to him, the remark is made that many copies of the Gospel to that day had the name "Isaiah," for which Porphyry had reproached Christians,<sup>2</sup> and the writer of the same commentary actually allows himself to make the assertion that Asaph was found in all the old codices, but ignorant men had removed it.<sup>3</sup> The fact is, that the reading "Asaph" for "Isaiah" is not found in any extant MS., and, although "Isaiah" has disappeared from all but a few obscure codices, it cannot be denied that the name anciently stood in the text. In the *Sinaitic Codex*, which is probably the earliest MS. extant, and which is assigned to the fourth century, "the prophet *Isaiah*" stands in the text by the first hand, but is erased by the second (B).

The quotation in the Homily, however, is clearly not from our Gospel. It is introduced by the words "For Isaiah says"; and the context is so different from that in Matthew that it seems most improbable that the author of the Homily could have had the passage suggested to him by the Gospel. It occurs in a discussion between Simon the Magician and Peter. The former undertakes to prove that the Maker of the world is not the highest God, and amongst other arguments he advances the passage, "No man knew the Father," etc., to show that the Father had remained concealed from the Patriarchs, etc., until revealed by the Son; and in reply to Peter he retorts, that if the supposition that the Patriarchs were not deemed worthy to know the Father was unjust, the Christian teacher himself was to blame who said, "I thank thee, Lord of heaven and earth, that what was concealed from the wise thou hast revealed to suckling babes."

<sup>1</sup> *Comment. Matt.*, xiii. 35.

<sup>2</sup> *Multa evangelia usque hodie ita habent: Ut impleretur, quod scriptum est per Isaiam prophetam*, etc. Hieron., *Opp.*, vii., p. 270 f.

<sup>3</sup> *Asaph invenitur in omnibus veteribus codicibus, sed homines ignorantes tulerunt illud.* To this Credner pertinently remarks: "*Die Noth, in welche die guten Kirchenväter durch Porphyrius gekommen waren, erlaubte auch eine Lüge. Sie geschah ja: in majorem Dei gloriam*" (*Beiträge*, i., p. 304).

Peter argues that in the statement of Jesus, "No man knew the Father," etc., he cannot be considered to indicate another God and Father from him who made the world, and he continues: "For the concealed things of which he spoke may be those of the Creator himself; for Isaiah says, 'I will open my mouth,' etc. Do you admit, therefore, that the prophet was not ignorant of the things concealed?"<sup>1</sup> and so on. There is absolutely nothing in this argument to indicate that the passage was suggested by the Gospel, but, on the contrary, it is used in a totally different way, and is quoted not as an evangelical text, but as a saying from the Old Testament, and treated in connection with the prophet himself, and not with its supposed fulfilment in Jesus. It may be remarked that in the corresponding part of the *Recognitions*, whether that work be of older or more recent date, the passage does not occur at all. Now, although it is impossible to say how and where this erroneous reference to a passage of the Old Testament first occurred, there is no reason for affirming that it originated in our first Synoptic, and as little for asserting that its occurrence in the *Clementine Homilies*, with so different a context and object, involves the conclusion that their author derived it from the Gospel, and not from the Old Testament or some other source. On the contrary, the peculiar argument based upon it in the *Homilies* suggests a different origin, and it is very probable that the passage, with its erroneous reference, was derived by both from another and common source.

Another passage is a phrase from the "Lord's Prayer," which occurs in *Hom.* xix. 2: "But also in the prayer which he commended to us we have it said: Deliver us from the evil one" (Ῥῦσαι ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ τοῦ πονηροῦ). It need scarcely be said that few Gospels can have been composed without including this prayer, and the occurrence of this short phrase demonstrates nothing more than the mere fact that the author of the *Homilies* was acquainted with one of the most universally known lessons of Jesus, or made use of a Gospel which contained it. There would have been cause for wonder had he been ignorant of it.

The only other passage which agrees literally with our Gospels is also a mere fragment from the parable of the Talents, and when the other references to the same parable are added, it is evident that the quotation is not from our Gospels. In *Hom.* iii. 65 the address to the good servant is introduced, "Well done, good and faithful servant" (Εὖ, δούλε ἀγαθὲ καὶ πιστὲ), which agrees with the words in Matt. xxv. 21. The allusion to the parable of the talents in the context is perfectly clear, and the passage occurs in an address of the Apostle Peter to overcome the

<sup>1</sup> *Hom.* xviii. 1-15.



modest scruples of Zaccheus, the former publican, who has been selected by Peter as his successor in the Church of Cæsarea when he is about to leave in pursuit of Simon the Magician. Anticipating the possibility of his hesitating to accept the office, Peter, in an earlier part of his address, however, makes fuller allusions to the same parable of the talents, which we must contrast with the parallel in the first Synoptic. "But if any of those present, having the ability to instruct the ignorance of men, shrink back from it, considering only his own ease, then let him expect to hear:"

HOM. III. 61.

