

the text of these works. If the identification were complete and decisive upon other grounds of evidence, it might be unnecessary to enter upon this part of the subject, but the changes which have taken place in the centuries which have passed since the compilation of the *Diatessaron* are so indicative of the tendency to adjust facts to agreement with prevalent opinion that it is instructive to consider also this side of the case. In his work on the *Diatessaron*, Mr. Rendel Harris frankly says: "From what has been said, it will be seen that, in describing the manuscripts from which Ciasca's text is made, we have been careful to avoid the assumption that the text of the Arabic Harmony is necessarily and at all points identical with that of the *Diatessaron* of Tatian. For, even if we accept the Harmony as Tatian's on the ground of its general agreements with the traditional Tatian, we are obliged to note in the manuscripts themselves a tendency to change in the most striking Tatian characteristics; and further, since the Harmony is substantially a New Testament manuscript, it is impossible that it could have remained in circulation without being affected by the same causes which were in operation to change the form of every successive recension of the New Testament into agreement with the latest recension of all."¹ Harnack considers that the Syriac manuscript from which the Arabic translation was made contained an already manipulated Catholic *Diatessaron*,² and elsewhere he says: "In all cases where I have referred to the Arabic Harmony—that is to say, at the passages characteristic of the real Tatian—the characteristic had been removed and the commonplace substituted." Resch, speaking of all these supposed representations of the *Diatessaron*, after pointing out the effect of the establishment of the canonical text, as the only authority, in producing a process of fundamental extirpation (*gründlicher Ausrottungs process*) of pre-canonical Gospel texts, says: "In consequence of this, the *Diatessaron* belongs to the number of wholly lost writings. Neither Greek nor Syriac copies of this oldest Gospel Harmony have been preserved," and he only regards Ephrem, Aphraates, the *Codex Fuldensis*, and the Arabic Harmony as sources for a partial reconstruction.³ Zahn's opinion of the text is not a whit more favourable. It will be remembered that he said of the Latin Tatian that "the translation, if we can so call it, has been made in such a way that the fragments from which the Syriac book was compiled were sought for in the Latin Bible in the version of Jerome, and transcribed from it. It is equally clear," he continues, "that either on the occasion of the

¹ *The Diatessaron of Tatian*, 1890, p. 9.

² *Gesch. d. altchr. Lit.*, 1893, i., p. 495.

³ *Aussercan. paralleltexzte zu d. Ev.*, 1893, p. 42 f.

translation from Syriac into Latin, or even previously in the Syriac text itself which the Latinist had before him, the literary composition of the *Diatessaron* had undergone a profound transformation. All this and much more," he adds, "may also have occurred when the *Diatessaron* was translated into Arabic."¹

When we consider the slightness of the evidence upon which any identification of these works with the *Diatessaron* of Tatian rests, this final judgment on the transformation of the text itself forms a suitable illustration of the whole position of the question. If many are content to consider the identity of the works settled, at least it is pretty certain that, if Tatian himself were to-day to see his *Diatessaron* as it stands in Ciasca's MS., he could not recognise his own work.

We have thought it desirable to state the case for Tatian's *Diatessaron* with sufficient fulness, as interesting in itself and important for a just appreciation of the difficulties which surround it; but so far as our special investigation is concerned a final judgment is simple and conclusive. Even if it be accepted that, towards the last quarter of the second century, Tatian possessed and made use of our Gospels, the fact can only prove the existence of those writings, but adds nothing to our knowledge of their authors, and certainly does not in the least justify us in accepting them as adequate witnesses for miracles and the reality of Divine Revelation.

Dionysius of Corinth need not detain us long. Eusebius informs us that he was the author of seven Epistles addressed to various Christian communities, and also of a letter to Chrysophora, "a most faithful sister." Eusebius speaks of these writings as Catholic Epistles, and briefly characterises each; but, with the exception of a few short fragments preserved by him, none of these fruits of the "inspired industry" (*ἐνθέου φιλοπονίας*) of Dionysius are now extant.² These fragments are all from an Epistle said to have been addressed to Soter, Bishop of Rome, and give us a clue to the time at which they were written. The Bishopric of Soter is generally dated between A.D. 168-176,³ during which years the Epistle must have been composed. It could not have been written, however, before Dionysius became Bishop of Corinth in A.D. 170,⁴ and it was probably written some years after.⁵

¹ *Gesch. des N. T. Kanons*, 1891, ii., p. 533 f.

² Eusebius, *H. E.*, iv. 23; Hieron., *De Vir. Ill.*, 27; Grabe, *Spicil. Patr.*, ii., p. 217 f.; Routh, *Reliq. Sacrae*, i., p. 180 ff.

³ Eusebius, in his *Chronicon*, sets it in A.D. 171. ⁴ Eusebius, *H. E.*, iv. 19.

⁵ Anger places it between 173-177, *Synops. Ev. Proleg.*, xxxii.; cf. Credner, *Gesch. N. T. Kan.*, p. 79. Jerome states that Dionysius flourished under M. Aurel. Verus and L. Aurel. Commodus (*De Vir. Ill.*, 27).

No quotation from, or allusion to, any writing of the New Testament occurs in any of the fragments of the Epistles now extant; nor does Eusebius make mention of any such reference in the Epistles which have perished. As testimony for our Gospels, therefore, Dionysius is an absolute blank. Some expressions and statements, however, are put forward by apologists which we must examine. In the few lines which Tischendorf accords to Dionysius he refers to two of these. The first is an expression used, not by Dionysius himself, but by Eusebius, in speaking of the Epistles to the Churches at Amastris and at Pontus. Eusebius says that Dionysius adds some "expositions of Divine Scriptures" (γραφῶν θείων ἐξηγήσεις).¹ There can be no doubt, we think, that this refers to the Old Testament only, and Tischendorf himself does not deny it.²

The second passage which Tischendorf³ points out, and which he claims with some other apologists as evidence of the actual existence of a New Testament Canon when Dionysius wrote, occurs in a fragment from the Epistle to Soter and the Romans which is preserved by Eusebius. It is as follows: "For the brethren having requested me to write Epistles, I wrote them. And the Apostles of the devil have filled these with tares, both taking away parts and adding others; for whom the woe is destined. It is not surprising, then, if some have recklessly ventured to adulterate the Scriptures of the Lord (τῶν κυριακῶν γραφῶν) when they have formed designs against these which are not of such importance."⁴ Regarding this passage, Dr. Westcott, with his usual boldness, says: "It is evident that the 'Scriptures of the Lord'—the writings of the New Testament—were at this time collected, that they were distinguished from other books, that they were jealously guarded, that they had been corrupted for heretical purposes."⁵ We have seen, however, that there has not been a trace of any New Testament Canon in the

¹ Eusebius, *H. E.*, iv. 23.

² Tischendorf, *Wann wurden*, u. s. w., p. 18 f.; Volkmar, *Der Ursprung*, p. 38; Donaldson, *Hist. Chr. Lit. and Doctr.*, iii., p. 217. Dr. Westcott's opinion is shown by his not even referring to the expression.

³ *Wann wurden*, u. s. w., p. 18 f.

⁴ *H. E.*, iv. 23.

⁵ *On the Canon*, p. 166. Dr. Westcott, in the first instance, translates the expression, τῶν κυριακῶν γραφῶν: "The Scriptures of the New Testament." In a note to his fourth edition, however, he explains: "Of course, it is not affirmed that the collection here called αἱ κυριακαὶ γραφαί was identical with our 'New Testament,' but simply that the phrase shows that a collection of writings belonging to the New Testament existed" (p. 188, n. 2). Such a translation, in such a work, assuming, as it does, the whole question, and concealing what is doubtful, is most unwarrantable. The fact is that not only is there no mention of the New Testament at all, but the words as little necessarily imply a "collection" of writings as they do a "collection" of the Epistles of Dionysius.

writings of the Fathers before and during this age, and it is not permissible to put such an interpretation upon the remark of Dionysius. Dr. Donaldson, with greater critical justice and reserve, remarks regarding the expression, "Scriptures of the Lord": "It is not easy to settle what this term means," although he adds his own personal opinion, "but most probably it refers to the Gospels as containing the sayings and doings of the Lord. It is not likely, as Lardner supposes, that such a term would be applied to the whole of the New Testament."¹ The idea of our collected New Testament being referred to is of course quite untenable, and although it is open to argument that Dionysius may have referred to evangelical works, it is obvious that there are no means of proving the fact, and much less that he referred specially to our Gospels. In fact, the fragments of Dionysius present no evidence whatever of the existence of our Synoptics.

In order further to illustrate the inconclusiveness of the arguments based upon so vague an expression, we may add that it does not of necessity apply to any Gospels or works of Christian history at all, and may with perfect propriety have indicated the Scriptures of the Old Testament. We find Justin Martyr complaining in the same spirit as Dionysius, through several chapters, that the Old Testament Scriptures, and more especially those relating to the Lord, had been adulterated, that parts had been taken away, and others added, with the intention of destroying or weakening their application to Christ.² Justin's argument throughout is, that the whole of the Old Testament Scriptures refer to Christ; and Tryphon, his antagonist, the representative of Jewish opinion, is made to avow that the Jews not only wait for Christ, but, he adds, "We admit that all the Scriptures which you have cited refer to him."³ Not only, therefore, were the Scriptures of the Old Testament closely connected with their Lord by the Fathers and, at the date of which we are treating, were the only "Holy Scriptures" recognised, but they made the same complaints which we meet with in Dionysius, that these Scriptures were adulterated by omissions and interpolations.⁴ The expression of Eusebius regarding "expositions of Divine Scriptures" (*γραφῶν θείων ἐξηγήσεις*) added by Dionysius, which applied to the Old Testament, tends to connect the Old Testament also with this term, "Scriptures of the Lord."

If the term, "Scriptures of the Lord," however, be referred to Gospels, the difficulty of using it as evidence continues undiminished. We have no indication of the particular evangelical works

¹ *Hist. Chr. Lit. and Doctr.*, iii., p. 217.

² *Dial. c. Tryph.*, lxx.-lxxv.

³ *Dial.* lxxxix.

⁴ This charge is made with insistence throughout the *Clementine Homilies*.

which were in the Bishop's mind. We have seen that other Gospels were used by the Fathers, and in exclusive circulation amongst various communities; and even until much later times many works were regarded by them as divinely inspired which have no place in our Canon. The Gospel according to the Hebrews, for instance, was probably used by some at least of the Apostolic Fathers, by pseudo-Ignatius, Polycarp, Papias, Hegesippus, Justin Martyr, and at least employed along with our Gospels by Clement of Alexandria, Origen, and Jerome.¹ The fact that Serapion, in the third century, allowed the Gospel of Peter to be used in the church of Rhossus² shows at the same time the consideration in which it was held, and the incompleteness of the canonical position of the New Testament writings. So does the circumstance that in the fifth century Theodoret found the Gospel according to the Hebrews, or Tatian's Gospel, widely circulated and held in honour amongst orthodox churches in his diocese.³ The Shepherd of Hermas, which was read in the churches and nearly secured a permanent place in the Canon, was quoted as inspired by Irenæus.⁴ The Epistle of Barnabas was held in similar honour, and quoted as inspired by Clement of Alexandria⁵ and by Origen,⁶ as was likewise the Epistle of the Roman Clement. The Apocalypse of Peter was included by Clement of Alexandria in his account of the canonical Scriptures and those which are disputed, such as the Epistle of Jude and the other Catholic Epistles,⁷ and it stands side by side with the Apocalypse of John in the Canon of Muratori, being long after publicly read in the churches of Palestine.⁸ Tischendorf, indeed, conjectures that a blank in the *Codex Sinaiticus*, after the New Testament, was formerly filled by it. Justin, Clement of Alexandria, and Lactantius quote the Sibylline books as the Word of God, and pay similar honour to the Book of Hystaspes.⁹ So great indeed was the consideration and use of the Sibylline Books in the Church of the second and third centuries that Christians from that fact were nicknamed Sibyllists.¹⁰ It is unnecessary to multiply, as might so easily be done, these illustrations; it is sufficiently well

¹ Cf. p. 263 f.

² Eusebius, *H. E.*, vi. 12.

³ Theodoret, *Her. Fab.*, i. 20; cf. ii. 2; cf. Epiph., *Her.*, xlvi. 1.

⁴ *Adv. Her.*, iv. 20, § 2; Eusebius, *H. E.*, v. 8; cf. iii. 3.

⁵ *Strom.*, ii. 8, iv. 17.

⁶ *Philocal.*, 18.

⁷ Eusebius, *H. E.*, vi. 14.

⁸ Sozom., *H. E.*, vii. 19.

⁹ Justin, *Apol.*, i. 20, 44; Clem. Al., *Strom.*, vi. 5, §§ 42, 43; Lactantius, *Instit. Div.*, i. 6, 7, vii. 15, 19. Clement of Alexandria quotes with perfect faith and seriousness some apocryphal book, in which, he says, the Apostle Paul recommends the Hellenic books, the Sibyl and the books of Hystaspes, as giving notably clear prophetic descriptions of the Son of God (*Strom.*, vi. 5, § 42, 43).

¹⁰ Origen, *Contra Cels.*, v. 6; cf. vii. 53.

known that a number of Gospels and similar works, which have been excluded from the Canon, were held in deepest veneration by the Church in the second century, to which the words of Dionysius may apply. So vague and indefinite an expression, at any rate, is useless as evidence for the existence of our canonical Gospels.

Dr. Westcott's deduction from the words of Dionysius, that not only were the writings of the New Testament already collected, but that they were "jealously guarded," is imaginative indeed. It is much and devoutly to be wished that they had been as carefully guarded as he supposes; but it is well known that this was not the case, and that numerous interpolations have been introduced into the text. The whole history of the Canon and of Christian literature in the second and third centuries displays the most deplorable carelessness and want of critical judgment on the part of the Fathers. Whatever was considered as conducive to Christian edification was blindly adopted by them, and a number of works were launched into circulation and falsely ascribed to Apostles and others likely to secure for them greater consideration. Such pious fraud was rarely suspected, still more rarely detected in the early ages of Christianity, and several of such pseudographs have secured a place in our New Testament. The words of Dionysius need not receive any wider signification than a reference to well-known Epistles. It is clear from the words attributed to the Apostle Paul, in 2 Thess. ii. 2, iii. 17, that his Epistles were falsified and, setting aside some of those which bear his name in our Canon, spurious Epistles were long ascribed to him, such as the Epistle to the Laodiceans and a third Epistle to the Corinthians. We need not do more than allude to the second Epistle falsely bearing the name of Clement of Rome, as well as the *Clementine Homilies* and *Recognitions*, the *Apostolical Constitutions*, and the spurious letters of Ignatius, the letters and legend of Abgarus quoted by Eusebius, and the Epistles of Paul and Seneca, in addition to others already pointed out, as instances of the wholesale falsification of that period, many of which gross forgeries were at once accepted as genuine by the Fathers, so slight was their critical faculty and so ready their credulity.¹ In one case the Church punished the author who, from mistaken zeal for the honour of the Apostle Paul, fabricated the *Acta Pauli et Theclæ* in his name,² but the forged production was not the less made use of in the Church. There was, therefore, no lack of falsification and adulteration of works of Apostles and others of greater note than himself to warrant the remark of Dionysius,

¹ The Epistle of Jude quotes as genuine the Assumption of Moses, and also the Book of Enoch; and the defence of the authenticity of the latter by Tertullian (*de Cultu fem.*, i. 3) will not be forgotten. ² Tertullian, *De Baptismo*, 17.

without any forced application of it to our Gospels or to a New Testament Canon, the existence of which there is nothing to substantiate, but, on the contrary, every reason to discredit.

Before leaving this passage we may add that, although even Tischendorf does not, Dr. Westcott does find in it references to our first Synoptic and to the Apocalypse. "The short fragment just quoted," he says, "contains two obvious allusions, one to the Gospel of St. Matthew and one to the Apocalypse."¹ The words, "the Apostles of the devil have filled these with tares," are, he supposes, an allusion to Matt. xiii. 24 ff. But even if the expression were an echo of the Parable of the Wheat and Tares, it is not permissible to refer it in this arbitrary way to our first Gospel, to the exclusion of the numerous other works which existed, many of which doubtless contained it. Obviously the words have no evidential value.

Continuing his previous assertions, however, Dr. Westcott affirms with equal boldness: "The allusion in the last clause"—to the "Scriptures of the Lord"—"will be clear when it is remembered that Dionysius 'warred against the heresy of Marcion and defended the rule of truth'" (παρίστασθαι κανόνι ἀλ.).² Tischendorf, who is ready enough to strain every expression into evidence, recognises too well that this is not capable of such an interpretation. Dr. Westcott omits to mention that the words, moreover, are not used by Dionysius at all, but simply proceed from Eusebius.³ Dr. Donaldson distinctly states the fact that "there is no reference to the Bible in the words of Eusebius: he defends the rule of the truth"⁴ (τῷ τῆς ἀληθείας παρίσταται κανόνι).

There is only one other point to mention. Dr. Westcott refers to the passage in the Epistle of Dionysius, which has already been quoted in this work, regarding the reading of Christian writings in churches. "To-day," he writes to Soter, "we have kept the Lord's holy day, in which we have read your Epistle, from the reading of which we shall ever derive admonition, as we do from the former one written to us by Clement."⁵ It is evident that there was no idea, in selecting the works to be read at the weekly assembly of Christians, of any Canon of a New Testament. We here learn that the Epistles of Clement and of Soter were habitually read; and, while we hear of this and of the similar reading of Justin's *Memoirs of the Apostles*,⁶ of the *Shepherd* of Hermas,⁷ of the Apocalypse of Peter,⁸ and other apocryphal works, we do not at the same time hear of the public reading of our Gospels.

¹ *On the Canon*, p. 167.

² *Ib.*, p. 166 f.

³ *H. E.*, iv. 23.

⁴ *Hist. Chr. Lit. and Doctr.*, iii., p. 217 f.

⁵ Euseb., *H. E.*, iv. 23.

⁶ Justin, *Apol.*, i. 67.

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

⁸ Sozom., *H. E.*, vii. 9.

CHAPTER IX.

MELITO OF SARDIS—CLAUDIUS APOLLINARIS—ATHENAGORAS—
THE EPISTLE OF VIENNE AND LYONS

WE might altogether have passed over Melito, Bishop of Sardis, in Lydia, had it not been for the use of certain fragments of his writings made by Dr. Westcott. Melito, naturally, is not cited by Tischendorf at all, but the English apologist, with greater zeal, we think, than critical discretion, forces him into service as evidence for the Gospels and a New Testament Canon. The date of Melito, it is generally agreed, falls after A.D. 176, a phrase in his apology presented to Marcus Antoninus preserved in Eusebius¹ (*μετὰ τοῦ παιδός*) indicating that Commodus had already been admitted to a share of the Government.