Thou wicked and slothful servant ;

thou oughtest to have put out my money with the exchangers, and at my coming I should have exacted mine own.

Cast ye the unprofitable servant into the darkness without.

Δούλε πονηρὲ καὶ ὀκνηρὲ,

ἔδει σε τὸ ἀργύριόν μου προβαλεῖν ἐπὶ τῶν τραπεζιτῶν, καὶ ἐγὼ ἂν ἐλθὼν ἔπραξα τὸ ἐμόν.

ἐκβάλετε τὸν ἀχρεῖον δούλον εἰς τὸ σκότος τὸ ἐξώτερον.

MATT. XXV. 26-30.

v. 26. Thou wicked and slothful servant, thou knewest that I reap where I sowed not, and gather from where I strawed not.

v. 27. Thou oughtest therefore to have put my money to the exchangers, and at my coming I should have received mine own with usury.

v. 28, 29. Take therefore, etc.

v. 30. And cast ye the unprofitable servant into the darkness without ; there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth.

v. 26. Πονηρὲ δούλε καὶ ὀκνηρὲ, ἦδεις ὅτι θερίζω, κ.τ.λ.

v. 27. ἔδει σε οὖν βαλεῖν τὸ ἀργύριόν μου τοῖς τραπεζίταις, καὶ ἐλθὼν ἐγὼ ἐκομισάμην<sup>1</sup> ἂν τὸ ἐμόν σὺν τόκῳ.

v. 28, 29. ἄρατε οὖν, κ.τ.λ.

v. 30. καὶ τὸν ἀχρεῖον δούλον ἐκβάλετε εἰς τὸ σκότος τὸ ἐξώτερον· ἐκεῖ ἔσται ὁ κλαυθμὸς, κ.τ.λ.

The Homily does not end here, however, but continues in words not found in our Gospels at all: "And reasonably: 'For,' he says, "it is thine, O man, to put my words as silver with exchangers, and to prove them as money."<sup>2</sup> This passage is very analogous to another saying of Jesus, frequently quoted from an apocryphal Gospel, by the author of the *Homilies*, to which we shall hereafter more particularly refer, but here merely point out: "Be ye approved money-changers" (γίνεσθε τραπεζῖται δόκιμοι).<sup>3</sup> The variations from the parallel passages in the first and third Gospels, the peculiar application of the parable to the words of Jesus, and the addition of a saying not found in our Gospels, warrant us in denying that the quotations we are considering can

<sup>1</sup> Luke xix. 23 substitutes ἔπραξα for ἐκομισάμην.

<sup>2</sup> Καὶ εὐλόγως. Σοῦ γὰρ, φησὶν, ἄνθρωπε, τοὺς λόγους μου ὡς ἀργύριον ἐπὶ τραπεζιτῶν βαλεῖν, καὶ ὡς χρήματα δοκιμάσαι. *Hom.* iii. 61.

<sup>3</sup> *Hom.* iii. 50 ; ii. 51, etc.

be appropriated by our canonical Gospels, and, on the contrary, give good reason for the conclusion that the author derived his knowledge of the parable from another source.

There is no other quotation in the *Clementine Homilies* which literally agrees with our Gospels, and it is difficult, without incurring the charge of partial selection, to illustrate the systematic variation in such very numerous passages as occur in these writings. It would be tedious and unnecessary to repeat the test applied to the quotations of Justin, and give in detail the passages from the Sermon on the Mount which are found in the *Homilies*. Some of these will come before us presently; but with regard to the whole, which are not less than fifty, we may broadly and positively state that they all more or less differ from our Gospels. To take the severest test, however, we shall compare those further passages which are specially adduced as most closely following our Gospels, and neglect the vast majority which widely differ from them. In addition to the passages which we have already examined, Credner<sup>1</sup> points out the following. The first is from *Hom.* xix. 2<sup>2</sup>: "If Satan cast out Satan he is divided against himself: how then can his kingdom stand?" In the first part of this sentence the Homily reads, ἐκβάλλη for the ἐκβάλλει of the first Gospel, and the last phrase in each is as follows:—

*Hom.* πῶς οὖν αὐτοῦ στήκη ἡ βασιλεία;

*Matt.* πῶς οὖν σταθήσεται ἡ βασιλεία αὐτοῦ;

The third Gospel differs from the first as the Homily does from both. The next passage is from *Hom.* xix. 7<sup>3</sup>: "For thus, said our Father, who was without deceit: out of abundance of heart mouth speaketh." The Greek compared with that of *Matt.* xii. 34.

*Hom.* Ἐκ περισσεύματος καρδίας στόμα λαλεῖ

*Matt.* Ἐκ γὰρ τοῦ περισσεύματος τῆς καρδίας τὸ στόμα λαλεῖ.

The form of the Homily is much more proverbial. The next passage occurs in *Hom.* iii. 52: "Every plant which the heavenly Father did not plant shall be rooted up." This agrees with the parallel in *Matt.* xv. 13, with the important exception, that although in the mouth of Jesus, "the heavenly Father" is substituted for the "my heavenly Father" of the Gospel. The last passage pointed out by Credner is from *Hom.* viii. 4: "But also 'many,' he said, 'called, but few chosen'"; which may be compared with *Matt.* xx. 16, etc.

*Hom.* Ἀλλὰ καὶ, πολλοὶ, φησὶν, κλητοὶ, ὀλίγοι δὲ ἐκλεκτοί.

*Matt.* πολλοὶ γὰρ εἰσιν κλητοὶ, ὀλίγοι δὲ ἐκλεκτοί.

We have already fully discussed this passage of the Gospel in connection with the "Epistle of Barnabas,"<sup>4</sup> and need not say more here.

<sup>1</sup> Credner, *Beiträge*, i., p. 285; cf. p. 302.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. *Matt.* xii. 34.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. *Matt.* xii. 26.

<sup>4</sup> P. 139 ff.

obvious

The variations in these passages, it may be argued, are not very important. Certainly, if they were the exceptional variations amongst a mass of quotations perfectly agreeing with parallels in our Gospels, it might be exaggeration to base upon such divergences a conclusion that they were derived from a different source. When it is considered, however, that the very reverse is the case, and that these are passages selected for their closer agreement out of a multitude of others, either more decidedly differing from our Gospels or not found in them at all, the case entirely changes; and, variations being the rule instead of the exception, these, however slight, become evidence of the use of a Gospel different from ours.

As an illustration of the importance of slight variations in connection with the question as to the source from which quotations are derived, the following may, at random, be pointed out: The passage, "See thou say nothing to any man, but go thy way, show thyself to the priest" ("Ὁρα μηδενὶ εἰπῆς, ἀλλὰ ὑπάγε σεαυτὸν δειξόν τῷ ἱερεῖ"), occurring in a work like the *Homilies* would, supposing our second Gospel no longer extant, be referred to Matt. viii. 4, with which it entirely agrees. It is, however, actually taken from Mark i. 44, and not from the first Gospel. Then, again, supposing that our first Gospel had shared the fate of so many others of the πολλοί of Luke, and in some early work the following passage was found: "A prophet is not without honour, except in his own country and in his own house" (Οὐκ ἔστιν προφήτης ἀτιμος εἰ μὴ ἐν τῇ πατρίδι αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ αὐτοῦ), this passage would, undoubtedly, be claimed by apologists as a quotation from Mark vi. 4, and as proving the existence and use of that Gospel. The omission of the words "and among his own kin" (καὶ ἐν τοῖς συγγενέσιν αὐτοῦ) would at first be explained as mere abbreviation, or defect of memory; but on the discovery that part or all of these words are omitted from some MSS., that, for instance, the phrase is erased from the oldest manuscript known—the *Cod. Sinaiticus*—the derivation from the second Gospel would be considered as established. The author, notwithstanding, might never have seen that Gospel, for the quotation is taken from Matt. xiii. 57.<sup>1</sup>

We have already quoted the opinion of De Wette as to the inconclusive nature of the deductions to be drawn from the quotations in the pseudo-Clementine writings regarding their source, but in pursuance of the plan we have adopted we shall now examine the passages which he cites as most nearly agreeing with our Gospels.<sup>2</sup> The first of these occurs in *Hom.* iii. 18: "The Scribes and the

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Matt. viii. 19-22; Luke ix. 57-60, etc.

<sup>2</sup> *Einkl. N. T.*, p. 115.

Pharisees sit upon Moses' seat ; all things, therefore, whatsoever they speak to you, hear them," which is compared with Matt. xxiii. 2, 3 : "The Scribes and the Pharisees sit upon Moses' seats ; all things, therefore, whatsoever they say to you, do and observe." We subjoin the Greek of the latter half of these passages :—

*Hom.* πάντα οὖν ὅσα λέγωσιν ὑμῖν, ἀκούετε αὐτῶν.