Dr. Westcott affirms that, in a fragment preserved by Eusebius, Melito speaks of the books of the New Testament in a collected form. He says: "The words of Melito on the other hand are simple and casual, and yet their meaning can scarcely be mistaken. He writes to Onesimus, a fellow-Christian, who had urged him 'to make selections for him from the Law and the Prophets concerning the Saviour and the faith generally, and furthermore desired to learn the accurate account of the Old (*παλαιῶν*) Books': 'having gone therefore to the East,' Melito says, 'and reached the spot where [each thing] was preached and done, and having learned accurately the Books of the Old Testament, I have sent a list of them.' The mention of 'the Old Books'—'the Books of the Old Testament,' naturally implies a definite New Testament, a written antitype to the Old; and the form of language implies a familiar recognition of its contents."² This is truly astonishing! The "form of language" can only refer to the words, "concerning the Saviour and the faith generally," which must have an amazing fulness of meaning to convey to Dr. Westcott the implication of a "familiar recognition" of the contents of a supposed already collected New Testament, seeing that a simple Christian, not to say a Bishop, might at least know of a Saviour and the faith generally from the oral preaching of the Gospel, from

¹ *H. E.*, iv. 26.

² *On the Canon*, p. 193. (In the fourth edition Dr. Westcott omits the last phrase, making a full stop at "Old," p. 218.)

a single Epistle of Paul, or from any of the πολλοί of Luke. This reasoning forms a worthy pendant to his argument, that because Melito speaks of the books of the Old Testament he implies the existence of a definite collected New Testament. Such an assertion is calculated to mislead a large class of readers.¹

The fragment of Melito is as follows: "Melito to his brother Onesimus, greeting. As thou hast frequently desired in thy zeal for the word (λόγον) to have extracts made for thee, both from the law and the prophets concerning the Saviour and our whole faith; nay, more, hast wished to learn the exact statement of the old books (παλαιῶν βιβλίων), how many they are and what is their order, I have earnestly endeavoured to accomplish this, knowing thy zeal concerning the faith, and thy desire to be informed concerning the word (λόγον), and especially that thou preferrest these matters to all others from love towards God, striving to gain eternal salvation. Having, therefore, gone to the East, and reached the place where this was preached and done, and having accurately ascertained the books of the Old Testament (τὰ τῆς παλαιᾶς διαθήκης βιβλία), I have, subjoined, sent a list of them unto thee, of which these are the names"—then follows a list of the books of the Old Testament, omitting, however, Esther. He then concludes with the words: "Of these I have made the extracts, dividing them into six books."²

Dr. Westcott's assertion that the expression, "Old Books," "Books of the Old Testament," involves here by antithesis a definite *written* New Testament, requires us to say a few words as to the name of "Testament" as applied to both divisions of the Bible. It is of course well known that this word came into use originally from the translation of the Hebrew word "covenant," or compact made between God and the Israelites,³ in the Septuagint version, by the Greek word Διαθήκη, which in a legal sense also means a will or testament,⁴ and that word is adopted throughout the New Testament.⁵ The Vulgate translation, instead of retaining the original Hebrew signification, translated

¹ It must be said, however, that Dr. Westcott merely follows and exaggerates Lardner here, who says: "From this passage I would conclude that there was then also a volume or collection of books called the New Testament, containing the writings of Apostles and Apostolical men; but we cannot from hence infer the names or the exact number of those books" (*Credibility*, etc., *Works*, ii., p. 148).

² Eusebius, *H. E.*, iv. 26.

³ Cf. Exod. xxiv. 7.

⁴ The legal sense of διαθήκη as a Will or Testament is distinctly intended in Heb. ix. 16. "For where a Testament (διαθήκη) is, there must also of necessity be the death of the testator" (διαθεμένου). The same word διαθήκη is employed throughout the whole passage (Heb. ix. 15-23).

⁵ 2 Cor. iii. 14; Heb. viii. 6-13, xii. 24; Rom. ix. 4, xi. 26-28; Gal. iii. 14-17; Ephes. ii. 12; etc.

the word in the Gospels and Epistles, "*Testamentum*," and ἡ παλαιὰ διαθήκη became "*Vetus Testamentum*," instead of "*Vetus Fœdus*," and whenever the word occurs in the English version it is almost invariably rendered "Testament" instead of covenant. The expression "Book of the Covenant," or "Testament," βίβλος τῆς διαθήκης, frequently occurs in the LXX version of the Old Testament and its Apocrypha;¹ and in Jeremiah xxxi. 31-34² the prophet speaks of making a "new covenant" (καινὴ διαθήκη) with the house of Israel, which is indeed quoted in Hebrews viii. 8. It is the doctrinal idea of the new covenant, through Christ confirming the former one made to the Israelites, which has led to the distinction of the Old and New Testaments. Generally the Old Testament was, in the first ages of Christianity, indicated by the simple expressions, "The Books" (τὰ βιβλία), "Holy Scriptures" (ἱερὰ γράμματα,³ or γραφαὶ ἁγίαι),⁴ or "The Scriptures" (αἱ γραφαί);⁵ but the preparation for the distinction of "Old Testament" began very early in the development of the doctrinal idea of the New Testament of Christ, before there was any part of the New Testament books written at all. The expression "New Testament," derived thus antithetically from the "Old Testament," occurs constantly throughout the second part of the Bible. In the Epistle to the Hebrews, viii. 6-13, the Mosaic dispensation is contrasted with the Christian, and Jesus is called the Mediator of a better Testament (διαθήκη).⁶ The first Testament, not being faultless, is replaced by the second, and the writer quotes the passage from Jeremiah to which we have referred regarding a New Testament, winding up his argument with the words, v. 13: "In that he saith a new (Testament) he hath made the first old." Again, in our first Gospel, during the Last Supper, Jesus is represented as saying: "This is my blood of the New Testament" (τῆς καινῆς διαθήκης);⁷ and in Luke he says: "This cup is the New Testament (ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη) in my blood."⁸ There is, therefore, a very distinct reference made to the two Testaments as "New" and "Old," and in speaking of the books of the Law and the Prophets as the "Old Books" and "Books of the Old Testament," after the general acceptance of the Gospel of Jesus as the New Testament or Covenant, there was no antithetical implication of a written New Testament, but a mere reference to the doctrinal idea. We might multiply illustrations showing how ever-present to the mind of the early Church was the

¹ Cf. Exod. xxiv. 7; 2 Chron. xxxiv. 30; 2 Kings xxiii. 2; 1 Maccab. i. 57; Sirach, xxiv. 23, etc.

² In the Septuagint version, xxxviii. 31-34.

³ 2 Tim. iii. 15.

⁴ Rom. i. 2.

⁵ Matt. xxii. 29.

⁶ Cf. ix. 15, xii. 24.

⁷ Matt. xxvi. 28.

⁸ Luke xxii. 20.

contrast of the Mosaic and Christian Covenants as Old and New. Two more we may venture to point out. In Romans ix. 4 and Gal. iv. 24 the two Testaments or Covenants (αἱ δύο διαθήκαι), typified by Sinai and the heavenly Jerusalem, are discussed, and the superiority of the latter asserted. There is, however, a passage still more clear and decisive. Paul says in 2 Corinthians iii. 6: "Who also (God) made us sufficient to be ministers of the New Testament (καινῆς διαθήκης), not of the letter, but of the spirit" (οὐ γράμματος ἀλλὰ πνεύματος). Why does not Dr. Westcott boldly claim this as evidence of a definite written New Testament, when not only is there reference to the name, but a distinction drawn between the letter and the spirit of it, from which an apologist might make a telling argument? But, proceeding to contrast the glory of the New with the Old dispensation, the Apostle, in reference to the veil with which Moses covered his face, says: "But their understandings were hardened: for until this very day remaineth the same veil in the reading of the Old Testament" (ἐπὶ τῇ ἀναγνώσει τῆς παλαιᾶς διαθήκης);¹ and as if to make the matter still clearer he repeats in the next verse: "But even unto this day, when Moses is read, the veil lieth upon their heart." Now, here the actual reading of the *Old* Testament (παλαιᾶς διαθήκης) is distinctly mentioned, and the expression, quite as aptly as that of Melito, "implies a definite New Testament, a written antitype to the Old"; but even Dr. Westcott would not dare to suggest that, when the second Epistle to the Corinthians was composed, there was a "definite written New Testament" in existence. This conclusively shows that the whole argument from Melito's mention of the books of the Old Testament is absolutely groundless.

On the contrary, the first general designation for the two portions of the New Testament collection was "The Gospel" (εὐαγγέλιον, εὐαγγελικόν, εὐαγγελικά) and "The Apostle" (ἀπόστολος, ἀποστολικόν, ἀποστολικά), in contrast with the two divisions of the Old Testament, the Law and the Prophets (ὁ νόμος, οἱ προφῆται);² and the name New Testament occurs for the very first time in the third century, when Tertullian called the collection of Christian Scriptures *Novum*

¹ Verse 14.

² Cf. Irenæus, *Adv. Hær.*, i. 3, § 6; Clemens Al., *Strom.*, v. 5, § 31; Tertullian, *De Præscr.*, 36; *Adv. Marc.*, iv. 2, *Apolog.*, 18; Origen, *Hom.* xix. in *Jerem.* iii., p. 364. The Canon of Muratori says that the Pastor of Hermas can neither be classed "*inter Prophetas neque inter Apostolos.*" In a translation of the *Clavis*, a spurious work attributed to Melito himself—and Dr. Westcott admits it to be spurious (p. 198, note 1)—the Gospels are referred to simply by the formula "*in evangelio,*" and the Epistles generally "*in apostolo.*"

Instrumentum and *Novum Testamentum*.¹ The term ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη is not, so far as we are aware, applied in the Greek to the "New Testament" Scriptures in any earlier work than Origen's *De Principiis*, iv. 1. It was only in the second half of the third century that the double designation τὸ εὐαγγέλιον καὶ ὁ ἀπόστολος was generally abandoned.

As to the evidence for a New Testament Canon, which Dr. Westcott supposes he gains by his unfounded inference from Melito's expression, we may judge of its value from the fact that he himself, like Lardner, admits: "But there is little evidence in the fragment of Melito to show what writings he would have included in the new collection."² Little evidence? There is none at all.

There is, however, one singular and instructive point in this fragment to which Dr. Westcott does not in any way refer, but which well merits attention as illustrating the state of religious knowledge at that time and, by analogy, giving a glimpse of the difficulties which beset early Christian literature. We are told by Melito that Onesimus had frequently urged him to give him exact information as to the number and order of the books of the Old Testament, and to have extracts made for him from them concerning the Saviour and the faith. Now, it is apparent that Melito, though a Bishop, was not able to give the desired information regarding the number and order of the books of the Old Testament himself, but that he had to make a journey to collect it. If this was the extent of knowledge possessed by the Bishop of Sardis of what was to the Fathers the only Holy Scripture, how ignorant his flock must have been, and how unfitted, both, to form any critical judgment as to the connection of Christianity with the Mosaic dispensation. The formation of a Christian Canon at a period when such ignorance was not only possible but generally prevailed, and when the zeal of believers led to the composition of such a mass of pseudonymic and other literature, in which every consideration of correctness and truth was subordinated to a childish desire for edification, must have been slow indeed and uncertain; and in such an age fortuitous circumstances must have mainly led to the canonisation or actual loss of many a work. So far from affording any evidence of the existence of a New Testament Canon, the fragment of Melito only shows the ignorance of the Bishop of Sardis as to the Canon even of the Old Testament.

We have not yet finished with Melito in connection with Dr.

¹ *Adv. Prax.*, 15, 20; *Adv. Marc.*, iv. 1. He says in the latter place "*instrumenti*," referring to Old and New Testaments, "*vel, quod magis usui est dicere, testamenti*."

² *On the Canon*, p. 194.

Westcott, however, and it is necessary to follow him further in order fully to appreciate the nature of the evidence for the New Testament Canon, which, in default of better, he is obliged to offer. Eusebius gives a list of the works of Melito which have come to his knowledge, and, in addition to the fragment already quoted, he extracts a brief passage from Melito's work on the Passover, and some much longer quotations from his *Apology*, to which we have in passing referred.¹ With these exceptions, none of Melito's writings are now extant. Dr. Cureton, however, has published a Syriac version, with translation, of a so-called *Oration of Meliton, the Philosopher, who was in the Presence of Antoninus Cæsar*, together with five other fragments attributed to Melito.² With regard to this Syriac *Oration*, Dr. Westcott says: "Though, if it be entire, it is not the *Apology* with which Eusebius was acquainted, the general character of the writing leads to the belief that it is a genuine book of Melito of Sardis";³ and he proceeds to treat it as authentic. In the first place, we have so little of Melito's genuine compositions extant that it is hazardous indeed to draw any positive deduction from the "character of the writing." Cureton, Bunsen, and others, maintain that this *Apology* is not a fragment; and it cannot be the work mentioned by Eusebius, for it does not contain the quotations from the authentic *Orations* which he has preserved, and which are considerable. It is, however, clear, from the substance of the composition, that it cannot have been spoken before the Emperor; and, moreover, it has in no way the character of an "apology," for there is not a single word in it about either Christianity or Christians. There is every reason to believe that it is not a genuine work of Melito. There is no ground for supposing that he wrote two *Apologies*, nor is this ascribed to him upon any other ground than the inscription of an unknown Syriac writer. This, however, is not the only spurious work attributed to Melito. Of this work Dr. Westcott says: "Like other *Apologies*, this oration contains only indirect references to the Christian Scriptures. The allusions in it to the Gospels are extremely rare, and, except so far as they show the influence of St. John's writings, of no special interest."⁴ It would have been more correct to have said that there are no allusions in it to the Gospels at all.

Dr. Westcott is somewhat enthusiastic in speaking of Melito and his literary activity as evinced in the titles of his works recorded by Eusebius, and he quotes a fragment, said to be from

¹ Euseb., *H. E.*, iv. 26.

² *Spicilegium Syriacum*, 1855, pp. 41-56; Pitra, *Spicil. Solesm.*, 1855, ii. Proleg., xxxviii. f.

³ *On the Canon*, p. 194.

⁴ *Ib.*, p. 194.

a treatise, *On Faith*, amongst these Syriac remains, and which he considers to be "a very striking expansion of the early historic creed of the Church."¹ As usual, we shall give the entire fragment:—

"We have made collections from the Law and the Prophets relative to those things which have been declared respecting our Lord Jesus Christ, that we may prove to your love that he is perfect Reason, the Word of God; who was begotten before the light; who was Creator together with the Father; who was the Fashioner of man; who was all in all; who among the Patriarchs was Patriarch; who in the Law was the Law; among the Priests chief Priest; among Kings Governor; among the Prophets the Prophet; among the Angels Archangel; in the voice the Word; among Spirits Spirit; in the Father the Son; in God the King for ever and ever. For this was he who was Pilot to Noah; who conducted Abraham; who was bound with Isaac; who was in exile with Jacob; who was sold with Joseph; who was captain with Moses; who was the Divider of the inheritance with Jesus the son of Nun; who in David and the Prophets foretold his own sufferings; who was incarnate in the Virgin; who was born at Bethlehem; who was wrapped in swaddling clothes in the manger; who was seen of shepherds; who was glorified of angels; who was worshipped by the Magi; who was pointed out by John; who assembled the Apostles; who preached the kingdom; who healed the maimed; who gave light to the blind; who raised the dead; who appeared in the Temple; who was not believed by the people; who was betrayed by Judas; who was laid hold of by the priests; who was condemned by Pilate; who was pierced in the flesh; who was hanged upon the tree; who was buried in the earth; who rose from the dead; who appeared to the Apostles; who ascended to heaven; who sitteth on the right hand of the Father; who is the Rest of those who are departed; the Recoverer of those who are lost; the Light of those who are in darkness; the Deliverer of those who are captives; the Finder of those who have gone astray; the Refuge of the afflicted; the Bridegroom of the Church; the Charioteer of the Cherubim; the Captain of the Angels; God who is of God; the Son who is of the Father; Jesus Christ, the King for ever and ever. Amen."²

Dr. Westcott commences his commentary upon this passage with the remark: "No writer could state the fundamental truths of Christianity more unhesitatingly, or quote the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments with more perfect confidence."³ We need not do more than remark that there is not a single quotation in the fragment, and that there is not a single one of the references to Gospel history or to ecclesiastical dogmas which might not have been derived from the Epistles of Paul, from any of the forms of the Gospel according to the Hebrews, the Protevangelium of James, or from many other apocryphal Gospels, or the oral teaching of the Church. It is singular, however, that the only hint which Dr. Westcott gives of the more than doubtful authenticity of this fragment consists of the introductory remark, after

¹ *On the Canon*, p. 196.

² Cureton, *Spicil. Syriacum*, p. 53 f.; Pitra, *Spicil. Solesm.*, ii. *Proleg.* lix. f.; Westcott, *On the Canon*, p. 196 f.

³ *On the Canon*, p. 197.

alluding to the titles of his genuine and supposititious writings: "Of these multifarious writings very few fragments remain in the original Greek, but the general tone of them is so decided in its theological character as to go far to establish the genuineness of those which are preserved in the Syriac translation."¹

Now, the fragment *On Faith* which has just been quoted is one of the five Syriac pieces of Dr. Cureton to which we have referred, and which even apologists agree "cannot be regarded as genuine."² It is well known that there were other writers in the early Church bearing the names of Melito and Miletius or Meletius, which were frequently confounded. Of these five Syriac fragments one bears the superscription, "Of Meliton, Bishop of the city of Attica," and another, "Of the holy Meliton, Bishop of Utica"; and Cureton himself evidently leant to the opinion that they are not by our Melito, but by a Meletius or Melitius, Bishop of Sebastopolis in Pontus.³ The third fragment is said to be taken from a discourse, *On the Cross*, which was unknown to Eusebius, and from its doctrinal peculiarities was probably written after his time.⁴ Another fragment purports to be from a work on the *Soul and Body*; and the last one from the treatise *On Faith*, which we are discussing. The last two works are mentioned by Eusebius, but these fragments, besides coming in such suspicious company, must for other reasons be pronounced spurious.⁵ They have in fact no attestation whatever except that of the Syriac translator, who is unknown, and which therefore is worthless; and, on the other hand, the whole style and thought of the fragments are unlike anything else of Melito's time, and clearly indicate a later stage of theological development.⁶ Moreover, in the Mechitarist Library at Venice there is a shorter version of the same passage in a Syriac MS., and an Armenian version of the extract as given above, with some variation of the opening lines, in both of which the passage is distinctly ascribed to Irenæus.⁷ Besides the *Oration* and the five Syriac fragments, there are two other works extant falsely attributed to Melito, one, *De Transitu Virginis Mariæ*, describing the miraculous presence of the Apostles at the death of Mary;⁸ and the other, *De Actibus Joannis Apostoli*, relates the history of miracles performed by the Apostle John. Both are universally admitted to be spurious, as are a few other fragments also bearing

¹ *On the Canon*, p. 196.

² Donaldson, *Hist. Chr. Lit. and Doctr.*, iii., p. 236; cf. Sanday, *Gospels in Sec. Cent.*, p. 245.