*Matt.* πάντα οὖν ὅσα ἐὰν εἴπωσιν ὑμῖν ποιήσατε καὶ τηρεῖτε.<sup>1</sup>

That the variation in the Homily is deliberate and derived from the Gospel used by the author is clear from the continuation : "Hear *them* (αὐτῶν), he said, as entrusted with the key of the kingdom, which is knowledge, which alone is able to open the gate of life, through which alone is the entrance to eternal life. But verily, he says : They possess the key indeed, but to those who wish to enter in they do not grant it."<sup>2</sup> The αὐτῶν is here emphatically repeated, and the further quotation and reference to the denunciation of the Scribes and Pharisees continue to differ distinctly from the account both in our first and third Gospels. The passage in Matt. xxiii. 13 reads : "But woe unto you, Scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites ! for ye shut the kingdom of heaven against men ; for ye go not in yourselves, neither suffer ye them that are entering to go in."<sup>3</sup> The parallel in Luke xi. 52 is not closer. There the passage regarding Moses' seat is altogether wanting, and in verse 52, where the greater similarity exists, the "lawyers," instead of the "Scribes and Pharisees," are addressed. The verse reads : "Woe unto you, Lawyers ! for ye have taken away the key of knowledge : ye entered not in yourselves, and them that were entering in ye hindered."<sup>4</sup> The first Gospel has not the direct image of the key at all : the Scribes and Pharisees "shut the kingdom of heaven" ; the third has "the key of knowledge" (κλείδα τῆς γνώσεως) taken away by the lawyers, and not by the Scribes and Pharisees, whilst the Gospel of the *Homilies* has the key of the kingdom (κλείδα τῆς βασιλείας), and explains that this key is knowledge (ἥτις ἐστὶ γνώσις). It is apparent that the first Gospel uses an

<sup>1</sup> It is unnecessary to point out the various readings of the three last words in various MSS. Whether shortened or inverted, the difference from the Homily remains the same.

<sup>2</sup> Αὐτῶν δὲ, εἶπεν, ὡς τὴν κλείδα τῆς βασιλείας πεπιστευμένων, ἥτις ἐστὶ γνώσις, ἢ μόνη τὴν πύλην τῆς ζωῆς ἀνοῖξαι δύναται, δι' ἧς μόνη εἰς τὴν αἰώνιον ζωὴν εἰσελθεῖν ἐστίν. Ἀλλὰ ναί, φησὶν, κρατοῦσι μὲν τὴν κλείν, τοῖς δὲ βουλομένοις εἰσελθεῖν οὐ παρέχουσιν. *Hom.* iii. 18 ; cf. *Hom.* iii. 70, xviii. 15, 16.

<sup>3</sup> Οὐαί, κ.τ.λ. . . . ὅτι κλείετε τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν οὐρανῶν ἔμπροσθεν τῶν ἀνθρώπων. ὑμεῖς γὰρ οὐκ εἰσέρχεσθε, οὐδὲ τοὺς εἰσερχομένους ἀφίετε εἰσελθεῖν. Matt. xxiii. 13.

<sup>4</sup> Οὐαί ὑμῖν τοῖς νομικοῖς, ὅτι ἤρατε τὴν κλείδα τῆς γνώσεως· αὐτοὶ οὐκ εἰσήλθατε καὶ τοὺς εἰσερχομένους ἐκωλύσατε. Luke xi. 52.

expression more direct than the others, whilst the third Gospel explains it; but the Gospel of the *Homilies* has in all probability the simpler original words, the "key of the kingdom," which both of the others have altered for the purpose of more immediate clearness. In any case, it is certain that the passage does not agree with our Gospel.

The next quotation referred to by De Wette is in *Hom.* iii. 51: "And also that he said: 'I am not come to destroy the law..... the heaven and the earth will pass away, but one jot or one tittle shall in nowise pass from the law.'" This is compared with Matt. v. 17, 18:<sup>1</sup> "Think not that I am come to destroy the law or the prophets: I am not come to destroy but to fulfil. (v. 18) For verily I say unto you: Till heaven and earth pass away one jot or one tittle shall in nowise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled." The Greek of both passages reads as follows:—

HOM. III. 51.

Τὸ δὲ καὶ εἰπεῖν αὐτόν·

Οὐκ ἦλθον καταλύσαι τὸν νόμον.

\* \* \* \*

Ὁ οὐρανὸς καὶ ἡ γῆ παρελεύσονται ἰῶτα δὲ ἐν ἡ μίᾳ κεραία οὐ μὴ παρέλθῃ ἀπὸ τοῦ νόμου.

MATT. V. 17, 18.

Μὴ νομίσητε ὅτι ἦλθον καταλύσαι τὸν νόμον ἢ τοὺς προφῆτας· οὐκ ἦλθον καταλύσαι ἀλλὰ πληρῶσαι.

v. 18. ἀμὴν γὰρ λέγω ὑμῖν, ἕως ἂν παρέλθῃ ὁ οὐρανὸς καὶ ἡ γῆ, ἰῶτα ἐν ἡ μίᾳ κεραία οὐ μὴ παρέλθῃ ἀπὸ τοῦ νόμου, ἕως ἂν πάντα γένηται.