³ *Spicil. Syriac.*, p. 96 f.

⁴ Donaldson, *Hist. Chr. Lit. and Doctr.*, iii., p. 237.

⁵ *Ib.*, iii., p. 227.

⁶ *Ib.*, iii., p. 236.

⁷ They are given by Pitra, *Spicil. Solesm.*, i., p. 3 f.

⁸ It is worthy of remark that the Virgin is introduced into all these fragments in a manner quite foreign to the period at which Melito lived.

his name. Melito did not escape from the falsification to which many of his more distinguished predecessors and contemporaries were victims, through the literary activity and unscrupulous religious zeal of the first three or four centuries of our era.

Very little is known regarding Claudius Apollinaris, to whom we must now for a moment turn. Eusebius informs us that he was Bishop of Hierapolis,¹ and in this he is supported by the fragment of a letter of Serapion, Bishop of Antioch, preserved to us by him, which refers to Apollinaris as the "most blessed."² Tischendorf, without any precise date, sets him down as contemporary with Tatian and Theophilus (the latter of whom, he thinks, wrote his work addressed to Autolycus about A.D. 180-181).³ Eusebius⁴ mentions that, like his somewhat earlier contemporary, Melito of Sardis, Apollinaris presented an "Apology" to the Emperor Marcus Antoninus, and he gives us further materials for a date⁵ by stating that Claudius Apollinaris, probably in his Apology, refers to the miracle of the "Thundering Legion," which is said to have occurred during the war of Marcus Antoninus against the Marcomanni in A.D. 174.⁶ The date of his writings may, therefore, with moderation, be fixed between A.D. 177-180.

Eusebius and others mention various works composed by him,⁷ none of which, however, are extant; and we have only to deal with two brief fragments in connection with the Paschal controversy, which are ascribed to Apollinaris in the *Paschal Chronicle* of Alexandria. This controversy as to the day upon which the Christian Passover should be celebrated broke out about A.D. 170, and long continued to divide the Church. In the preface to the *Paschal Chronicle*, a work of the seventh century, the unknown chronicler says: "Now, even Apollinaris, the most holy Bishop of Hierapolis, in Asia, who lived near apostolic times, taught the like things in his work on the Passover, saying

¹ *H. E.*, iv. 21, 26.

² *Ib.*, v. 19.

³ *Wann wurden*, u. s. w., p. 16, anm. 1.

⁴ *H. E.*, iv. 26, 27; cf. Hieron., *De Vir. Ill.*, 26.

⁵ Eusebius himself sets him down in his *Chronicle* as flourishing in the eleventh year of Marcus, or A.D. 171, a year later than he dates Melito.

⁶ Eusebius, *H. E.*, v. 5; Moshem, *Inst. Hist. Eccles.*, book i., cent. ii., part. i., ch. i., § 9. Apollinaris states that, in consequence of this miracle, the Emperor had bestowed upon the Legion the name of the "Thundering Legion." We cannot here discuss this subject, but the whole story illustrates the rapidity with which a fiction is magnified into truth by religious zeal, and is surrounded by false circumstantial evidence. Cf. Tertullian, *Apol.* 5, *ad Scapulam*, 4; Dion Cassius, *lib.* 55; Scaliger, *Animadv. in Euseb.*, p. 223 f.

⁷ Eusebius, *H. E.*, iv. 27; cf. 26, v. 19; Hieron., *Vir. Ill.*, 26; Theodoret, *Hær. Fab.*, ii. 21, iii. 2; Photius, *Biblioth. Cod.* 14.

thus: 'There are some, however, who, through ignorance, raise contentions regarding these matters in a way which should be pardoned, for ignorance does not admit of accusation, but requires instruction. And they say that the Lord, together with his disciples, ate the sheep (τό πρόβατον) on the 14th Nisan, but himself suffered on the great day of unleavened bread. And they state (διηγούνται) that Matthew says precisely what they have understood; hence their understanding of it is at variance with the law, and, according to them, the Gospels seem to contradict each other.'¹ The last sentence is interpreted as pointing out that the first synoptic Gospel is supposed to be at variance with our fourth Gospel. This fragment is claimed by Tischendorf² and others as evidence of the general acceptance, at that time, both of the Synoptics and the fourth Gospel. Dr. Westcott, with obvious exaggeration, says: "The Gospels are evidently quoted as books certainly known and recognised; their authority is placed on the same footing as the Old Testament."³ The Gospels are referred to merely for the settlement of the historical fact as to the day on which the last Passover had been eaten, a narrative of which they contained.

There are, however, very grave reasons for doubting the authenticity of the two fragments ascribed to Apollinaris, and we must mention that these doubts are much less those of German critics, who either do not raise the question at all or hastily dispose of it, than doubts entertained by orthodox apologists, who see little ground for accepting them as genuine.⁴ Eusebius, who gives a catalogue of the works of Apollinaris which had reached him,⁵ was evidently not acquainted with any writing of his on the Passover. It is argued, however, that "there is not any sufficient ground for doubting the genuineness of these fragments *On Easter*, in the fact that Eusebius mentions no such book by Apollinaris."⁶ It is quite true that Eusebius does not pretend to give a complete list of these works, but merely says that there are many preserved by many, and that he mentions those with which he had met.⁷ At the same time, entering with great interest, as

¹ *Præfat. Chron. Pasch. sive Alex. ed.* Ducange, p. 6; Routh, *Reliq. Sacr.*, i., p. 160.

² *Wann wurden, u. s. w.*, p. 18.

³ *On the Canon*, p. 199.

⁴ Donaldson, *Hist. Chr. Lit. and Doctr.*, iii., p. 247 f.; Lardner, *Credibility, etc., Works*, 1788, ii., p. 296; Tillemont, *Mém. Hist. Eccles.*, ii., pt. iii., p. 91; cf. Neander, *K. G.* 1842, i., p. 513, anm. 1.

⁵ *H. E.*, iv. 27.

⁶ Westcott, *On the Canon*, p. 198, note 3; cf. Baur, *Unters. kan. Evv.*, p. 340 f. This is the only remark which Dr. Westcott makes as to any doubt of the authenticity of these fragments. Tischendorf does not mention a doubt at all.

⁷ *H. E.*, iv. 27.

he does, into the Paschal controversy, and acquainted with the principal writings on the subject,¹ it would indeed have been strange had he not met with the treatise itself, or at least with some notice of it in the works of others. Eusebius gives an account of the writings of Melito and Apollinaris together. He was acquainted with the work of Melito on the Passover, and quotes it,² and it is extremely improbable that he could have been ignorant of a treatise by his distinguished contemporary on the same subject had he actually written one. Not only, however, does Eusebius seem to know nothing of his having composed such a work, but neither do Theodoret,³ Jerome,⁴ nor Photius,⁵ who refer to his writings, mention it; and we cannot suppose that it was referred to in the lost works of Irenæus or Clement of Alexandria on the Passover. Eusebius, who quotes from them,⁶ would in that case have probably mentioned the fact, as he does the statement by Clement regarding Melito's work, or at least would have been aware of the existence of such a writing, and alluded to it when speaking of the works of Apollinaris.

This silence is equally significant whether we regard Apollinaris as a Quartodeciman or as a supporter of the views of Victor and the Church of Rome. On the one hand, Eusebius states that "all the churches of Asia"⁷ kept the 14th Nisan, and it is difficult to believe that, had Apollinaris differed from this practice and, more especially, had he written against it, the name of so eminent an exception would not have been mentioned. The views of the Bishop of Hierapolis, as a prominent representative of the Asiatic Church, must have been quoted in many controversial works on the subject, and even if the writing itself had not come into their hands, Eusebius and others could scarcely fail to become indirectly acquainted with it. On the other hand, supposing Apollinaris to have been a Quartodeciman, whilst the ignorance of Eusebius and others regarding any contribution by him to the discussion is scarcely less remarkable, it is still more surprising that no allusion is made to him by Polycrates⁸ when he names so many less distinguished men of Asia, then deceased, who kept the 14th Nisan, such as Thaseas of Eumenia, Sagoris of Laodicea, Papius of Sardis, and the seven Bishops of his kindred, not to mention Polycarp of Smyrna and the Apostles Philip and John. He also cites Melito of Sardis: why does he not refer to Apollinaris of Hierapolis? If it be argued that he was still living, then why does Eusebius not mention him amongst those who protested against the measures of Victor of Rome?⁹

¹ Eusebius, *H. E.*, v. 23, 24.

³ *Hæret. Fab.*, ii. 21, iii. 2.

⁵ *Biblioth. Cod.*, 14.

⁷ *Ib.*, v. 23.

⁸ *Ib.*, v. 24.

² *Ib.*, iv. 26.

⁴ *Vir. Ill.* 26.

⁶ *H. E.*, v. 24, iv. 26; cf. vi. 13.

⁹ *Ib.*, v., 23, 24.

There has been much discussion as to the view taken by the writer of these fragments, Hilgenfeld and others¹ maintaining that he is opposed to the Quartodeciman party. Into this it is not necessary for us to enter, as our contention simply is that in no case can the authenticity of the fragments be established. Supposing them, however, to be directed against those who kept the 14th Nisan, how can it be credited that this isolated convert to the views of Victor and the Roman Church could write of so vast and distinguished a majority of the Churches of Asia, including Polycarp and Melito, as "some who through ignorance raised contentions" on the point, when they really raised no new contention at all, but, as Polycrates represented, followed the tradition handed down to them from their fathers, and authorised by the practice of the Apostle John himself!

None of his contemporaries nor writers about his own time seem to have known that Apollinaris wrote any work from which these fragments can have been taken, and there is absolutely no independent evidence that he ever took any part in the Paschal controversy at all. The only ground we have for attributing these fragments to him is the preface to the *Paschal Chronicle* of Alexandria, written by an unknown author of the seventh century some five hundred years after the time of Apollinaris, whose testimony has rightly been described as "worth almost nothing."² Most certainly many passages preserved by him are inauthentic, and generally allowed to be so.³ The two fragments have by some been conjecturally ascribed to Pierius of Alexandria, a writer of the third century, who composed a work on Easter; but there is no evidence on the point. In any case, there is such exceedingly slight reason for attributing these fragments to Claudius Apollinaris, and so many strong grounds for believing that he cannot have written them, that they have no material value as evidence for the antiquity of the Gospels.

We know little or nothing of Athenagoras. He is not mentioned by Eusebius, and our only information regarding him is derived from a fragment of Philip Sidetes, a writer of the fifth century, first published by Dodwell.⁴ Philip states that he was the first leader of the school of Alexandria during the time of Hadrian and Antoninus, to the latter of whom he addressed his

¹ Hilgenfeld, *Der Paschastreit*, 1860, p. 255 f.; Baur, *K.G.*, i., p. 157; Davidson, *Int. N. T.*, ii., p. 406 f.

² Donaldson, *Hist. Chr. Lit. and Doctr.*, iii., p. 247; Lardner, *Credibility*, etc., *Works*, ii., p. 296.

³ Dr. Donaldson rightly calls a fragment in the *Chronicle* ascribed to Melito, "unquestionably spurious" (*Hist. Chr. Lit. and Doctr.*, iii., p. 231).

⁴ *Append. ad Diss. Iren.*, p. 488. The extract from *Philip's History* is made by an unknown author.

Apology; and he further says that Clement of Alexandria was his disciple, and that Pantænus was the disciple of Clement. Part of this statement we know to be erroneous, and the *Christian History* of Philip, from which the fragment is taken, is very slightly spoken of both by Socrates¹ and Photius.² No reliance can be placed upon this information.

The only works ascribed to Athenagoras are an Apology—called an Embassy, *πρεσβεία*—bearing the inscription: “The Embassy of Athenagoras the Athenian, a philosopher and a Christian, concerning Christians, to the Emperors Marcus Aurelius Antoninus and Lucius Aurelius Commodus, Armeniaci Sarmatici and, above all, philosophers”; and further, a Treatise: *On the Resurrection of the Dead*. A quotation from the Apology by Methodius in his work on the Resurrection of the Body is preserved by Epiphanius³ and Photius,⁴ and this, the mention by Philip Sidetes, and the inscription by an unknown hand just quoted, are all the evidence we possess regarding the Apology. We have no evidence at all regarding the treatise on the Resurrection, beyond the inscription. The authenticity of neither therefore stands on very sure grounds. The address of the Apology and internal evidence furnished by it, into which we need not go, show that it could not have been written before A.D. 176–177, the date assigned to it by most critics, although there are many reasons for dating it some years later.

In the six lines which Tischendorf devotes to Athenagoras, he says that the Apology contains “several quotations from Matthew and Luke,”⁵ without, however, indicating them. In the very few sentences which Dr. Westcott vouchsafes to him, he says: “Athenagoras quotes the words of our Lord as they stand in St. Matthew four times, and appears to allude to passages in St. Mark and St. John, but he nowhere mentions the name of an Evangelist.”⁶ Here the third Synoptic is not mentioned. In another place he says: “Athenagoras at Athens and Theophilus at Antioch make use of the same books generally, and treat them with the same respect”; and in a note: “Athenagoras quotes the Gospels of St. Matthew and St. John.”⁷ Here it will be observed that also the Gospel of Mark is quietly dropped out of sight, but still the positive manner in which it is asserted that Athenagoras quotes from “the Gospel of St. Matthew,” without further explanation, is calculated to mislead. We shall refer to each of the supposed quotations.

Athenagoras not only does not mention any Gospel, but singularly enough he never once introduces the name of “Christ”

¹ *H. E.*, vii. 27.

² *Bibl. Cod.*, xxxv., p. 21.

³ *Her.*, lxiv. 21.

⁴ *Bibl. Cod.*, ccxxxiv., p. 908.

⁵ *Wann wurden, u. s. w.*, p. 19.

⁶ *On the Canon*, p. 103.

⁷ *Ib.*, p. 304, and note 2.

into the works ascribed to him, and all the "words of the Lord" referred to are introduced simply by the indefinite "he says," φησί, and without any indication whatever of a written source. The only exception to this is an occasion on which he puts into the mouth of "the Logos" a saying which is not found in any of our Gospels. The first passage to which Dr. Westcott alludes is the following, which we contrast with the supposed parallel in the Gospel:—

ATHENAGORAS.

For we have learnt not only not to render a blow, nor to go to law (δικάζεσθαι) with those who spoil and plunder us, but even to those who should strike (us) on one side of the forehead (κατὰ κόρυθης προσπηλακίζωσι) to offer for a blow the other side of the head also; and to those who should take away (ἀφαιροῦντο) the coat, to give also (ἐπιδιδόναι) the cloak besides.¹

MATT. v. 39-40.

But I say unto you: that ye resist not evil: but whosoever shall smite thee on thy right cheek (σε ῥαπίσει ἐπὶ τὴν δεξιάν σου σιαγόνα) turn to him the other also. And if any man be minded to sue thee at the law (κριθῆναι) and take away (λαβεῖν) thy coat, let him have (ἄφες αὐτῷ) thy cloak also.²

It is scarcely possible to imagine a greater difference in language conveying a similar idea than that which exists between Athenagoras and the first Gospel, and the parallel passage in Luke is in many respects still more distant. No echo of the words in Matthew has lingered in the ear of the writer, for he employs utterly different phraseology throughout, and nothing can be more certain than the fact that there is not a linguistic trace in it of acquaintance with our Synoptics.

The next passage which is referred to is as follows:—

ATHENAGORAS.

What, then, are those precepts in which we are instructed?

I say unto you: love your enemies, bless them that curse,

pray for them that persecute you; that ye may be sons of your Father which is in the heavens who (ὁ) maketh his sun, etc.³

MATT. v. 44-45.

But I say unto you, Love your enemies, bless them that curse you,⁴ do good to them that hate you, and pray for them that⁵ persecute you: That ye may be sons of your Father which is in heaven: for (ὅτι) he maketh his sun, etc.⁶

¹ *Legation pro Christianis*, § 1.

² Matt. v. 39, 40; cf. Luke vi. 29.

³ λέγω ὑμῖν Ἀγαπᾶτε τοὺς ἐχθροὺς ὑμῶν, εὐλογεῖτε τοὺς καταρωμένους, προσεύχεσθε ὑπὲρ τῶν διωκόντων ὑμᾶς, ὅπως γένησθε υἱοὶ τοῦ Πατρὸς ὑμῶν τοῦ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς, ὁ τὸν ἥλιον αὐτοῦ ἀνατέλλει, κ.τ.λ. *Leg. Pro. Christ.*, § 11.

⁴ The expressions, εὐλογεῖτε τοὺς καταρωμένους ὑμᾶς, καλῶς ποιεῖτε τοὺς μισοῦντας ὑμᾶς, "bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you," are omitted from some of the oldest MSS., but we do not know any in which the first of these two doubtful phrases is retained, as in Athenagoras, and the "do good to them that hate you" is omitted.

⁵ The phrase, ἐπηρεάζοντων ὑμᾶς, "despitefully use you," is omitted from many ancient codices.

⁶ Ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω ὑμῖν, ἀγαπᾶτε τοὺς ἐχθροὺς ὑμῶν καὶ προσεύχεσθε ὑπὲρ τῶν

The same idea is continued in the next chapter, in which the following passage occurs :—

ATHENAGORAS.

For if ye love (*ἀγαπάτε*), he says, (*φησί*) them which love, and lend to them which lend to you, what reward shall ye have?¹

MATT. v. 46.

For if ye should love (*ἀγαπήσητε*) them which love you, what reward have ye?²

There is no parallel at all in the first Gospel to the phrase, “and lend to them that lend to you,” and in Luke vi. 34 the passage reads: “and if ye lend to them of whom ye hope to receive, what thank have ye?” (*καὶ ἐὰν δανίζετε παρ’ ὧν ἐλπίζετε λαβεῖν, ποία ὑμῶν χάρις ἐστίν*);. It is evident, therefore, that there are decided variations here, and that the passage of Athenagoras does not agree with either of the Synoptics. We have seen the persistent variation in the quotations from the “Sermon on the Mount” which occur in Justin,³ and there is no part of the discourses of Jesus more certain to have been preserved by living Christian tradition, or to have been recorded in every form of Gospel. The differences in these passages from our Synoptic present the same features as mark the several versions of the same discourse in our first and third Gospels, and indicate a distinct source. The same remarks also apply to the next passage :—

ATHENAGORAS.

For whosoever, he says (*φησί*), looketh on a woman to lust after her, hath committed adultery (*μεμοίχευκεν*) already in his heart.⁴

MATT. v. 28.

But I say unto you, That whosoever looketh on a woman to lust after her, hath committed adultery with her (*ἐμοίχευσεν αὐτήν*) already in his heart.⁵

The omission of *αὐτήν*, “with her,” is not accidental, but is an important variation in the sense, which we have already met with in the Gospel used by Justin Martyr.⁶ There is another passage, in the next chapter, the parallel to which follows closely on this in the great Sermon as reported in our first Gospel, to which Dr. Westcott does not refer, but which we must point out :—

διωκόντων ὑμᾶς· ὅπως γένησθε υἱοὶ τοῦ πατρὸς ὑμῶν τοῦ [ἐν οὐρανοῖς, ὅτι τὸν ἥλιον αὐτοῦ ἀνατέλλει, κ.τ.λ. Matt. v. 44, 45.