That the omissions and variations in this passage are not accidental is proved by the fact that the same quotation occurs again literally in the Epistle from Peter<sup>2</sup> which is prefixed to the *Homilies* in which the *παρελεύσονται* is repeated, and the sentence closes at the same point. The author in that place adds: "This he said that all might be fulfilled" (*τοῦτο δὲ εἶρηκεν, ἵνα τὰ πάντα γένηται*). Hilgenfeld considers the Epistle of much more early date than the *Homilies*, and that this agreement bespeaks a particular text.<sup>3</sup> The quotation does not agree with our Gospels, and must be assigned to another source.

The next passage pointed out by De Wette is the erroneous quotation from Isaiah which we have already examined.<sup>4</sup> That which follows is found in *Hom.* viii. 7: "For on this account our Jesus himself said to one who frequently called him Lord, yet did nothing which he commanded: Why dost thou say to me Lord, Lord, and doest not the things which I say?" This is compared with Luke vi. 46<sup>5</sup>: "But why call ye me Lord, Lord, and do not the things which I say?"

HOM. VIII. 7.

Τί με λέγεις, Κύριε, κύριε, καὶ οὐ ποιεῖς ἃ λέγω;

LUKE VI. 46.

Τί δέ με καλεῖτε Κύριε, κύριε, καὶ οὐ ποιεῖτε ἃ λέγω;

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Luke xvi. 17.

<sup>2</sup> § ii.

<sup>3</sup> *Die Evv. Justin's*, p. 340.

<sup>4</sup> P. 303 f.; cf. *Hom.* xviii. 15, Matt. xiii. 35.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. Matt. vii. 21.

This passage differs from our Gospels in having the second person singular instead of the plural, and in substituting λέγεις for καλείτε in the first phrase. The Homily, moreover, in accordance with the use of the second person singular, distinctly states that the saying was addressed to a person who frequently called Jesus "Lord," whereas in the Gospels it forms part of the Sermon on the Mount, with a totally impersonal application to the multitude.

The next passage referred to by De Wette is in *Hom.* xix. 2: "And he declared that he saw the evil one as lightning fall from heaven." This is compared with Luke x. 18, which has no parallel in the other Gospels: "And he said to them, I beheld Satan as lightning fall from heaven."

HOM. XIX. 2.

Καὶ ὅτι ἐώρακε τὸν πονηρὸν  
ὡς ἀστραπὴν πεσόντα ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ  
ἐδήλωσεν.

LUKE X. 18.

Εἶπεν δὲ αὐτοῖς Ἐθεώρουν τὸν σατανᾶν  
ὡς ἀστραπὴν ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ πεσόντα.

The substitution of τὸν πονηρὸν for τὸν σατανᾶν, had he found the latter in his Gospel, would be all the more remarkable from the fact that the author of the *Homilies* has just before quoted the saying, "If Satan cast out Satan,"<sup>1</sup> etc.; and he continues in the above words to show that Satan had been cast out, so that the evidence would have been strengthened by the retention of the word in Luke, had he quoted that Gospel. The variations indicate that he quoted from another source.

The next passage pointed out by De Wette likewise finds a parallel only in the third Gospel. It occurs in *Hom.* ix. 22: "Nevertheless, though all demons with all the diseases flee before you, in this only is not to be your rejoicing, but in that, through grace, your names, as of the ever-living, are recorded in heaven." This is compared with Luke x. 20: "Notwithstanding, in this rejoice not that the spirits are subject unto you, but rejoice that your names are written in the heavens."

HOM. IX. 22.

Ἄλλ' ὁμως κἂν πάντες δαίμονες μετὰ  
πάντων τῶν παθῶν ὑμᾶς φεύγωσιν, οὐκ  
ἔστιν ἐν τούτῳ μόνῳ χαίρειν, ἀλλ' ἐν  
τῷ δι' εὐαρεστίαν τὰ ὀνόματα ὑμῶν ἐν  
οὐρανῷ ὡς ἀεὶ ζώντων ἀναγραφῆναι.

LUKE X. 20.

Πλὴν ἐν τούτῳ μὴ χαίρετε, ὅτι τὰ  
πνεύματα ὑμῖν ὑποτάσσεται, χαίρετε δὲ  
ὅτι τὰ ὀνόματα ὑμῶν ἐγγέγραπται ἐν  
τοῖς οὐρανοῖς.

The differences between these two passages are too great, and the peculiarities of the Homily too marked, to require any argument to demonstrate that the quotation cannot be successfully claimed by our third Gospel. On the contrary, as one of so many other passages systematically varying from the canonical Gospels, it must be assigned to another source.

<sup>1</sup> See p. 307.

De Wette says: "A few others (quotations) presuppose (*voraussetzen*) the Gospel of Mark,"<sup>1</sup> and he gives them. The first occurs in *Hom.* ii. 19: "There is a certain Justa<sup>2</sup> amongst us, a Syrophœnician, a Canaanite by race, whose daughter was affected by a sore disease, and who came to our Lord crying out and supplicating that he would heal her daughter. But he, being also asked by us, said: 'It is not meet to heal the Gentiles who are like dogs from their using different meats and practices, whilst the table in the kingdom has been granted to the sons of Israel.' But she, hearing this and exchanging her former manner of life for that of the sons of the kingdom, in order that she might, like a dog, partake of the crumbs falling from the same table, obtained, as she desired, healing for her daughter."<sup>3</sup> This is compared with Mark vii. 24-30,<sup>4</sup> as it is the only Gospel which calls the woman a Syrophœnician. The Homily, however, not only calls her so, but gives her name as "Justa." If, therefore, it be argued that the mention of her nationality supposes that the author found the fact in his Gospel, and because we know no other but Mark<sup>5</sup> which gives that information, that he therefore derived it from our second Gospel, the additional mention of the name of "Justa" on the same grounds necessarily points to the use of a Gospel which likewise contained it, which our Gospel does not. Nothing can be more decided than the variation in language throughout this whole passage from the account in Mark, and the reply of Jesus is quite foreign to our Gospels. In Mark (vii. 25) the daughter has "an unclean spirit" (*πνεῦμα ἀκάθαρτον*); in Matthew (xv. 22) she is "grievously possessed by a devil" (*κακῶς δαιμονίζεται*), but in the Homily she is "affected by a sore disease" (*ὑπὸ χαλεπῆς νόσου συνείχετο*). The second Gospel knows nothing of any intercession on the part of the disciples, but Matthew has: "And the disciples came and besought him (*ἠρώτων αὐτόν*), saying: 'Send her away, for she crieth after us,'"<sup>6</sup> whilst the Homily has merely "being also asked by us" (*ἀξιωθεὶς*), in the sense of intercession in her favour. The second Gospel gives the reply of Jesus as follows: "Let the children first be filled; for it is not meet to take the bread of the children, and to cast it to the dogs. And she answered and said unto him: 'Yea, Lord, for the dogs also eat under the table of the crumbs of the children.' And he said unto her: 'For this saying

<sup>1</sup> *Einl. N. T.*, p. 115.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. *Hom.* iii. 73; xiii. 7.

<sup>3</sup> *Hom.* ii. 19.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Matt. xv. 21-28.

<sup>5</sup> "The woman was a Greek, a Syrophœnician by nation." (*ἡ δὲ γυνὴ ἦν Ἑλληνίς, Συροφονικίσσα τῷ γένει*). Mark vii. 26. "A woman of Canaan" (*γυνὴ Χανααία*). Matt. xv. 22.

<sup>6</sup> Matt. xv. 23.

go thy way; the devil is gone out of thy daughter.'"<sup>1</sup> The nature of the reply of the woman is, in the Gospels, the reason given for granting her request; but in the Homily the woman's conversion to Judaism,<sup>2</sup> that is to say Judeo-Christianity, is prominently advanced as the cause of her successful pleading. It is certain from the whole character of this passage, the variation of the language, and the reply of Jesus which is not in our Gospels at all, that the narrative cannot rightly be assigned to them; but the more reasonable inference is that it was derived from another source.

The last of De Wette's<sup>3</sup> passages is from *Hom.* iii. 57: "Hear, O Israel; the Lord thy<sup>4</sup> God is one Lord." This is a quotation from Deuteronomy vi. 4, which is likewise quoted in the second Gospel, xii. 29, in reply to the question, "Which is the first Commandment of all? Jesus answered: The first is, Hear, O Israel; the Lord our God is one Lord, and thou shalt love the Lord thy God," etc. In the Homily, however, the quotation is made in a totally different connection, for there is no question of commandments at all, but a clear statement of the circumstances under which the passage was used, which excludes the idea that this quotation was derived from Mark xii. 29. The context in the Homily is as follows: "But to those who were beguiled to imagine many Gods as the Scriptures say, he said: Hear, O Israel," etc.<sup>5</sup> There is no hint of the assertion of many gods in the Gospels: but, on the contrary, the question is put by one of the scribes in Mark to whom Jesus says: "Thou art not far from the Kingdom of God."<sup>6</sup> The quotation, therefore, cannot be legitimately appropriated by the second Synoptic, but may with much greater probability be assigned to a different Gospel.

We may here refer to the passage, the only one pointed out by him in connection with the Synoptics, the discovery of which, Dr. Westcott affirms, "has removed the doubts which had long been raised about those (allusions) to St. Mark."<sup>7</sup> The discovery referred to is that of the *Codex Ottobonianus* by Dressel, which contains the concluding part of the *Homilies*, and which was first published by him in 1853. Dr. Westcott says: "Though St. Mark has few peculiar phrases, one of these is repeated verbally in the concluding part of the 19th Homily."<sup>8</sup> The passage is as follows: *Hom.* xix. 20: "Wherefore also he explained to his disciples privately the mysteries of the kingdom of the heavens."