¹ *Ἐὰν γὰρ ἀγαπάτε, φησὶν, τοὺς ἀγαπῶντας, καὶ δανείζετε τοῖς δανείζουσιν ὑμῶν, τίνα μισθὸν ἔχετε. Leg. pro Chr., § 12.*

² *Ἐὰν γὰρ ἀγαπήσητε τοὺς ἀγαπῶντας ὑμᾶς, τίνα μισθὸν ἔχετε. Matt. v. 46.*

³ Justin likewise has *ἀγαπάτε* for *ἀγαπήσητε* in this passage.

⁴ *Ὁ γὰρ βλέπων, φησὶ, γυναῖκα πρὸς τὸ ἐπιθυμῆσαι αὐτῆς, ἤδη μεμοίχευκεν ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ αὐτοῦ. Leg. pro Chr., § 32.*

⁵ *Ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι πᾶς ὁ βλέπων γυναῖκα πρὸς τὸ ἐπιθυμῆσαι αὐτήν ἤδη ἐμοίχευσεν αὐτήν ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ αὐτοῦ.*

⁶ *Apol., i. 15.*

ATHENAGORAS.

For whosoever, he says (*φησί*), shall put away his wife and marry another committeth adultery.¹

MATT. V. 32.

But I say unto you, That whosoever shall put away his wife, saving for the cause of fornication, causeth her to commit adultery: and whosoever shall marry her when divorced committeth adultery.²

It is evident that the passage in the Apology is quite different from that in the "Sermon on the Mount" in the first Synoptic. If we compare it with Matt. xix. 9, there still remains the express limitation *μὴ ἐπὶ πορνείᾳ*, which Athenagoras does not admit, his own express doctrine being in accordance with the positive declaration in his text. In the immediate context, indeed, he insists that even to marry another wife after the death of the first is cloaked adultery. We find in Luke xvi. 18 the reading of Athenagoras,³ but with important linguistic variation:—

ATHENAGORAS.

Ὁς γὰρ ἂν ἀπολύσῃ τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ, καὶ γαμήσῃ ἄλλην μοιχᾶται.

LUKE. XVI. 18.

Πᾶς ὁ ἀπολύων τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ καὶ γαμῶν ἑτέραν μοιχεύει.

It cannot, obviously, be rightly affirmed that Athenagoras must have derived this from Luke, and the sense of the passage in that Gospel, compared with the passage in Matt. xix. 9, on the contrary, rather makes it certain that the reading of Athenagoras was derived from a source combining the language of the one and the thought of the other. In Mark x. 11 the reading is nearer that of Athenagoras, and confirms this conclusion; and the addition there of *ἐπ' αὐτήν*, "against her," after *μοιχᾶται*, further tends to prove that his source was not that Gospel.

We may at once give the last passage which is supposed to be a quotation from our Synoptics, and it is that which is affirmed to be a reference to Mark. Athenagoras states in almost immediate context with the above: "for in the beginning God formed one man and one woman."⁴ This is compared with Mark x. 6: "But from the beginning of the creation God made them male and female":—

ATHENAGORAS.

Ὅτι ἐν ἀρχῇ ὁ Θεὸς ἓνα ἄνδρα ἐπλασε καὶ μίαν γυναῖκα.

MARK. X. 6.

Ἀπὸ δὲ ἀρχῆς κτίσεως ἄρσεν καὶ θῆλυ ἐποίησεν αὐτοὺς ὁ Θεός.

¹ Ὁς γὰρ ἂν ἀπολύσῃ, φησί, τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ, καὶ γαμήσῃ ἄλλην, μοιχᾶται. *Leg. pro Chr.*, § 33.

² Ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι ὅς ἂν ἀπολύσῃ τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ παρεκτὸς λόγου πορνείας ποιεῖ αὐτὴν μοιχευθῆναι, καὶ ὅς ἂν ἀπολελυμένην γαμήσῃ, μοιχᾶται. Matt. v. 32. πᾶς ὁ ἀπολύων is the older and better reading, but we give ὅς ἂν ἀπολύσῃ as favouring the similarity.

³ Lardner, indeed, points to the passage as a quotation from the third Gospel. *Works*, ii., p. 183.

⁴ *Leg. pro Chr.*, § 33.

This passage differs materially in every way from the second Synoptic. The reference to "one man" and "one woman" is used in a totally different sense, and enforces the previous assertion that a man may only marry one wife. Such an argument, directly derived from the Old Testament, is perfectly natural to one who, like Athenagoras, derived his authority from it alone. It is not permissible to claim it as evidence of the use of Mark.

We must repeat that Athenagoras does not name any source from which he derives his knowledge of the sayings of Jesus. These sayings are all from the Sermon on the Mount, and are introduced by the indefinite phrase *φησί*; and it is remarkable that all differ distinctly from the parallels in our Gospels. The whole must be taken together as coming from one source, and while the decided variation excludes the inference that they must have been taken from our Gospels, there is reasonable ground for assigning them to a different source. Dr. Donaldson states the case with great fairness: "Athenagoras makes no allusion to the inspiration of any of the New Testament writers. He does not mention one of them by name, and one cannot be sure that he quotes from any except Paul. All the passages taken from the Gospels are parts of our Lord's discourses, and may have come down to Athenagoras by tradition."¹ He should have added that they might also have been derived from the Gospel according to the Hebrews, or many other collections now unhappily lost.

One circumstance strongly confirming this conclusion is the fact already mentioned, that Athenagoras, in the same chapter in which one of these quotations occurs, introduces an apocryphal saying of the Logos, and connects it with previous sayings by the expression, "The Logos *again* (*πάλιν*) saying to us." This can only refer to the sayings previously introduced by the indefinite *φησί*. The sentence, which is in reference to the Christian salutation of peace, is as follows: "The Logos again saying to us: 'If any one for this reason kiss a second time because it pleased him (he sins)'; and adding: 'Thus the kiss, or rather the salutation, must be used with caution, as, if it be defiled even a little by thought, it excludes us from the life eternal.'"² This saying, which is directly attributed to the Logos, is not found in our Gospels. The only natural deduction is that it comes from the same source as the other sayings, and that source was not our synoptic Gospels.

The total absence of any allusion to New Testament Scriptures

¹ *Hist. Chr. Lit. and Doctr.*, iii., p. 172. De Wette says regarding Athenagoras: "The quotations of evangelical passages prove nothing" (*Einl. A. T.*, 1852, p. 25).

² *Leg. pro Chr.*, § 32.

in Athenagoras, however, is rendered more striking and significant by the marked expression of his belief in the inspiration of the Old Testament. He appeals to the prophets for testimony as to the truth of the opinions of Christians—men, he says, who spoke by the inspiration of God, whose Spirit moved their mouths to express God's will as musical instruments are played upon:¹ "But since the voices of the prophets support our arguments, I think that you, being most learned and wise, cannot be ignorant of the writings of Moses, or of those of Isaiah and Jeremiah and of the other prophets, who, being raised in ecstasy above the reasoning that was in themselves, uttered the things which were wrought in them, when the Divine Spirit moved them, the Spirit using them as a flute-player would blow into the flute."² He thus enunciates the theory of the mechanical inspiration of the writers of the Old Testament in the clearest manner, and it would, indeed, have been strange, on the supposition that he extended his views of inspiration to any of the Scriptures of the New Testament, that he never names a single one of them, nor indicates to the Emperors in the same way, as worthy of their attention, any of these Scriptures along with the Law and the Prophets. There can be no doubt that he nowhere gives reason for supposing that he regarded any other writings than the Old Testament as inspired or "Holy Scripture."³

In the seventeenth year of the reign of Marcus Aurelius, between the 7th March, 177–178, a fierce persecution was, it is said,⁴ commenced against the Christians in Gaul, and more especially at Vienne and Lyons, during the course of which the aged Bishop Pothinus, the predecessor of Irenæus, suffered martyrdom for the faith. The two communities some time after addressed an Epistle to their brethren in Asia and Phrygia, and also to Eleutherus, Bishop of Rome,⁵ relating the events which had occurred, and the noble testimony which had been borne to Christ by the numerous martyrs who had been cruelly put to death. The Epistle has in great part been preserved by Eusebius,⁶ and critics generally agree in dating it about A.D. 177, although it was most probably not written until the following year.⁷

No writing of the New Testament is mentioned in this Epistle, but it is asserted that there are "unequivocal coincidences of language"⁸ with the Gospel of Luke, and others of its books.

¹ *Leg. pro Chr.*, § 7.

² *Ib.*, § 9.

³ In the treatise on the Resurrection there are no arguments derived from Scripture.

⁴ Eusebius, *H. E.*, v. *Proem.*

⁵ *Ib.*, v. 3.

⁶ *Ib.*, v. 11.

⁷ Baronius dates the death of Pothinus in A.D. 179; Valesius, *ad Euseb.*, *H. E.*, v. 5.

⁸ Westcott, *On the Canon*, p. 295.

The passage which is referred to as showing knowledge of our Synoptic is as follows. The letter speaks of one of the sufferers, a certain Vettius Epagathus, whose life was so austere that, although a young man, "he was thought worthy of the testimony (*μαρτυρία*) borne by the elder (*πρεσβυτέρου*) Zacharias. He had walked, of a truth, in all the commandments and ordinances of the Lord blameless, and was untiring in every kind office towards his neighbour; having much zeal for God and being fervent in spirit."¹ This is compared with the description of Zacharias and Elizabeth in Luke i. 6: "And they were both righteous before God, walking in all the commandments and ordinances of the Lord blameless."² A little further on in the Epistle it is said of the same person: "Having in himself the advocate (*παράκλητον*), the spirit (*τὸ πνεῦμα*), more abundantly than Zacharias," etc.,³ which again is referred to Luke i. 67, "And his father Zacharias was filled with the Holy Spirit and prophesied, saying," &c.⁴

A few words must be said regarding the phrase, *τῆ τοῦ πρεσβυτέρου Ζαχαρίου μαρτυρία*, "the testimony of the presbyter Zacharias." This, of course, may either be rendered: "the testimony borne to Zacharias," that is to say, borne by others to his holy life; or, "the testimony borne by Zacharias," his own testimony to the Faith: his martyrdom. We adopt the latter rendering for various reasons. The Epistle is an account of the persecution of the Christian community of Vienne and Lyons, and Vettius Epagathus is the first of the martyrs who is named in it: *μαρτυρία* was at that time the term used to express the supreme testimony of Christians—martyrdom, and the Epistle seems here simply to refer to the martyrdom, the honour of which he shared with Zacharias. It is, we think, very improbable that under such circumstances the word *μαρτυρία* would have been used to express a mere description of the character of Zacharias given by some other writer. The interpretation which we prefer is that adopted by Tischendorf.⁵ We must add that the Zacharias here spoken of is generally understood to be the father of John the Baptist,

¹συνεξισοῦσθαι τῆ τοῦ πρεσβυτέρου Ζαχαρίου μαρτυρία· πεπόρευτο γοῦν ἐν πάσαις ταῖς ἐντολαῖς καὶ δικαιώμασι τοῦ Κυρίου ἄμεμπτος, καὶ πάσῃ τῇ πρὸς τὸν πλησίον λειτουργίᾳ ἄοκνος, ζῆλον Θεοῦ πολὺν ἔχων, καὶ ζέων τῷ πνεύματι, κ.τ.λ. Euseb., *H. E.*, v. 1.

² ἦσαν δὲ δίκαιοι ἀμφοτέρωθεν ἐνώπιον τοῦ Θεοῦ, πορευόμενοι ἐν πάσαις ταῖς ἐντολαῖς καὶ δικαιώμασιν τοῦ κυρίου ἄμεμπτοι. Luke i. 6.

³ ἔχων δὲ τὸν παράκλητον ἐν ἑαυτῷ, τὸ πνεῦμα πλεῖον τοῦ Ζαχαρίου. Euseb., *H. E.*, v. 1.

⁴ Καὶ Ζαχαρίας ὁ πατὴρ αὐτοῦ ἐπλήσθη πνεύματος ἁγίου καὶ ἐπροφήτευσεν λέγων, κ.τ.λ. Luke i. 67.

⁵ *Wann wurden*, u. s. w., p. 80, n. 1. See also Hilgenfeld, *Die Evv. Justin's*, p. 155, and others.

and no critic, so far as we can remember, has suggested that the reference in Luke xi. 51 applies to him.¹ Since the Epistle, therefore, refers to the martyrdom of Zacharias, the father of John the Baptist, when using the expressions which are supposed to be taken from our third Synoptic, is it not reasonable to suppose that those expressions were derived from some work which likewise contained an account of his death, which is not found in the Synoptic? When we examine the matter more closely, we find that, although none of the Canonical Gospels, except the third, gives any narrative of the birth of John the Baptist, that portion of the Gospel in which are the words we are discussing cannot be considered an original production by the third Synoptist, but, like the rest of his work, is merely a composition, based upon earlier written narratives. Ewald, for instance, assigns the whole of the first chapters of Luke (i. 5–ii. 40) to what he terms “the eighth recognisable book.”²

However this may be, the fact that other works existed at an earlier period in which the history of Zacharias the father of the Baptist was given, and in which not only the words used in the Epistle were found but also the martyrdom, is in the highest degree probable; and, so far as the history is concerned, this is placed almost beyond doubt by the *Protevangelium Jacobi* which contains it. Tischendorf, who does not make use of this Epistle at all as evidence for the Scriptures of the New Testament, does refer to it, and to this very allusion in it to the martyrdom of Zacharias, as testimony to the existence and use of the *Protevangelium Jacobi*, a work whose origin he dates so far back as the first three decades of the second century,³ and which he considers was also used by Justin, as Hilgenfeld had already observed.⁴ Tischendorf and Hilgenfeld, therefore, agree in affirming that the reference to Zacharias which we have quoted indicates acquaintance with a different Gospel from our third Synoptic. Hilgenfeld rightly maintains that the *Protevangelium Jacobi* in its present shape is merely an altered form of an older work,⁵ which he conjectures to have been the Gospel according to Peter, or the Gnostic work, *Γέννα Μαρίας*,⁶ and both he and Tischendorf show that many of the Fathers⁷ were either acquainted with

¹ The great majority of critics consider it a reference to 2 Chron. xxiv. 21, though some apply it to a later Zacharias.

² *Die drei erst. Ewv.*, p. 97 f.

³ *Wann wurden, u. s. w.*, p. 76 ff., 80, anm. 1; cf. *Evang. Apocr. Proleg.*, p. xii. f.

⁴ *Wann wurden, u. s. w.*, p. 76 f., p. 80, anm. 1; Hilgenfeld, *Die Ewv. Justin's*, p. 154 f.

⁵ *Die Ewv. Justin's*, p. 154 f.

⁶ *Ib.*, p. 160 f.

⁷ Tischendorf, *Wann wurden, u. s. w.*, p. 76 ff.; cf. *Evang. Apocr. Proleg.*, p. xii. f.; Hilgenfeld, *Die Ewv. J.*, p. 154 f.

the Protevangelium itself or the works on which it was based.

The state of the case, then, is as follows : We find a coincidence in a few words in connection with Zacharias between the Epistle and our third Gospel ; but, so far from the Gospel being in any way indicated as their source, the words in question are connected with a reference to events unknown to our Gospel, but which were indubitably chronicled elsewhere. As part of the passage in the epistle, therefore, could not have been derived from our third Synoptic, the natural inference is that the whole emanates from a Gospel, different from ours, which likewise contained that part. In any case, the agreement of these few words, without the slightest mention of the third Synoptic in the epistle, cannot be admitted as proof that they must necessarily have been derived from it, and from no other source.

CHAPTER X.

PTOLEMÆUS AND HERACLEON—CELSUS—THE CANON OF MURATORI—RESULTS

WE have now reached the extreme limit of time within which we think it in any degree worth while to seek for evidence as to the date and authorship of the Synoptics, and we might now proceed to the fourth Gospel; but before doing so it may be well to examine one or two other witnesses whose support has been claimed by apologists, although our attention may be chiefly confined to an inquiry into the date of such testimony, upon which its value, even if real, mainly depends so far as we are concerned. The first of these whom we must notice are the two Gnostic leaders, Ptolemæus and Heracleon.

Epiphanius has preserved a certain "Epistle to Flora" ascribed to Ptolemæus, in which, it is contended, there are "several quotations from Matthew, and one from the first chapter of John."¹ What date must be assigned to this Epistle? In reply to those who date it about the end of the second century, Tischendorf produces the evidence for an earlier period to which he assigns it. He says: "He (Ptolemæus) appears in all the oldest sources as one of the most important, most influential of the disciples of Valentinus. As the period at which the latter himself flourished falls about 140, do we say too much when we represent Ptolemæus as working at the latest about 160; Irenæus (in the 2nd Book) and Hippolytus name him together with Heracleon; likewise pseudo-Tertullian (in the appendix to *De Præscriptionibus Hæreticorum*) and Philastrius make him appear immediately after Valentinus. Irenæus wrote the first and second books of his great work most probably before 180, and in both he occupies himself much with Ptolemæus."² Dr. Westcott, beyond calling Ptolemæus and Heracleon disciples of Valentinus, does not assign any date to either, and does not, of course, offer any further evidence on the point, although, in regard to Heracleon, he admits the ignorance in which we are as to all points of his history,³ and states generally, in treating of him, that "the exact chronology of the early heretics is very uncertain."⁴

¹ Tischendorf, *Wann wurden*, u. s. w., p. 46. Dr. Westcott, with greater caution, says: "He quoted words of our Lord recorded by St. Matthew, the prologue of St. John's Gospel, etc." (*On the Canon*, p. 267).

² *Wann wurden*, u. s. w., p. 46 f.

³ *On the Canon*, p. 263.

⁴ *Ib.*, p. 264, note 2.

Let us examine the evidence upon which Tischendorf relies for the date he assigns to Ptolemæus. He states in vague terms that Ptolemæus appears "in all the oldest sources" (*in allen den ältesten Quellen*) as one of the most important disciples of Valentinus. We shall presently see what these sources are, but must now follow the argument: "As the date of Valentinus falls about 140, do we say too much when we represent Ptolemæus as working at the latest about 160?" It is obvious that there is no evidence here, but merely assumption, and the manner in which the period "about 160" is begged is a clear admission that there are no certain data. The year might with equal propriety upon those grounds have been put ten years earlier or ten years later. The deceptive and arbitrary character of the conclusion, however, will be more apparent when we examine the grounds upon which the relative dates 140 and 160 rest. Tischendorf here states that the time at which Valentinus flourished falls about A.D. 140, but the fact is that, as all critics are agreed, and as even Tischendorf himself elsewhere states,¹ Valentinus came out of Egypt to Rome in that year, when his public career practically commenced, and he continued to flourish for at least twenty years after.² Tischendorf's pretended moderation, therefore, consists in dating the period when Valentinus flourished from the very year of his first appearance, and in assigning the active career of Ptolemæus to 160, when Valentinus was still alive and teaching. He might on the same principle be dated 180, and even in that case there could be no reason for ascribing the Epistle to Flora to so early a period of his career. Tischendorf never even pretends to state any ground upon which Ptolemæus must be connected with any precise part of the public life of Valentinus, and still less for determining the period of the career of Ptolemæus at which the Epistle may have been composed. It is obvious that a wide limit for date thus exists.