<sup>1</sup> Mark vii. 27-29.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. *Hom.* xiii. 7.

<sup>3</sup> *Einl. N. T.*, p. 115.

<sup>4</sup> Although most MSS. have σου in this place, some, as, for instance, that edited by Cotelerius, read ὑμῶν.

<sup>5</sup> *Hom.* iii. 57.

<sup>6</sup> Mark xii. 34.

<sup>7</sup> *On the Canon*, p. 251.

<sup>8</sup> Cf. *Ib.*, p. 252.



This is compared with Mark iv. 34..... "and privately, to his own disciples, he explained all things."

HOM. XIX. 20.

Διὸ καὶ τοῖς αὐτοῦ μαθηταῖς κατ' ἰδίαν  
ἐπέλυε τῆς τῶν οὐρανῶν βασιλείας τὰ  
μυστήρια.

MARK IV. 34.

.....κατ' ἰδίαν δὲ τοῖς ἰδίοις μαθη-  
ταῖς ἐπέλυεν πάντα.<sup>1</sup>

We have only a few words to add to complete the whole of Dr. Westcott's remarks upon the subject. He adds after the quotation: "This is the only place where ἐπιλύω occurs in the Gospels."<sup>2</sup> We may, however, point out that it occurs also in Acts xix. 39 and 2 Peter i. 20. It is upon the coincidence of this word that Dr. Westcott rests his argument that this passage is a reference to Mark. Nothing, however, could be more untenable than such a conclusion from such an indication. The phrase in the Homily presents a very marked variation from the passage in Mark. The "all things" (πάντα) of the Gospel reads: "The mysteries of the kingdom of the heavens" (τῆς τῶν οὐρανῶν βασιλείας τὰ μυστήρια) in the Homily. The passage in Mark iv. 11, to which Dr. Westcott does not refer, reads τὸ μυστήριον τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ θεοῦ. There is one very important matter, however, which our apologist has omitted to point out, and which, it seems to us, decides the case—the context in the Homily. The chapter commences thus: "And Peter said: We remember that our Lord and Teacher, as commanding, said to us: 'Guard the mysteries for me, and the sons of my house.' Wherefore, also he explained to his disciples privately," etc.<sup>3</sup>; and then comes our passage. Now, here is a command of Jesus, in immediate connection with which the phrase before us is quoted, which does not appear in our Gospels, and which clearly establishes the use of a different source. The phrase itself, which differs from Mark, as we have seen, may, with all right, be referred to the same unknown Gospel.

It must be borne in mind that all the quotations which we have hitherto examined are those which have been selected as most closely approximating to passages in our Gospels. Space forbids our giving illustrations of the vast number which so much more widely differ from parallel texts in the Synoptics. We shall confine ourselves to pointing out, in the briefest possible manner, some of the passages which are persistent in their variations, or recall similar passages in the Memoirs of Justin. The first of these is the injunction in *Hom.* iii. 55: "Let your yea be yea, your nay

<sup>1</sup> Dr. Westcott quotes this reading, which is supported by the Codices B, C, Sinaiticus, and others. The *Codex Alexandrinus* and a majority of other MSS. read for τοῖς ἰδίοις μαθηταῖς,—"τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ," which is closer to the passage in the Homily. It is fair that this should be pointed out.

<sup>2</sup> *On the Canon*, p. 252, note 1.

<sup>3</sup> *Hom.* xix. 20.

nay, for whatsoever is more than these cometh of the evil one." The same saying is repeated in *Hom.* xix. with the sole addition of "and." We subjoin the Greek of these, together with that of the Gospel and Justin with which the *Homilies* agree:—

<i>Hom.</i> iii. 55.	"Ἐστω	ὑμῶν τὸ ναὶ ναὶ	τὸ οὐ οὐ.
<i>Hom.</i> xix. 2.	"Ἐστω	ὑμῶν τὸ ναὶ ναὶ καὶ	τὸ οὐ οὐ.
<i>Apol.</i> , i. 16.	"Ἐστω δὲ	ὑμῶν τὸ ναὶ ναὶ καὶ	τὸ οὐ οὐ.
Matt. v. 37.	"Ἐστω δὲ ὁ λόγος ὑμῶν	ναὶ ναὶ	οὐ οὐ.

As we have already discussed this passage,<sup>1</sup> we need not repeat our remarks here. That it comes from a source different from our Gospels is rendered still more probable by the quotation in *Hom.* xix. 2 being preceded by another which has no parallel in our Gospels. "And elsewhere he said: 'He who sowed the bad seed is the devil' ('Ο δὲ τὸ κακὸν σπέρμα σπείρας ἐστὶν ὁ διάβολος<sup>2</sup>); and again: 'Give no pretext to the evil one' (Μὴ δότε πρόφασιν τῷ πονηρῷ). But in exhorting he prescribes: 'Let your yea be yea,' etc. The first of these phrases differs markedly from our Gospels; the second is not in them at all; the third, which we are considering, differs likewise in an important degree in common with Justin's quotation, and there is every reason for supposing that the whole were derived from the same unknown source.

In the same Homily (xix. 2) there occurs also a passage which exhibits variations likewise found in Justin, which we have already examined,<sup>3</sup> and now merely point out: "Begone into the darkness without, which the Father hath prepared for the devil and his angels."<sup>4</sup> The quotation in Justin (*Dial.* 76) agrees exactly with this, with the exception that Justin has Σατανᾶ instead of διαβόλω, which is not important, whilst the agreement in the marked variation from the parallel in the first Gospel establishes the probability of a common source different from ours.

We have also already<sup>5</sup> referred to the passage in *Hom.* xvii. 4: "No one knew (ἐγνώ) the Father but the Son, even as no one knoweth the son but the Father and those to whom the Son is minded to reveal him." This quotation differs from Matt. xi. 27 in form, in language, and in meaning; but agrees with Justin's reading of the same text, and, as we have shown, the use of the aorist here, and the transposition of the order, were characteristics of the Gospels used by Gnostics and other parties in the early Church; and the passage, with these variations, was regarded by them as the basis of some of their leading doctrines.<sup>6</sup> That the

<sup>1</sup> P. 226, n. 1, p. 235 f.

<sup>3</sup> P. 226, n. 4, p. 235 f.

<sup>5</sup> P. 252 ff.

<sup>6</sup> Irenæus, *Adv. Her.*, iv. 6, §§ 1, 3, 7; cf. p. 254 f.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Matt. xiii. 39.

<sup>4</sup> *Hom.* xix. 2; cf. Matt. xxv. 41.

variation is not accidental, but a deliberate quotation from a written source, is proved by this, and by the circumstance that the author of the *Homilies* repeatedly quotes it elsewhere in the same form.<sup>1</sup> It is unreasonable to suppose that the quotations in these *Homilies* are so systematically and consistently erroneous, and not only can they not, from their actual variations, be legitimately referred to the Synoptics exclusively, but, considering all the circumstances, the only natural conclusion is that they are derived from a source different from our Gospels.

Another passage occurs in *Hom.* iii. 50: "Wherefore ye do err, not knowing the true things of the Scriptures; and on this account ye are ignorant of the power of God." This is compared with Mark xii. 24:<sup>2</sup> "Do ye not therefore err, not knowing the Scriptures nor the power of God?"

HOM. III. 50.

Διὰ τοῦτο πλανᾶσθε, μὴ εἰδότες τὰ ἀληθῆ τῶν γραφῶν, οὗ ἕνεκεν ἀγνοεῖτε τὴν δύναμιν τοῦ Θεοῦ.

MARK XII. 24.

Οὐ διὰ τοῦτο πλανᾶσθε μὴ εἰδότες τὰς γραφὰς μηδὲ τὴν δύναμιν τοῦ Θεοῦ;

The very same quotation is made both in *Hom.* ii. 51 and xviii. 20, and in each case in which the passage is introduced it is in connection with the assertion that there are true and false Scriptures, and that, as there are in the Scriptures some true sayings and some false, Jesus, by these words, showed to those who erred by reason of the false the cause of their error. There can scarcely be a doubt that the author of the *Homilies* quotes this passage from a Gospel different from ours, and this is demonstrated by the important variation from our text, by its consistent repetition, and by the context in which it stands.

Upon each occasion, also, that the author of the *Homilies* quotes the foregoing passage he likewise quotes another saying of Jesus which is foreign to our Gospels: "Be ye approved money-changers," γίνεσθε τραπέζιται δόκιμοι.<sup>3</sup> The sentence is thrice quoted without variation, and each time, together with the preceding passage, it refers to the necessity of discrimination between true and false sayings in the Scriptures, as, for instance: "And Peter said: If, therefore, of the Scriptures some are true and some are false, our Teacher rightly said: 'Be ye approved money-changers,' as in the Scriptures there are some approved sayings and some spurious."<sup>4</sup> This is one of the best known of the apocryphal sayings of Jesus, and it is quoted by nearly all the Fathers,<sup>5</sup> by

<sup>1</sup> *Hom.* xviii. 4, 6, 7, 8, 13, 20.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Matt. xxii. 29, which is still more remote.

<sup>3</sup> *Hom.* ii. 51, iii. 50, xviii. 20.

<sup>4</sup> *Apost. Constit.*, ii. 36; cf. 37; Clem. Al., *Strom.*, i. 28, § 177; cf. ii. 4, § 15, vi. 10, § 81, vii. 15, § 90; Origen, in *Joan. T.* xix., vol. iv., p. 289;

<sup>5</sup> *Hom.* ii. 51.