After these general statements Tischendorf details the only evidence which is available. (1) "Irenæus (in the 2nd Book) and Hippolytus name him together with Heracleon; likewise (2) pseudo-Tertullian (in the appendix to *De Præscriptionibus Hæreticorum*) and Philastrius make him appear immediately after Valentinus," etc. We must examine these two points a little more closely in order to ascertain the value of such statements. With regard to the first (1), we shall presently see that the mention of the name of Ptolemæus along with that of Heracleon throws no light upon the matter from any point of view,

¹ *Wann wurden, u. s. w.*, p. 43. "Valentinus, der um 140 aus Ägypten nach Rom kam und darauf noch 20 Jahre gelebt haben mag."

² Cf. Irenæus, *Adv. Hær.*, iii. 4, § 3; Eusebius, *H. E.*, iv. 11.

inasmuch as Tischendorf has as little authority for the date he assigns to the latter, and is in as complete ignorance concerning him as in the case of Ptolemæus. It is amusing, moreover, that Tischendorf employs the very same argument, which sounds well although it means nothing, inversely to establish the date of Heracleon. Here, he argues, "Irenæus and Hippolytus name him (Ptolemæus) together with Heracleon";¹ there, he reasons, "Irenæus names Heracleon together with Ptolemæus,"² etc. As neither the date assigned to the one nor to the other can stand alone, he tries to get them into something like an upright position by propping the one against the other—an expedient which, naturally, meets with little success. We shall in dealing with the case of Heracleon show how untenable is the argument from the mere order in which such names are mentioned by these writers; meantime we may simply say that Irenæus only once mentions the name of Heracleon in his works, and that the occasion on which he does so, and to which reference is here made, is merely an allusion to the Æons "of Ptolemæus himself, and of Heracleon, and all the rest who hold these views."³ This phrase might have been used, exactly as it stands, with perfect propriety even if Ptolemæus and Heracleon had been separated by a century. The only point which can be deduced from this coupling of names is that, in using the present tense, Irenæus is speaking of his own contemporaries. We may make the same remark regarding Hippolytus, for, if his mention of Ptolemæus and Heracleon has any weight at all, it is to prove that they were flourishing in his time: "Those who are of Italy, of whom *is* Heracleon and Ptolemæus, say.....,"⁴ etc. We shall have to go further into this point presently. As to (2) pseudo-Tertullian and Philastrius, we need only say that even if the fact of the names of the two Gnostics being coupled together could prove anything in regard to the date, the repetition by these writers could have no importance for us, their works being altogether based on those of Irenæus and Hippolytus,⁵ and scarcely, if at all, conveying independent information.⁶ We have merely indicated the weakness of these arguments in passing, but shall again take them up further on.

The next and final consideration advanced by Tischendorf is

¹ *Wann wurden, u. s. w.*, p. 47.

² *Ib.*, p. 48.

³ *Ipsius Ptolemæi et Heracleonis, et reliquorum omnium qui eadem opinantur* (*Adv. Hær.*, ii. 4, § 1).

⁴ *Ref. Hom. Hær.*, vi. 35.

⁵ Cf. Lipsius, *Zur Quellenkritik des Epiphanius*, 1865.

⁶ Indeed, the direct and avowed dependence of Hippolytus himself upon the work of Irenæus deprives the *Philosophumena*, in many parts, of all separate authority.

the only one which merits serious attention. "Irenæus wrote the first and second book of his great work most probably before 180, and in both he occupies himself much with Ptolemæus." Before proceeding to examine the accuracy of this statement regarding the time at which Irenæus wrote, we may ask what conclusion would be involved if Irenæus really did compose the two books in A.D. 180 in which he mentions our Gnostics in the present tense? Nothing more than the simple fact that Ptolemæus and Heracleon were promulgating their doctrines at that time. There is not a single word to show that they did not continue to flourish long after; and as to the "Epistle to Flora," Irenæus apparently knows nothing of it, nor has any attempt been made to assign it to an early part of the Gnostic's career. Tischendorf, in fact, does not produce a single passage nor the slightest argument to show that Irenæus treats our two Gnostics as men of the past, or otherwise than as heretics then actively disseminating their heterodox opinions; and, even taken literally, the argument of Tischendorf would simply go to prove that about A.D. 180 Irenæus wrote part of a work in which he attacks Ptolemæus and mentions Heracleon.

When did Irenæus, however, really write his work against Heresies? Although our sources of credible information regarding him are exceedingly limited, we are not without materials for forming a judgment on the point. Irenæus was probably born about A.D. 140-145, and is generally supposed to have died at the beginning of the third century (A.D. 202). We know that he was deputed by the Church of Lyons to bear to Eleutherus, then Bishop of Rome, the Epistle of that Christian community describing their sufferings during the persecution commenced against them in the seventeenth year of the reign of Marcus Aurelius Antoninus (7th March, 177-178).¹ It is very improbable that this journey was undertaken, in any case, before the spring of A.D. 178, and, indeed, in accordance with the given data, the persecution itself may not have commenced earlier than the beginning of that year, so that his journey need not have been undertaken before the close of 178 or the spring of 179, to which epoch other circumstances might lead us.² There is reason to believe that he remained some time in Rome. Baronius states that Irenæus was not appointed Bishop of Lyons till A.D. 180, for he says that the see remained vacant for that period after the death of Pothinus in consequence of the persecution. Now, certain expressions in his work show that Irenæus did not write it until he became Bishop.³ It is not known how long Irenæus

¹ Eusebius, *H. E.*, v. 1, *Præf.*; § 1, 3, 4.

² Baronius (*Ann. Eccles.*) sets the death of Pothinus in A.D. 179.

³ Cf. *Adv. Hær.*, v. *Præf.*; Massuet, *Dissert. in Iren.*, ii., art. ii., § 49; Lardner, *Works*, ii., p. 157.

remained in Rome, but there is every probability that he must have made a somewhat protracted stay for the purpose of making himself acquainted with the various tenets of Gnostic and other heretics then being actively taught, and the preface to the first book refers to the pains he took. He wrote his work in Gaul, however, after his return from this visit to Rome. This is apparent from what he himself states in the Preface to the first Book: "I have thought it necessary," he says, "after having read the Memoirs (*ὑπομνήμασι*) of the disciples of Valentinus, as they call themselves, and *having had personal intercourse with some of them* and acquired full knowledge of their opinions, to unfold to thee,"¹ etc. A little further on he claims from the friend to whom he addresses his work indulgence for any defects of style on the score of his being resident amongst the Keltæ.² Irenæus no doubt, during his stay in Rome, came in contact with the school of Ptolemæus and Heracleon, if not with the Gnostic leaders themselves and, being shocked, as he describes himself, at the doctrines which they insidiously taught, he undertook, on his return to Lyons, to explain them that others might be exhorted to avoid such an "abyss of madness and blasphemy against Christ."³ Irenæus gives us other materials for assigning a date to his work. In the third Book he enumerates the bishops who had filled the Episcopal Chair of Rome, and the last whom he names is Eleutherus (A.D. 177-190), who, he says, "now in the twelfth place from the apostles, holds the inheritance of the episcopate."⁴ There is, however, another clue which, taken along with this, leads us to a close approximation to the actual date. In the same Book, Irenæus mentions Theodotion's version of the Old Testament: "But not as some of those say," he writes, "who now (*νῦν*) presume to alter the interpretation of the Scripture: 'Behold the young woman shall conceive, and bring forth a son,' as Theodotion, the Ephesian, translated it, and Aquila of Pontus, both Jewish proselytes."⁵ Now we are informed by Epiphanius that Theodotion published his translation during the reign of the Emperor Commodus⁶ (A.D. 180-192). The *Chronicon Paschale* adds that it was during the Consulship of Marcellus, or, as Massuet⁷ proposes to read, Marullus, who, jointly with Ælianus, assumed office A.D. 184. These dates decidedly agree with the passage of Irenæus and with the other data, all of which lead us to about the same period within the episcopate of Eleutherus

¹ *Adv. Hær.*, i. *Pref.*, § 2 (see the passage quoted, p. 332 f.).

² *Ib.*, § 3.

³ *Ib.*, § 2.

⁴ *Adv. Hær.*, iii. 3, § 3; Eusebius, *H. E.*, v. 6.

⁵ *Adv. Hær.*, iii. 21, § 1; Euseb., *H. E.*, v. 8.

⁶ *De Ponderib. et Mens.*, 17.

⁷ *Dissert. in Iren.*, ii., art. ii. xcvi., § 47.

(† c. 190).¹ We have here, therefore, a clue to the date at which Irenæus wrote. It must be remembered that at that period the multiplication and dissemination of books was a very slow process. A work published about 184 or 185 could scarcely have come into the possession of Irenæus in Gaul till some years later, and we are, therefore, brought towards the end of the episcopate of Eleutherus as the earliest date at which the first three books of his work against Heresies can well have been written, and the rest must be assigned to a later period under the episcopate of Victor († 198-199).²

At this point we must pause and turn to the evidence which Tischendorf offers regarding the date to be assigned to Heracleon.³ As in the case of Ptolemæus, we shall give it entire, and then examine it in detail. To the all-important question, "How old is Heracleon?" Tischendorf replies: "Irenæus names Heracleon, together with Ptolemæus (II. 4, § 1), in a way which makes them appear as well-known representatives of the Valentinian school. This interpretation of his words is all the more authorised because he never again mentions Heracleon. Clement, in the 4th Book of his *Stromata*, written shortly after the death of Commodus (193), recalls an explanation by Heracleon of Luke xii. 8, when he calls him the most noted man of the Valentinian school (ὁ τῆς Οὐαλεντίνου σχολῆς δοκιμώτατος is Clement's expression). Origen, at the beginning of his quotation from Heracleon, says that he was held to be a friend of Valentinus (τὸν Οὐαλεντίνου λεγόμενον εἶναι γνώριμον Ἡρακλέωνα). Hippolytus mentions him, for instance, in the following way (vi. 29): 'Valentinus, and Heracleon, and Ptolemæus, and the whole school of these, disciples of Pythagoras and Plato.....' Epiphanius says (*Hær.* 41): 'Cerdo (the same who, according

¹ Cf. Credner, *Beiträge*, ii., p. 253 f.; De Wette, *Einl. A. T.*, 1852, p. 61 f., p. 62, anm. d.; Lardner, "He also speaks of the translation of Theodotion, which is generally allowed to have been published in the reign of Commodus." *Works*, ii., p. 156 f.; Massuet, *Dissert. in Iren.*, ii., art. ii. xcvi., § 47.

² Massuet, *Dissert. in Iren.*, ii., art. ii. xcvi. (§ 47), xcix. (§ 50); Volkmar, *Der Ursprung*, p. 24; cf. De Wette, *Einl. A. T.*, p. 62, anm. d. ("Er schrieb zw., 177-192"); cf. Credner, *Beiträge*, ii., p. 255. The late Dr. Mansel places the work "between A.D. 182-188." *The Gnostic Heresies*, p. 240. This date is partly based upon the mention of Eleutherus (cf. p. 240, note 2), which, it must be remembered, however, occurs in the third book. Jerome says: "*Hoc ille scripsit ante annos circiter trecentos*" (*Epist. ad Theod.*, § 53, al. 29). If, instead of "*trecentos*," which is an evident slip of the pen, we read "*ducentos*," his testimony as to the date exactly agrees.

³ Dr. Westcott adds no separate testimony. He admits that "The history of Heracleon, the great Valentinian commentator, is full of uncertainty. Nothing is known of his country or parentage" (*On the Canon*, p. 263). And in a note, "The exact chronology of the early heretics is very uncertain" (p. 264, note 2).

to Irenæus III. 4, § 3, was in Rome under Bishop Hyginus with Valentinus) follows these (Ophites, Kainities, Sethiani), and Heracleon.' After all this, Heracleon certainly cannot be placed later than 150 to 160. The expression which Origen uses regarding his relation to Valentinus must, according to linguistic usage, be understood of a personal relation."¹

We have already pointed out that the fact that the names of Ptolemæus and Heracleon are thus coupled together affords no clue in itself to the date of either, and their being mentioned as leading representatives of the school of Valentinus does not in any way involve the inference that they were not contemporaries of Irenæus, living and working at the time he wrote. The way in which Irenæus mentions them in this the only passage throughout his whole work in which he names Heracleon, and to which Tischendorf pointedly refers, is as follows: "But if it was not produced, but was generated by itself, then that which is void is both like, and brother to, and of the same honour with, that Father who has before been mentioned by Valentinus; but it is really more ancient, having existed long before, and is more exalted than the rest of the Æons of Ptolemæus himself, and of Heracleon, and all the rest who hold these views."² We fail to recognise anything special here, of the kind inferred by Tischendorf, in the way in which mention is made of the two later Gnostics. If anything be clear, on the contrary, it is that distinction is drawn between Valentinus and Ptolemæus and Heracleon, and that Irenæus points out inconsistencies between the doctrines of the founder and those of his later followers. It is quite irrelevant to insist merely, as Tischendorf does, that Irenæus and subsequent writers represent Ptolemæus and Heracleon and other Gnostics of his time as of "the school" of Valentinus. The question simply is, whether in doing so they at all imply that these men were not contemporaries of Irenæus, or necessarily assign their period of independent activity to the lifetime of Valentinus, as Tischendorf appears to argue? Most certainly not, and Tischendorf does not attempt to offer any evidence that they do so. We may perceive how utterly worthless such a fact is for the purpose of fixing an early date by merely considering the quotation which Tischendorf himself makes from Hippolytus: "Valentinus, therefore, and Heracleon and Ptolemæus, and the whole school of these, disciples

¹ *Wann wurden, u. s. w.*, p. 48 .

² *Si autem non prolatum est, sed a se generatum est; et simile est, et frater-num, et ejusdem honoris id quod est vacuum, ei Patri qui prædictus est a Valentino: antiquius autem et multo ante existens, et honorificentius reliquis Æonibus ipsius Ptolemæi et Heracleonis, et reliquorum omnium qui eadem opinantur (Adv. Hær., ii. 4, § 1).*

of Pythagoras and Plato....."¹ If the statement that men are of a certain school involves the supposition of coincidence of time, the three Gnostic leaders must be considered contemporaries of Pythagoras or Plato, whose disciples they are said to be. Again, if the order in which names are mentioned, as Tischendorf contends by inference throughout his whole argument, is to involve strict similar sequence of date, the principle applied to the whole of the early writers would lead to the most ridiculous confusion. Tischendorf quotes Epiphanius: "Cerdo follows these (the Ophites, Kainites, Sethiani), and Heracleon." Why he does so it is difficult to understand, unless it be to give the appearance of multiplying testimonies, for two sentences further on he is obliged to admit: "Epiphanius has certainly made a mistake, as in such things not unfrequently happens to him, when he makes Cerdo, who, however, is to be placed about 140, follow Heracleon."² This kind of mistake is, indeed, common to all the writers quoted, and when it is remembered that such an error is committed where a distinct and deliberate affirmation of the point is concerned, it will easily be conceived how little dependence is to be placed on the mere mention of names in the course of argument. We find Irenæus saying that "neither Valentinus, nor Marcion, nor Saturninus, nor Basilides" possesses certain knowledge,³ and elsewhere: "of such an one as Valentinus, or Ptolemæus, or Basilides."⁴ To base an argument as to date on the order in which names appear in such writers is preposterous.

Tischendorf draws an inference from the statement that Heracleon was said to be a *γνώριμος* of Valentinus, that Origen declares him to have been his friend, holding personal intercourse with him. Origen, however, evidently knew nothing individually on the point, and speaks from mere hearsay, guardedly using the expression "said to be" (*λεγόμενον εἶναι γνώριμον*). But according to the later and patristic use of the word, *γνώριμος* meant nothing more than a "disciple," and it cannot here be necessarily interpreted into a "contemporary." Under no circumstances could such a phrase, avowedly limited to hearsay, have any weight. The loose manner in which the Fathers repeat each other, even in serious matters, is too well known to every one acquainted with their writings to require any remark. Their inaccuracy keeps pace with their want of critical judgment. We

¹ *Ref. Omn. Her.*, vi. 29.

² *Wann wurden, u. s. w.*, p. 49. We do not here enter into the discussion of the nature of this error (see Volkmar, *Der Ursprung*, p. 129 f.; Scholten, *Die ält. Zeugnisse*, p. 91; Riggerbach, *Die Zeugn. f. d. Ev. Johan.*, 1866, p. 79).

³ *Adv. Her.*, ii. 28, § 6.

⁴ *Ib.*, ii. 28, § 9.

have seen one of the mistakes of Epiphanius, admitted by Tischendorf to be only too common with him, which illustrates how little such data are to be relied on. We may point out another of the same kind committed by him in common with Hippolytus, pseudo-Tertullian, and Philastrius. Mistaking a passage of Irenæus¹ regarding the sacred Tetrads (Kol-Arbas) of the Valentinian Gnosis, Hippolytus supposes Irenæus to refer to another heretic leader. He at once treats the Tetrads as such a leader named "Kolarbasus," and after dealing (vi. 4) with the doctrines of Secundus, Ptolemæus, and Heracleon, he proposes, § 5, to show "what are the opinions held by Marcus and Kolarbasus."² At the end of the same book he declares that Irenæus, to whom he states that he is indebted for a knowledge of their inventions, has completely refuted the opinions of these heretics, and he proceeds to treat of Basilides, considering that it has been sufficiently demonstrated "whose disciples are Marcus and Kolarbasus, the successors of the school of Valentinus."³ At an earlier part of the work, he had spoken in a more independent way in reference to certain persons who had promulgated great heresies: "Of these," he says, "one is Kolarbasus, who endeavours to explain religion by measures and numbers."⁴ The same mistake is committed by pseudo-Tertullian⁵ and Philastrius,⁶ each of whom devotes a chapter to this supposed heretic. Epiphanius, as might have been expected, fell into the same error, and he proceeds elaborately to refute the heresy of the Kolarbasians, "which is Heresy XV." He states that Kolarbasus follows Marcus and Ptolemæus,⁷ and after discussing the opinions of this mythical heretic he devotes the next chapter, "which is Heresy XVI.," to the Heracleonites, commencing it with the information that "A certain Heracleon follows after Kolarbasus."⁸ This absurd mistake⁹ shows how little these writers knew of the Gnostics of whom they wrote, and how the one ignorantly follows the other.

The order, moreover, in which they set the heretic leaders varies considerably. It will be sufficient for us merely to remark

¹ *Adv. Hær.*, i. 14.

² *Ref. Omn. Hær.*, vi., § 5. There can be no doubt that a chapter on Kolarbasus is omitted from the MS. of Hippolytus which we possess. Cf. Bunsen, *Hippolytus u. s. Zeit*, 1852, p. 54 f.

³ *Ref. Omn. Hær.*, vi., § 55.

⁴ Ὁν εἰς μὲν Κολάρβασος, ὃς διὰ μέτρων καὶ ἀριθμῶν ἐκτίθεσθαι θεοσέβειαν ἐπιχειρεῖ. *Ref. Omn. Hær.*, iv., § 13.

⁵ *Hær.*, 15.

⁶ *Ib.*, 43.

⁷ *Ib.*, xxxv., § 1, p. 258.

⁸ *Hær.*, xxxvi., § 1, p. 262.

⁹ Volkmar, *Die Kolarbasus-gnosis in Niedner's Zeitschr. hist. Theol.*, 1855; *Der Ursprung*, p. 128 f.; Baur, *K.G. d. drei erst. Jahrh.*, p. 204; anm. 1; Lipsius, *Der Gnosticismus*, in *Ersch. u. Gruber's Real. Encykl.*; *Zur Quellenkritik des Epiph.*, p. 166 f., 168 f.; Scholten, *Die ält. Zeugnisse*, p. 91.

here that while pseudo-Tertullian¹ and Philastrius² adopt the following order after the Valentinians: Ptolemæus, Secundus, Heracleon, Marcus, and Kolarbasus; Epiphanius³ places them: Secundus, Ptolemæus, Marcosians, Kolarbasus, and Heracleon; and Hippolytus⁴ again: Secundus, Ptolemæus, Heracleon, Marcus, and Kolarbasus. The vagueness of Irenæus had left some latitude here, and his followers were uncertain. The somewhat singular fact that Irenæus only once mentions Heracleon, whilst he so constantly refers to Ptolemæus, taken in connection with this order, in which Heracleon is always placed after Ptolemæus,⁵ and by Epiphanius after Marcus, may be reasonably explained by the fact that, whilst Ptolemæus had already gained considerable notoriety when Irenæus wrote, Heracleon may only have begun to come into notice. Since Tischendorf lays so much stress upon pseudo-Tertullian and Philastrius making Ptolemæus appear immediately after Valentinus, this explanation is after his own principles.

We have already pointed out that there is not a single passage in Irenæus, or any other early writer, assigning Ptolemæus and Heracleon to a period anterior to the time when Irenæus undertook to refute their opinions. Indeed, Tischendorf has not attempted to show that they do, and he has merely, on the strength of the general expression that these Gnostics were of the school of Valentinus, boldly assigned to them an early date. Now, as we have stated, he himself admits that Valentinus only came from Egypt to Rome in A.D. 140, and continued teaching till 160,⁶ and these dates are most clearly given by Irenæus himself.⁷ Why, then, should Ptolemæus and Heracleon, to take an extreme case, not have known Valentinus in their youth, and yet have flourished chiefly during the last two decades of the second century? Irenæus himself may be cited as a parallel case, which Tischendorf at least cannot gainsay. He is never tired of telling us that Irenæus was the disciple of Polycarp,⁸ whose martyrdom he sets about A.D. 165; and he considers that the intercourse of Irenæus with the aged Father must properly be put about A.D. 150,⁹ yet he himself dates the death of Irenæus A.D. 202,¹⁰ and nothing is more certain than that the period of his greatest activity and influence falls precisely in the last twenty years of the second century. Upon his own data, therefore, that Valentinus may have taught for

¹ *Hær.*, 13 f.² *Ib.*, 39 f.³ *Ib.*, 32 f.⁴ *Ref. Omn. Hær.*, vi., § 3, 4, 5.⁵ Tertullian also makes Heracleon follow Ptolemæus (*Adv. Val.*, 4).⁶ *Wann wurden*, u. s. w., p. 43.⁷ *Adv. Hær.*, iii. 4, § 3; Euseb., *H. E.*, iv. 11.⁸ *Wann wurden*, u. s. w., p. 25, p. 11.⁹ *Ib.*, p. 12. Compare, however, p. 175 f.¹⁰ *Ib.*, p. 11 f.

twenty years after his first appearance in Rome A.D. 140—and there is no ground whatever for asserting that he did not teach for even a much longer period—Ptolemæus and Heracleon might well have personally sat at the feet of Valentinus in their youth, as Irenæus is said to have done about the very same period at the feet of Polycarp, and yet, like him, have flourished chiefly towards the end of the century.

Although there is not the slightest ground for asserting that Ptolemæus and Heracleon were not contemporaries with Irenæus, flourishing like him towards the end of the second century, there are, on the other hand, many circumstances which altogether establish the conclusion that they were. We have already shown, in treating of Valentinus,¹ that Irenæus principally directs his work against the followers of Valentinus living at the time he wrote, and notably of Ptolemæus and his school.² In the preface to the first book, having stated that he writes after personal intercourse with some of the disciples of Valentinus,³ he more definitely declares his purpose: “We will, then, to the best of our ability, clearly and concisely set forth the opinions of those who are *now* (*vûv*) teaching heresy, *I speak particularly of the disciples of Ptolemæus* (*τῶν περὶ Πτολεμαίου*), whose system is an offshoot from the school of Valentinus.”⁴ Nothing could be more explicit. Irenæus in this passage distinctly represents Ptolemæus as teaching at the time he is writing, and this statement alone is decisive, more especially as there is not a single known fact which is either directly or indirectly opposed to it.

Tischendorf lays much stress on the evidence of Hippolytus in coupling together the names of Ptolemæus and Heracleon with that of Valentinus; similar testimony of the same writer, fully confirming the above statement of Irenæus, will, therefore, have the greater force. Hippolytus says that the Valentinians differed materially among themselves regarding certain points which led to divisions, one party being called the Oriental and the other the Italian. “They of the Italian party, of whom *is* Heracleon and Ptolemæus, *say*, etc.....They, however, who are of the Oriental party, of whom *is* Axionicus and Bardesanes, maintain,” etc.⁵ Now, Ptolemæus and Heracleon are here quite clearly represented as being contemporary with Axionicus and Bardesanes, and, without discussing whether Hippolytus does not, in continuation, describe them as all living at the time he wrote,⁶ there can be no

¹ P. 332 f.

² Dr. Westcott admits this (*On the Canon*, p. 266 f.).

³ See passage quoted, p. 332 f.

⁴ *Adv. Hær.*, i., *Præf.*, § 2.

⁵ *Ref. Omn. Hær.*, vi. 35.

⁶ Tischendorf did not refer to these passages at all originally, and only does so in the second and subsequent editions of his book, in reply to Volkmar and

doubt that some of them were, and that this evidence confirms again the statement of Irenæus. Hippolytus, in a subsequent part of his work, states that a certain Prepon, a Marcionite, has introduced something new, and "now, in our own time (*ἐν τοῖς καθ' ἡμᾶς χρόνοις νῦν*), has written a work regarding the heresy in reply to Bardesanes."¹ The researches of Hilgenfeld have proved that Bardesanes lived at least over the reign of Heliogabalus (218–222), and the statement of Hippolytus is thus confirmed.² Axionicus again was still flourishing when Tertullian wrote his work against the Valentinians (201–226). Tertullian says: "Axionicus of Antioch alone to the present day (*ad hodiernum*) respects the memory of Valentinus, by keeping fully the rules of his system."³ Although on the whole they may be considered to have flourished somewhat earlier, Ptolemæus and Heracleon are thus shown to have been for a time at least contemporaries of Axionicus and Bardesanes.⁴

Moreover, it is evident that the doctrines of Ptolemæus and Heracleon represent a much later form of Gnosticism than that of Valentinus. It is generally admitted that Ptolemæus reduced the system of Valentinus to consistency,⁵ and the inconsistencies which existed between the views of the Master and these later followers, and which indicate a much more advanced stage of development, are constantly pointed out by Irenæus and the Fathers who wrote in refutation of heresy. Origen also represents Heracleon as amongst those who held opinions sanctioned by the Church,⁶ and both he and Ptolemæus must indubitably be classed amongst the latest Gnostics. It is clear, therefore, that Ptolemæus and Heracleon were contemporaries of Irenæus at the time he composed his work against Heresies (185–195), both, and

others in the *Vorwort* (p. ix. f.), and in a note (p. 49, note 2). Volkmar argues from the opening of the next chapter (36), *Τὰῦτα οὖν ἐκεῖνοι ζητεῖτωσαν κατ' αὐτοὺς* (Let those heretics, therefore, discuss these points amongst themselves), that they are represented as contemporaries of Hippolytus himself at the time he wrote (A.D. 225–235), *Der Ursprung*, p. 23, p. 130 f. It is not our purpose to pursue this discussion, but, whatever may be the conclusion as regards the extreme deduction of Volkmar, there can be no doubt that the passage proves at least the date which was assigned to them against Tischendorf.

¹ *Ref. Omn. Hær.*, vii. 31.

² Hilgenfeld, *Bardesanes*, 1864, p. 11 ff.; Volkmar, *Der Ursprung*, p. 131, p. 23; Lipsius, *Zeitschr. wiss. Theol.*, 1867, p. 80 ff.; Riggenbach, *Die Zeugnisse f. d. Ev. Johannis*, 1866, p. 78 f.; Scholten, *Die ält. Zeugnisse*, p. 90.

³ *Adv. Val.*, 4; Hilgenfeld, *Bardesanes*, p. 15; Volkmar, *Der Ursprung*, p. 130 f.; Lipsius, *Zeitschr. wiss. Theol.*, 1867, p. 81.

⁴ Volkmar, *Der Ursprung*, p. 23 f., p. 130 f.; Lipsius, *Zeitschr. wiss. Theol.*, 1867, p. 82; Scholten, *Die ält. Zeugnisse*, p. 90.

⁵ Westcott, *On the Canon*, p. 276.

⁶ *In Joh.*, T. xvi., p. 236 f.; Grabe, *Spicil. Patr.*, ii., p. 105.

especially the latter, flourishing and writing towards the end of the second century.

We mentioned, in first speaking of these Gnostics, that Epiphanius has preserved an Epistle, attributed to Ptolemæus, which is addressed to Flora, one of his disciples.¹ This Epistle is neither mentioned by Irenæus nor by any other writer before Epiphanius. There is nothing in the Epistle itself to show that it was really written by Ptolemæus himself. Assuming it to be by him, however, the Epistle was in all probability written towards the end of the second century, and it does not, therefore, come within the scope of our inquiry. We may, however, briefly notice the supposed references to our Gospels which it contains. The writer of the Epistle, without any indication of a written source from which he derived them, quotes sayings of Jesus for which parallels are found in our first Gospel. These sayings are introduced by such expressions as "he said," "our Saviour declared," but never as quotations from any Scripture. Now, in affirming that they are taken from the Gospel according to Matthew, apologists exhibit their usual arbitrary haste, for we must clearly and decidedly state that there is not a single one of the passages which does not present decided variations from the parallel passages in our first Synoptic. We subjoin for comparison in parallel columns the passages from the Epistle and Gospel:—

EPISTLE (HÆR. XXXIII., § 3).

Οἰκία γὰρ ἢ πόλις μερισθείσα ἐφ' ἑαυτὴν ὅτι μὴ δύναται στήναι, ὁ σωτὴρ ἡμῶν ἀπεφήνατο.....

§ 4. ἔφη αὐτοῖς ὅτι Μωϋσῆς πρὸς τὴν σκληροκαρδίαν ὑμῶν ἐπέτρεψε τὸ ἀπολύειν τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ· ἀπ' ἀρχῆς γὰρ οὐ γέγονεν οὕτως. Θεὸς γὰρ, φησὶ, συνέζευξε ταύτην τὴν συζυγίαν, καὶ ὁ συνέζευξεν ὁ κύριος, ἄνθρωπος μὴ χωριζέτω, ἔφη.

§ 4. Ἔθ γὰρ θεὸς, φησὶν, εἶπε, τίμα τὸν πατέρα σου καὶ τὴν μητέρα σου, ἵνα εὖ σοι γένηται. ὑμεῖς δὲ, φησὶν, εἰρήκατε, τοῖς πρεσβυτέροις λέγων, δῶρον τῷ θεῷ ὃ εἰάν ὠφελῆθῃς ἐξ ἐμοῦ,

καὶ ἠκυρώσατε τὸν νόμον τοῦ θεοῦ, διὰ τὴν παράδοσιν τῶν πρεσβυτέρων ὑμῶν.

Τοῦτο δὲ Ἡσαΐας ἐξεφώνησεν εἰπών,

Ὁ λαὸς οὗτος, κ.τ.λ.....

MATT. XII. 25.

.....πᾶσα πόλις ἢ οἰκία μερισθείσα καθ' ἑαυτῆς οὐ σταθήσεται.

MATT. XIX. 8 and 6.

λέγει αὐτοῖς Ὅτι Μωϋσῆς πρὸς τὴν σκληροκαρδίαν ὑμῶν ἐπέτρεψεν ὑμῖν ἀπολύσαι τὰς γυναῖκας ὑμῶν· ἀπ' ἀρχῆς δὲ οὐ γέγονεν οὕτως. 6.....δ οὖν ὁ θεὸς συνέζευξεν, ἄνθρωπος μὴ χωριζέτω.

MATT. XV. 4-8.

Ὁ γὰρ θεὸς ἐνετείλατο, λέγων· Τίμα τὸν πατέρα καὶ τὴν μητέρα, καὶ Ὁ κακολογῶν, κ.τ.λ.² 5. ὑμεῖς δὲ λέγετε· Ὅς ἂν εἴπῃ τῷ πατρὶ ἢ τῇ μητρὶ, Δῶρον, ὃ εἰάν ἐξ ἐμοῦ ὠφελῆθῃς, καὶ οὐ μὴ τιμήσει τὸν πατέρα αὐτοῦ, ἢ τὴν μητέρα αὐτοῦ·

6. καὶ ἠκυρώσατε τὸν νόμον τοῦ θεοῦ διὰ τὴν παράδοσιν ὑμῶν.

7. ὑποκριταί, καλῶς ἐπροφήτευσεν περὶ ὑμῶν Ἡσαΐας, λέγων,

8. Ὁ λαὸς οὗτος, κ.τ.λ.

¹ Epiphanius, *Hær.*, xxxiii. 3-7.

² This phrase, from Leviticus xx. 9, occurs further on in the next chapter.

EPISTLE (HÆR. XXXII., § 3).

§ 5. τὸ γὰρ, Ὁφθαλμὸν ἀντὶ ὀφθαλμοῦ, καὶ ὀδόντα ἀντὶ ὀδόντος.....

§ 6. ἐγὼ γὰρ λέγω ὑμῖν μὴ ἀντιστῆναι ὅλως τῷ πονηρῷ ἀλλὰ εἴαν τις σε ῥαπίση στρέψον αὐτῷ καὶ τὴν ἄλλην σιαγόνα.¹

MATT. V. 38-39.

Ἐκούσατε ὅτι ἐρρέθη Ὁφθαλμὸν ἀντὶ ὀφθαλμοῦ, καὶ ὀδόντα ἀντὶ ὀδόντος. 39. ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω ὑμῖν, μὴ ἀντιστῆναι τῷ πονηρῷ· ἀλλ' ὅστις σε ῥαπίσει ἐπὶ τὴν δεξιάν σου σιαγόνα, στρέψον αὐτῷ καὶ τὴν ἄλλην.

It must not be forgotten that Irenæus makes very explicit statements as to the recognition of other sources of evangelical truth than our Gospels by the Valentinians, regarding which we have fully written when discussing the founder of that sect.² We know that they professed to have direct traditions from the Apostles through Theodas, a disciple of the Apostle Paul;³ and in the Epistle to Flora allusion is made to the succession of doctrine received by direct tradition from the Apostles.⁴ Irenæus says that the Valentinians profess to derive their views from unwritten sources,⁵ and he accuses them of rejecting the Gospels of the Church;⁶ but, on the other hand, he states that they had many Gospels different from what he calls the Gospels of the Apostles.⁷

With regard to Heracleon, it is said that he wrote Commentaries on the third and fourth Gospels. The authority for this statement is very insufficient. The assertion with reference to the third Gospel is based solely upon a passage in the *Stromata* of the Alexandrian Clement. Clement quotes a passage found in Luke xii. 8, 11, 12, and says: "Expounding this passage, Heracleon, the most distinguished of the school of Valentinus, says as follows," etc.⁸ This is immediately interpreted into a quotation from a Commentary on Luke.⁹ We merely point out that from Clement's remark it by no means follows that Heracleon wrote a Commentary at all; and, further, there is no evidence that the passage commented upon was actually from our third Gospel.¹⁰ The *Stromata* of Clement were not written until after A.D. 193, and in them we find the first and only reference to this supposed Commentary. We need not here refer to the Commentary on the fourth Gospel,

¹ In the next chapter, § 7, there is ἓνα γὰρ μόνον εἶναι ἀγαθὸν θεὸν τὸν ἑαυτοῦ πατέρα ὁ σωτὴρ ἡμῶν ἀπεφήνατο, κ.τ.λ. Cf. Matt. xix. 17.....εἰς ἐστὶν ὁ ἀγαθός.

² See p. 342 ff.

³ Clemens Al., *Strom.*, vii. 17.

⁴ Epiphanius, *Hær.*, xxxiii. 7.

⁵ *Adv. Hær.*, i. 8, § 1.

⁶ *Ib.*, iii. 2, § 1.

⁷ *Ib.*, iii. 11, § 9.

⁸ *Strom.*, iv. 9, § 73.

⁹ *In Luce igitur Evangelium Commentaria edidit Heracleon*, etc. (Grabe, *Spicil. Patr.*, ii., p. 83).

¹⁰ The second reference by Clement to Heracleon is in the fragment § 25; but it is doubted by apologists (cf. Westcott, *On the Canon*, p. 264). It would, however, tend to show that the supposed Commentary could not be upon our Luke, as it refers to an apostolic injunction regarding baptism not found in our Gospels.

which is merely inferred from references in Origen (c. A.D. 225) but of which we have neither earlier nor fuller information.¹ We must, however, before leaving this subject, mention that Origen informs us that Heracleon quotes from the Preaching of Peter (*Κήρυγμα Πέτρου, Prædicatio Petri*), a work which, as we have already several times mentioned, was cited by Clement of Alexandria as authentic and inspired Holy Scripture.²

The epoch at which Ptolemæus and Heracleon flourished would, in any case, render testimony regarding our Gospels of little value. The actual evidence which they furnish, however, is not of a character to prove even the existence of our Synoptics, and much less does it in any way bear upon their character or authenticity.

A similar question of date arises regarding Celsus, who wrote a work entitled *Λόγος ἀληθείας*, True Doctrine, which is no longer extant, of which Origen composed an elaborate refutation. The Christian writer takes the arguments of Celsus in detail, presenting to us, therefore, its general features, and giving many extracts; and, as Celsus professes to base much of his accusation upon the writings in use amongst Christians, although he does not name a single one of them, it becomes desirable to ascertain what those works were, and the date at which Celsus wrote. As usual, we shall state the case by giving the reasons assigned for an early date.

Arguing against Volkmar and others, who maintain, from a passage at the close of his work, that Origen, writing about the second quarter of the third century, represents Celsus as his contemporary,³ Tischendorf, referring to the passage, which we shall give in its place, proceeds to assign an earlier date upon the following grounds: "But, indeed, even in the first book, at the commencement of the whole work, Origen says: 'Therefore, I cannot compliment a Christian whose faith is in danger of being shaken by Celsus, who yet does not even (οὐδὲ) still (ἔτι) live the common life among men, but already and long since (ἤδη καὶ πάλαι) is dead.' In the same first book Origen says: 'We have heard that there were two men of the name of Celsus, Epicureans, the first under Nero;

¹ Neither of the works, whatever they were, could have been written before the end of the second century. Volkmar, *Der Ursprung*, p. 22 f., 130 f., 165; Scholten, *Die ält. Zeugnisse*, p. 91 f.; Ebrard, *Evangel. Gesch.*, p. 874, § 142; Lipsius, *Zeitschr. wiss. Theol.*, 1867, p. 81 f.

² Clem. Al., *Strom.*, vi. 5, § 39, 6, § 48, 7, § 58, 15, § 128. Dr. Westcott says regarding Ptolemæus: "Two statements, however, which he makes are at variance with the Gospels: that our Lord's ministry was completed in a year; and that He continued for eighteen months with His disciples after His resurrection" (*On the Canon*, p. 268).

³ Volkmar, *Der Ursprung*, p. 80; Scholten, *Die ält. Zeugnisse*, p. 99 f.

this one' (that is to say, ours) 'under Hadrian and later.' It is not impossible that Origen mistakes when he identified his Celsus with the Epicurean living 'under Hadrian and later'; but it is impossible to convert the same Celsus of whom Origen says this into a contemporary of Origen. Or would Origen himself, in the first book, really have set his Celsus 'under Hadrian (117-138) and later,' yet in the eighth have said: 'We will wait (about 225) to see whether he will still accomplish this design of making another work follow'? Now, until some better discovery regarding Celsus is attained, it will be well to hold to the old opinion that Celsus wrote his book about the middle of the second century, probably between 150-160," etc.¹

It is scarcely necessary to point out that the only argument advanced by Tischendorf bears solely against the assertion that Celsus was a contemporary of Origen, "about 225," and leaves the actual date entirely unsettled. He not only admits that the statement of Origen regarding the identity of his opponent with the Epicurean of the reign of Hadrian "and later" may be erroneous, but he tacitly rejects it, and, having abandoned the conjecture of Origen as groundless and untenable, he substitutes a conjecture of his own, equally unsupported by reasons, that Celsus probably wrote between 150-160. Indeed, he does not attempt to justify this date, but arbitrarily decides to hold by it until a better can be demonstrated. He is forced to admit the ignorance of Origen on the point, and he does not conceal his own.

Now it is clear that the statement of Origen in the preface to his work, quoted above, that Celsus, against whom he writes, is long since dead,² is made in the belief that this Celsus was the Epicurean who lived under Hadrian,³ which Tischendorf, although he avoids explanation of the reason, rightly recognises to be a mistake. Origen undoubtedly knew nothing of his adversary, and it obviously follows that, his impression that he is Celsus the Epicurean being erroneous, his statement that he was long since dead, which is based upon that impression, loses all its value. Origen certainly at one time conjectured his Celsus to be the Epicurean of the reign of Hadrian, for he not only says so directly in the passage quoted, but on the strength of his belief in the fact he accuses him of inconsistency. "But Celsus," he says, "must be convicted of contradicting himself; for he is discovered from other of his works to have been an Epicurean; but here, because he considered that he could attack the Word more effectively by not avowing the views of Epicurus, he pretends, etc.

¹ *Wann wurden, u. s. w.*, p. 74.

² *Contra Cels.*, *Pref.*, § 4.

³ *Ib.*, i. 8.

.....Remark, therefore, the falseness of his mind," etc.¹ And from time to time he continues to refer to him as an Epicurean,² although it is evident that, in the writing before him, he constantly finds evidence that he is of a wholly different school. Beyond this belief, founded avowedly on mere hearsay, Origen absolutely knows nothing of the personality of Celsus or the time at which he wrote,³ and he sometimes very naïvely expresses his uncertainty regarding him. Referring in one place to certain passages which seem to imply a belief in magic on the part of Celsus, Origen adds: "I do not know whether he is the same who has written several books against magic."⁴ Elsewhere he says: ".....the Epicurean Celsus (if he be the same who composed two other books against Christians)," etc.⁵

Not only is it apparent that Origen knows nothing of the Celsus with whom he is dealing, but it is almost impossible to avoid the conviction that, during the time he was composing his work, his impressions concerning the date and identity of his opponent became considerably modified. In the earlier portion of the first book⁶ he has heard that his Celsus is the Epicurean of the reign of Hadrian; but a little further on⁷ he confesses his ignorance as to whether he is the same Celsus who wrote against magic, which Celsus the Epicurean actually did. In the fourth book,⁸ he expresses uncertainty as to whether the Epicurean Celsus had composed the work against Christians which he is refuting, and at the close of his treatise he seems to treat him as a contemporary. He writes to his friend Ambrosius, at whose request the refutation of Celsus was undertaken: "Know, however, that Celsus has promised to write another treatise after this one.....If, therefore, he has not fulfilled his promise to write a second book, we may well be satisfied with the eight books in reply to his Discourse. If, however, he has commenced and finished this work also, seek it and send it in order that we may answer it also, and confute the false teaching in it," etc.⁹ From this passage, and supported by

¹ Cf. *Contra Cels.*, i. 8.

² Cf. *ib.*, i. 10, 21; iii. 75, 80; iv. 36.

³ Neander, *K. G.*, 1842, i., p. 274.

⁵ *Ib.*, iv. 36.

⁶ i. 8.

⁴ *Contra Cels.*, i. 68.

⁷ i. 68.

⁸ iv. 36.

⁹ Ἴσθι μέντοι ἐπαγγελόμενον τὸν Κέλσον ἄλλο σύνταγμα μετὰ τοῦτο ποιήσιν.....Εἰ μὲν οὖν οὐκ ἔγραψεν ὑποσχόμενος τὸν δεύτερον λόγον, εὖ ἂν ἔχοι ἀρκεῖσθαι ἡμᾶς τοῖς ὀκτῶ πρὸς τὸν λόγον αὐτοῦ ὑπαγορευθείσι βιβλίοις. Εἰ δὲ κακείνον ἀρξάμενος συνετέλεσε, ζήτησον, καὶ πέμψον τὸ σύγγραμμα, ἵνα καὶ πρὸς ἐκείνο.....ὑπαγορεύσαντες, καὶ τὴν ἐν ἐκείνῳ ψευδοδοξίαν ἀνατρῖψωμεν κ.τ.λ. *Contra Cels.*, viii. 76. We quote above the rendering of the passage referred to, p. 422, upon which Tischendorf (*Wann wurden*, u. s. w., p. 73 f.) insists. We may mention that, in strictness, the original Greek reads: "promises" instead of "has promised";....."did not write" instead of "has

other considerations, Volkmar and others assert that Celsus was really a contemporary of Origen.¹ To this, as we have seen, Tischendorf merely replies by pointing out that Origen, in the preface, says that Celsus was already dead, and that he was identical with the Epicurean Celsus who flourished under Hadrian and later. The former of these statements, however, was made under the impression that the latter was correct, and, as it is generally agreed that Origen was mistaken in supposing that Celsus the Epicurean was the author of the *Λόγος ἀληθής*, and Tischendorf himself admits the fact, the two earlier statements, that Celsus flourished under Hadrian, and consequently that he had long been dead, fall together, whilst the subsequent doubts regarding his identity not only stand, but rise into assurance at the close of the work, in the final request to Ambrosius.² There can be no doubt that the first statements and the closing paragraphs are contradictory, and, whilst almost all critics pronounce against the accuracy of the former, the inferences from the latter retain full force, confirmed as they are by the intermediate doubts expressed by Origen himself.

Even those who, like Tischendorf, in an arbitrary manner assign an early date to Celsus, although they do not support their conjectures by any satisfactory reasons of their own, all tacitly set aside these of Origen.³ It is generally admitted by these, with Lardner⁴ and Michaelis,⁵ that the Epicurean Celsus, to whom Origen was at one time disposed to refer the work against Christianity, was the writer of that name to whom Lucian, his friend and contemporary, addressed his *Alexander* or *Pseudomantis*, and who really wrote against magic,⁶ as Origen mentions.⁷

not written"; and "commenced and finished" instead of "has commenced and finished." This, however, does not materially affect the argument of Volkmar.

¹ Volkmar, *Der Ursprung*, p. 80, cf. 165; Scholten, *Die ält. Zeugnisse*, p. 100; cf. Riggenbach, *Die Zeugn. f. d. Ev. Johann.*, p. 83; Ueberweg, *Grundriss der Gesch. der Philos. des Alterth.*, 1867, i., p. 237.

² *Contra Cels.*, viii. 76.

³ Kirchhofer says that Origen himself does not assign a date to the work of Celsus: "but as he (Celsus) speaks of the Marcionites, he must, in any case, be set in the second half of the second century" (*Quellensamml.*, p. 330, ann. 1). Lardner decides that Celsus wrote under Marcus Aurelius, and chooses to date him A.D. 176 (*Works*, viii., p. 6). Bindemann dates between 170-180 (*Zeitschr. f. d. Hist. Theol.*, 1842, H. 2, p. 60, 107 f.; cf. Anger, *Synops. Ev. Proleg.*, p. xl.; Michaelis, *Einl. N. B.*, 1788, i., p. 41; Riggenbach, *Die Zeugn. f. d. Ev. Johan.*, p. 83; Zeller, *Theol. Jahrb.*, 1845, p. 629). Dr. Westcott dates Celsus "towards the close of the second century" (*On the Canon*, p. 356). Keim dates the work about A.D. 178 (*Celsus' Wahres Wort*, 1873, p. 261 f.); so also Pélagaud, *Et. sur Celse*, 1878, p. 207 f.

⁴ *Works*, viii., p. 6.

⁵ *Einl. N. B.*, i., p. 41.

⁶ *Ψευδόμαντις*, § 21.

⁷ *Contra Cels.*, i. 68; Neander, *K. G.*, i., p. 275; Baur, *K. G.*, drei erst. *Jahrh.*, p. 383, ann. 1; cf. Keim, *Celsus' Wahres Wort*, 1873, p. 275 f.

But although on this account Lardner assigns to him the date of A.D. 176, the fact is that Lucian did not write his *Pseudomantis*, as Lardner is obliged to admit,¹ until the reign of the Emperor Commodus (180-193), and even upon the supposition that this Celsus wrote against Christianity, of which there is not the slightest evidence, there would be no ground for dating the work before A.D. 180. On the contrary, as Lucian does not in any way refer to such a writing by his friend, there would be strong reason for assigning the work, if it be supposed to be written by him, to a date subsequent to the *Pseudomantis*. It need not be remarked that the references of Celsus to the Marcionites,² and to the followers of Marcellina,³ only so far bear upon the matter as to exclude an early date.⁴

It requires very slight examination of the numerous extracts from, and references to, the work which Origen seeks to refute, however, to convince any impartial mind that the doubts of Origen were well founded as to whether Celsus the Epicurean were really the author of the *Λόγος ἀληθής*. As many critics of all shades of opinion have long since determined, so far from being an Epicurean, the Celsus attacked by Origen, as the philosophical opinions which he everywhere expresses clearly show, was a Neo-Platonist. Indeed, although Origen seems to retain some impression that his antagonist must be an Epicurean, as he had heard, and frequently refers to him as such, he does not point out Epicurean sentiments in his writings, but, on the contrary, not only calls upon him no longer to conceal the school to which he belongs and avow himself an Epicurean,⁵ but accuses him of expressing views inconsistent with that philosophy,⁶ or of so concealing his Epicurean opinions that it might be said that he is an Epicurean only in name.⁷ On the other hand, Origen is clearly surprised to find that he quotes so largely from the writings, and shows such marked leaning towards the teaching, of Plato, in which Celsus indeed finds the original and purer form of many Christian doctrines;⁸ and Origen is constantly forced to discuss Plato in meeting the arguments of Celsus.

The author of the work which Origen refuted, therefore, instead of being an Epicurean, as Origen supposed merely from there having been an Epicurean of the same name, was undoubtedly a

¹ *Works*, viii., p. 6; cf. Bindemann, *Zeitschr. hist. Theol.*, 1842, H. 2, p. 107.

² *Contra Cels.*, v. 62, vi. 53, 74.

³ *Ib.*, v. 62.

⁴ Irenæus says that Marcellina came to Rome under Anicetus (157-168), and made many followers (*Adv. Hær.*, i. 25, § 6; cf. Epiphanius, *Hær.*, xxvii. 6).

⁵ *Contra Cels.*, iii. 80, iv. 54.

⁶ *Ib.*, i. 8.

⁷ *Ib.*, iv. 54.

⁸ *Ib.*, i. 32, iii. 63, iv. 54, 55, 83, vi. 1, 6, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 47, vii. 28, 31, 42, 58 f., etc.

Neo-Platonist, as Mosheim long ago demonstrated, of the school of Ammonius, who founded the sect at the close of the second century.¹ The promise of Celsus to write a second book with practical rules for living in accordance with the philosophy he promulgates, to which Origen refers at the close of his work, confirms this conclusion, and indicates a new and recent system of philosophy.² An Epicurean would not have thought of such a work—it would have been both appropriate and necessary in connection with Neo-Platonism.

We are, therefore, constrained to assign the work of Celsus to at least the early part of the third century, and to the reign of Septimius Severus. In it, Celsus repeatedly accuses Christians of teaching their doctrines secretly and against the law, which seeks them out and punishes them with death,³ and this indicates a period of persecution. Lardner, assuming the writer to be the Epicurean friend of Lucian, supposes from this clue that the persecution referred to must have been that under Marcus Aurelius († 180), and, practically rejecting the data of Origen himself, without advancing sufficient reasons of his own, dates Celsus A.D. 176.⁴ As a Neo-Platonist, however, we are more accurately led to the period of persecution which, from embers never wholly extinct since the time of Marcus Aurelius, burst into fierce flame, more especially in the tenth year of the reign of Severus⁵ (A.D. 202), and continued for many years to afflict Christians.

It is evident that the dates assigned by apologists are wholly arbitrary, and even if our argument for the later epoch were very much less conclusive than it is, the total absence of evidence for an earlier date would completely nullify any testimony derived from Celsus. It is sufficient for us to add that, whilst he refers to incidents of Gospel history and quotes some sayings which have parallels, with more or less of variation, in our Gospels, Celsus nowhere mentions the name of any Christian book, unless we except the Book of Enoch;⁶ and he accuses Christians, not without reason, of interpolating the books of the Sibyl, whose authority, he states, some of them acknowledged.⁷

The last document which we need examine in connection with the synoptic Gospels is the list of New Testament and other writings held in consideration by the Church, which is generally called, after its discoverer and first editor, the *Canon of Muratori*.

¹ *Inst. Hist. Eccles.*, lib. i., sæc. ii., p. 1, cap. 2, § 8; *De Rebus Christ.*, sæc. ii., § 19, § 27.

² Cf. Neander, *K. G.*, i., p. 278.

³ Origen, *Contra Cels.*, i. 1, 3, 7, viii. 69.

⁴ *Works*, viii., p. 6.

⁶ *Contra Cels.*, v. 54, 55.

⁵ Euseb., *H. E.*, vi. 1, 2.

⁷ *Ib.*, vii. 53, 56.

This interesting fragment, which was published in 1740 by Muratori in his collection of Italian antiquities,¹ at one time belonged to the monastery of Bobbio, founded by the Irish monk Columban, and was found by Muratori in the Ambrosian Library at Milan in a MS. containing extracts of little interest from writings of Eucherius, Ambrose, Chrysostom, and others. Muratori estimated the age of the MS. at about a thousand years, but so far as we are aware no thoroughly competent judge has since expressed any opinion upon the point. The fragment, which is defective both at the commencement and at the end, is written in an apologetic tone, and professes to give a list of the writings which are recognised by the Christian Church. It is a document which has no official character, but which merely conveys the private views and information of the anonymous writer, regarding whom nothing whatever is known. From any point of view, the composition is of a nature permitting the widest differences of opinion. It is by some affirmed to be a complete treatise on the books received by the Church, from which fragments have been lost; whilst others consider it a mere fragment in itself. It is written in Latin, which by some is represented as most corrupt, whilst others uphold it as most correct.² The text is further rendered almost unintelligible by every possible inaccuracy of orthography and grammar, which is ascribed diversely to the transcriber, to the translator, and to both. Indeed, such is the elastic condition of the text, resulting from errors and obscurity of every imaginable description, that, by means of ingenious conjectures, critics are able to find in it almost any sense they desire. Considerable difference of opinion exists as to the original language of the fragment, the greater number of critics maintaining that the composition is a translation from the Greek, whilst others assert it to have been originally written in Latin.³ Its composition is variously attributed to the Church of Africa and to a member of the Church in Rome.

The fragment commences with the concluding portion of

¹ *Antiquit. Ital. Med. Ævi*, iii., p. 851 f.

² Volkmar considers it in reality the reverse of corrupt. After allowing for peculiarities of speech, and for the results of an Irish-English pronunciation by the monk who transcribed it, he finds the characteristic original Latin, the old *lingua volgata* which, in the Roman provinces, such as Africa, etc., was the written as well as the spoken language (*Anhang zu Credner's Gesch. N. T. Kanon*, p. 341 f.).

³ If the fragment, as there is some reason to believe, was originally written in Latin, it furnishes evidence that it was not written till the third century. Dr. Westcott, who concludes from the order of the Gospels, etc., that it was not written in Africa, admits that "There is no evidence of the existence of Christian Latin literature out of Africa till about the close of the second century."

a sentence.....“*quibus tamen interfuit et ita posuit*”—“at which nevertheless he was present, and thus he placed it.” The MS. then proceeds: “Third book of the Gospel according to Luke. Luke, that physician, after the ascension of Christ when Paul took him with him....., wrote it in his name as he deemed best (*ex opinione*)—nevertheless he had not himself seen the Lord in the flesh—and he too, as far as he could obtain information, also begins to speak from the nativity of John.” The text, at the sense of which this is a closely approximate guess, though several other interpretations might be maintained, is as follows: *Tertio evangelii librum secundo Lucan Lucas iste medicus post ascensum Christi cum eo Paulus quasi ut juris studiosum secundum adsumsisset numeni suo ex opinione concribset dominum tamen nec ipse vidit in carne et idem prout asequi potuit ita et ad nativitate Johannis incipet dicere.*

The MS. goes on to speak in more intelligible language “of the fourth of the Gospels of John, one of the disciples” (*Quarti evangeliorum Johannis ex decipolis*), regarding the composition of which the writer relates a legend, which we shall quote when we come to deal with that Gospel. The fragment then proceeds to mention the Acts of the Apostles—which is ascribed to Luke—thirteen epistles of Paul in peculiar order, and it then refers to an Epistle to the Laodiceans and another to the Alexandrians, forged, in the name of Paul, after the heresy of Marcion, “and many others which cannot be received by the Catholic Church, as gall must not be mixed with vinegar.” The Epistle to the Ephesians bore the name of Epistle to the Laodiceans in the list of Marcion, and this may be a reference to it.¹ The Epistle to the Alexandrians is generally identified with the Epistle to the Hebrews, although some critics think this doubtful, or deny the fact, and consider both Epistles referred to pseudographs attributed to the Apostle Paul. The Epistle of Jude and two (the second and third) Epistles of John are, with some tone of doubt, mentioned amongst the received books, and so is the Book of Wisdom. The Apocalypses of John and of Peter only are received, but some object to the latter being read in church.

The Epistle of James, both Epistles of Peter, the Epistle to the Hebrews (which is, however, probably that entitled here the Epistle to the Alexandrians), and the first Epistle of John are omitted altogether, with the exception of a quotation which is supposed to be from the last-named Epistle, to which we shall hereafter

¹ Tertullian, *Adv. Marc.*, v. 17. Hilgenfeld, *Der Kanon*, p. 42; Scholten, *Die ält. Zeugnisse*, p. 129; Westcott, *On the Canon*, p. 190, note 1. Cf. Schnekenburger, *Beitr. Einl. N. T.*, 1832, p. 153 f. It will be remembered that reference is made in the Epistle to the Colossians to an Epistle to the Laodiceans which is lost (Col. iv. 16).

refer. Special reference is made to the Shepherd of Hermas, regarding which the writer expresses his opinion that it should be read privately but not publicly in church, as it can be classed neither amongst the books of the prophets nor of the apostles. The fragment concludes with the rejection of the writings of several heretics.

It is inferred that in the missing commencement of the fragment the first two Synoptics must have been mentioned. This, though of course most probable, cannot actually be ascertained, and so far as these Gospels are concerned, therefore, the "Canon of Muratori" only furnishes conjectural evidence. The statement regarding the third Synoptic merely proves the existence of that Gospel at the time the fragment was composed, and we shall presently endeavour to form some idea of that date. Beyond this, the information given does not at all tend to establish the unusual credibility claimed for the Gospels. It is declared by the fragment, as we have quoted, that the third Synoptic was written by Luke, who had not himself seen the Lord, but narrated the history as best he was able. It is worthy of remark, moreover, that even the Apostle Paul, who took Luke with him after the Ascension, had not been a follower of Jesus, nor had seen him in the flesh; and certainly he did not, by the showing of his own Epistles, associate much with the other Apostles, so that Luke could not have had much opportunity while with him of acquiring any intimate knowledge of the events of Gospel history. It is undeniable that the third Synoptic is not the narrative of an eye-witness, and the occurrences which it records did not take place in the presence or within the personal knowledge of the writer, but were derived from tradition, or from written sources. Such testimony, therefore, could not in any case be of much service to our third Synoptic; but when we consider the uncertainty of the date at which the fragment was composed, and the certainty that it could not have been written at an early period, it will become apparent that the value of its evidence is reduced to a minimum.

We have already mentioned that the writer of this fragment is totally unknown, nor does there exist any clue by which he can be identified. All the critics who have assigned an early date to the composition of the fragment have based their conclusion, almost solely, upon a statement made by the author regarding the *Shepherd* of Hermas. He says: "Hermas in truth composed the *Shepherd* very recently in our times in the city of Rome, the Bishop Pius his brother, sitting in the chair of the church of the city of Rome. And, therefore, it should indeed be read, but it cannot be published in the church to the people, neither being among the prophets, whose

number is complete, nor amongst the apostles in the latter days."¹

Muratorì, the discoverer of the MS., conjectured for various reasons, which need not be here detailed, that the fragment was written by Caius the Roman Presbyter, who flourished at the end of the second (c. A.D. 196) and beginning of the third century, and in this he was followed by a few others.² The great mass of critics, however, have rejected this conjecture, as they have likewise negatived the fanciful ascription of the composition by Simon de Magistris to Papias of Hierapolis,³ and by Bunsen to Hegesippus.⁴ Such attempts to identify the unknown author are obviously mere speculation, and it is impossible to suppose that, had Papias, Hegesippus, or any other well-known writer of the same period composed such a list, Eusebius could have failed to refer to it, as so immediately relevant to the purpose of his work. Thiersch even expressed a suspicion that the fragment was a literary mystification on the part of Muratori himself.⁵

The mass of critics, with very little independent consideration, have taken literally the statement of the author regarding the composition of the *Shepherd* "very recently in our times" (*nuperrime temporibus nostris*), during the Episcopate of Pius (A.D. 142-157), and have concluded the fragment to have been written towards the end of the second century, though we need scarcely say that a few writers would date it even earlier. On the other hand, and we consider with reason, many critics, including men who will not be accused of opposition to an early Canon, assign the composition to a later period, between the end of the second or beginning of the third century, and some even to the fourth century.

When we examine the ground upon which alone an early date can be supported, it becomes apparent how slight the foundation is. The only argument of any weight is the statement with regard to the composition of the *Shepherd*; but, with the exception of the few apologists who do not hesitate to assign a date totally inconsistent with the state of the Canon described in the fragment, the great majority of critics feel that they are forced to place the composition not earlier than the end of the second century, at a period when

¹ "Pastorem vero nuperrime temporibus nostris in urbe Roma Herma conscripsit sedente cathedra urbis Romae ecclesiae Pio episcopus fratre ejus et ideo legi eum quidem oportet se publicare vero in ecclesia populo neque inter prophetas completum numero neque inter apostolos in fine temporum potest."

² *Antiq. Ital.*, iii., p. 854 f.; Gallandi, *Bibl. Vet. Patr.*, 1788, ii., p. xxxiii.; Freindaller, *apud Routh, Rel. Sacr.*, i., p. 401; cf. Hefele, *Patr. Ap. Proleg.*, p. lxiii.

³ *Daniel secundum LXX.* 1772; *Dissert.*, iv., p. 467 f.

⁴ *Analecta Ante-Nic.*, 1854, i., p. 125; *Hippolytus and his Age*, i., p. 314.

⁵ *Versuch, u. s. w.*, p. 387.

the statements in the fragment may better agree with the actual opinions in the Church, and yet sufficiently accord with the expression, "very recently in our times," as applied to the period of Pius of Rome, 142-157. It must be evident that, taken literally, a very arbitrary interpretation is given to this indication, and in supposing that the writer may have appropriately used the phrase thirty or forty years after the time of Pius, so much license is taken that there is absolutely no reason why a still greater interval may not be allowed. With this sole exception, there is not a single word or statement in the fragment which would oppose our assigning the composition to a late period of the third century. Volkmar has very justly pointed out, however, that in saying "very recently in our times" the writer merely intended to distinguish the *Shepherd* of Hermas from the writings of the Prophets and Apostles: It cannot be classed amongst the Prophets whose number is complete, nor amongst the Apostles, inasmuch as it was only written in our post-apostolic time. This seems an accurate interpretation of the expression, which might with perfect propriety be used a century after the time of Pius. We have seen that there has not appeared a single trace of any Canon in the writings of the Fathers whom we have examined, and that the Old Testament has been the only Holy Scripture they have acknowledged; and it is therefore unsafe, upon the mere interpretation of an elastic phrase, to date this anonymous fragment earlier than the very end of the second or beginning of the third century, and it is still more probable that it was not written until an advanced period of the third century. The expression used with regard to Pius, "Sitting in the chair of the Church," is quite unprecedented in the second century or until a very much later date. It is argued that the fragment is imperfect, and that sentences have fallen out; and in regard to this, and to the assertion that it is a translation from the Greek, it has been well remarked by a writer whose judgment on the point will scarcely be called prejudiced: "If it is thus mutilated, why might it not also be interpolated? If, moreover, the translator was so ignorant of Latin, can we trust his translation? and what guarantee have we that he has not paraphrased and expanded the original? The force of these remarks is peculiarly felt in dealing with the paragraph which gives the date. The Pastor of Hermas was not well known to the Western Church, and it was not highly esteemed. It was regarded as inspired by the Eastern, and read in the Eastern Churches. We have seen, moreover, that it was extremely unlikely that Hermas was a real personage. It would be, therefore, far more probable that we have here an interpolation, or addition by a member of the Roman or African Church, probably by the translator, made expressly for the purpose of

ſerving as proof that the Paſtor of Hermas was not inſpired. The paragraph itſelf bears unqueſtionable marks of tampering,"¹ etc. It would take us too far were we to diſcuſs the various ſtatements of the fragment as indications of date, and the matter is not of ſufficient importance. It contains nothing involving an earlier date than the third century.

The facts of the caſe may be briefly ſummed up as follows, ſo far as our object is concerned. The third Synoptic is mentioned by a totally unknown writer, at an unknown, but certainly not early, date—in all probability during the third century—in a fragment which we poſſeſs in a very corrupt verſion, much open to ſuſpicion of interpolation in the precise part from which the early date is inferred. The Goſpel is attributed to Luke, who was not one of the followers of Jeſus, and of whom it is expreſſly ſaid that "he himſelf had not ſeen the Lord in the fleſh," but wrote "as he deemed beſt (*ex opinione*)," and followed his hiſtory as he was able (*et idem prout aſequi potuit*).² If the fragment of Muratori, therefore, even came within our limits as to date, its evidence would be of no value, for, inſtead of eſta bliſhing the truſtworthineſs and abſolute accuracy of the narrative of the third Synoptic, it diſtinctly tends to diſcredit it, inasmuch as it declares it to be the compoſition of one who undeniably was not an eye-witneſs of the miracles reported, but collected his materials as beſt he could long after their ſuppoſed occurrence.³

We may now briefly ſum up the reſults of our examination of the evidence for the ſynoptic Goſpels. After having exhausted the literature and the teſtimony bearing on the point, we have not found a ſingle diſtinct trace of any of thoſe Goſpels, with the exception of the third, during the firſt century and a half after the death of Jeſus. Only once during the whole of that period do we find even a tradition that any of our Evangeliſts compoſed a Goſpel at all, and that tradition, ſo far from favouring our Synoptics, is fatal to the claims of the firſt and ſecond. Papias, about the middle of the ſecond century, on the occaſion to which

¹ Donaldſon, *Hiſt. Chr. Lit. and Doctr.*, iii., p. 202.

² The paſſage is freely rendered thus by Dr. Weſtcott: "The Goſpel of St. Luke, it is then ſaid, ſtands third in order (in the Canon), having been written by 'Luke the phyſician,' the companion of St. Paul, who, not being himſelf an eye-witneſs, baſed his narrative on ſuch information as he could obtain, beginning from the birth of John" (*On the Canon*, p. 187).

³ We do not propoſe to conſider the Ophites and Peratici, obſcure Gnoſtic ſects towards the end of the ſecond century. There is no direct evidence regarding them, and the teſtimony of writers in the third century, like Hippolytus, is of no value for the Goſpels. Further on, in connection with the Acts of the Apoſtles, we ſhall ſtate reafons for aſcribing a late date for the compoſition of the third Goſpel.

we refer, records that Matthew composed the Discourses of the Lord in the Hebrew tongue, a statement which totally excludes the claim of our Greek Gospel to apostolic origin. Mark, he said, wrote down from the casual preaching of Peter the sayings and doings of Jesus, but without orderly arrangement, as he was not himself a follower of the Master, and merely recorded what fell from the Apostle. This description, likewise, shows that our actual second Gospel could not, in its present form, have been the work of Mark. There is no other reference during the period to any writing of Matthew or Mark, and no mention at all of any work ascribed to Luke. The identification of Marcion's Gospel with our third Synoptic proves the existence of that work before A.D. 140; but no evidence is thus obtained either as to the author or the character of his work; but, on the contrary, the testimony of the great heresiarch is so far unfavourable to that Gospel, as it involves a charge against it of being interpolated and debased by Jewish elements. The freedom with which Marcion expurgated and altered it clearly shows that he did not regard it either as a sacred or canonical work. Any argument for the mere existence of our Synoptics based upon their supposed rejection by heretical leaders and sects has the inevitable disadvantage that the very testimony which would show their existence would oppose their authenticity. There is no evidence of their use by heretical leaders, however, and no direct reference to them by any writer, heretical or orthodox, whom we have examined. If it be considered that the *Diatessaron* of Tatian is based upon our Synoptics, all that is established by the fact is their existence about the last quarter of the second century, and no appreciable addition is made to our knowledge of their authorship. It is unnecessary to add that no reason whatever has been shown for accepting the testimony of these Gospels as sufficient to establish the reality of miracles and of a direct Divine Revelation.¹ It is not pretended that more than one of the synoptic Gospels was written by an eye-witness of the miraculous occurrences reported; and, whilst no evidence has been, or can be, produced even of the historical accuracy of the narratives, no testimony as to the correctness of the inferences from the external phenomena exists, or is now even conceivable. The discrepancy between the amount of evidence required and that which is forthcoming, however, is greater than, under the circumstances, could have been thought possible.

¹ A comparison of the contents of the three Synoptics would have confirmed this conclusion; but this is not at present necessary.

PART III.

THE FOURTH GOSPEL

CHAPTER I.

THE EXTERNAL EVIDENCE

WE shall now examine, in the same order, the witnesses already cited in connection with the Synoptics, and ascertain what evidence they furnish for the date and authenticity of the fourth Gospel.

Apologists do not even allege that there is any reference to the fourth Gospel in the so-called *Epistle of Clement of Rome to the Corinthians*.¹

A few critics² pretend to find a trace of it in the *Epistle of Barnabas*, in the reference to the brazen Serpent as a type of Jesus. Tischendorf states the case as follows:—

“And when in the same chapter xii. it is shown how Moses, in the brazen serpent, made a type of Jesus ‘who should suffer (die) and yet himself make alive,’ the natural inference is that Barnabas connected therewith John iii. 14 f., even if the use of this passage in particular cannot be proved. Although this connection cannot be affirmed, since the author of the Epistle, in this passage as in many others, may be independent, yet it is justifiable to ascribe

¹ Dr. Westcott, however, cannot resist the temptation to press Clement into service. He says: “In other passages it is possible to trace the influence of St. John, ‘The blood of Christ hath gained for the whole world the offer of the grace of repentance.’ ‘Through Him we look steadfastly on the heights of heaven; through Him we view as in a glass (*ἐνοπτρίζομεθα*) His spotless and most excellent visage; through Him the eyes of our heart were open; through Him our dull and darkened understanding is quickened with new vigour on turning to his marvellous light.’” He does not indicate more clearly the nature and marks of the “influence” to which he refers. As he also asserts that the Epistle “affirms the teaching of St. Paul and St. James,” and that the Epistle to the Hebrews is “wholly transfused into Clement’s mind,” such an argument does not require a single remark (*On the Canon*, p. 23 f.).

² Lardner, Dr. Westcott, and others, do not refer to it at all.

the greatest probability to its dependence on the passage in John, as the tendency of the Epistle in no way required a particular leaning to the expression of John. The disproportionately more abundant use of express quotations from the Old Testament in Barnabas is, on the contrary, connected most intimately with the tendency of his whole composition."¹

It will be observed that the suggestion of reference to the fourth Gospel is here advanced in a very hesitating way, and does not indeed go beyond an assertion of probability. We might, therefore, well leave the matter without further notice, as the reference in no case could be of any weight as evidence. On examination of the context, however, we find that there is every reason to conclude that the reference to the brazen serpent is made direct to the Old Testament. The author, who delights in typology, is bent upon showing that the cross is prefigured in the Old Testament. He gives a number of instances, involving the necessity for a display of ridiculous ingenuity of explanation, which should prepare us to find the type of the brazen serpent naturally selected. After pointing out that Moses, with his arms stretched out in prayer that the Israelites might prevail in the fight, was a type of the cross, he goes on to say: "Again Moses makes a type of Jesus, that he must suffer and himself make alive (*καὶ αὐτὸς ζωοποιήσει*), whom they will appear to have destroyed, in a figure, while Israel was falling";² and connecting the circumstance that the people were bit by serpents and died with the transgression of Eve by means of the serpent, he goes on to narrate minutely the story of Moses and the brazen serpent, and then winds up with the words: "Thou hast in this the glory of Jesus; that in him are all things and for him."³ No one can read the whole passage carefully without seeing that the reference is direct to the Old Testament. There is no ground for supposing that the author was acquainted with the fourth Gospel.

To the *Shepherd* of Hermas Tischendorf devotes only two lines, in which he states that "it has neither quotations from the Old nor from the New Testament." Dr. Westcott makes the same statement,⁴ but, unlike the German apologist, he proceeds subsequently to affirm that Hermas makes "clear allusions to St. John," which few or no apologists support. This assertion he elaborates and illustrates as follows:—

"The view which Hermas gives of Christ's nature and work is no less harmonious with apostolic doctrine, and it offers striking analogies to the Gospel of St. John. Not only did the Son 'appoint angels to preserve each of those whom the Father gave

¹ *Wann wurden*, u. s. w., 96 f.

³ Ch. xii.; cf. Heb. ii. 10; Rom. xi. 36.

² Ch. xii.

⁴ *On the Canon*, p. 175.

to him,' but 'He himself toiled very much and suffered very much to cleanse our sins.....And so when he himself had cleansed the sins of the people, he showed them the paths of life by giving them the Law which he received from his Father.'¹ He is 'a Rock higher than the mountains, able to hold the whole world; ancient, and yet having a new gate.'² 'His name is great and infinite, and the whole world is supported by him.'³ 'He is older than Creation, so that he took counsel with the Father about the creation which he made.'⁴ 'He is the sole way of access to the Lord; and no one shall enter in unto him otherwise than by his Son.'⁵

This is all Dr. Westcott says on the subject.⁶ He does not attempt to point out any precise portions of the fourth Gospel with which to compare these "striking analogies," nor does he produce any instances of similarity of language, or of the use of the same terminology as the Gospel in this apocalyptic allegory. It is clear that such evidence could in no case be of any value for the fourth Gospel.

When we examine more closely, however, it becomes certain that these passages possess no real analogy with the fourth Gospel, and were not derived from it. There is no part of them that has not close parallels in writings antecedent to our Gospel, and there is no use of terminology peculiar to it. The author does not even once use the term Logos. Dr. Westcott makes no mention of the fact that the doctrine of the Logos and of the pre-existence of Jesus was enunciated long before the composition of the fourth Gospel, with almost equal clearness and fulness, and that its development can be traced through the Septuagint translation, the "Proverbs of Solomon," some of the Apocryphal works of the Old Testament, the writings of Philo, the Apocalypse, and the Epistle to the Hebrews, as well as the Pauline Epistles. To any one who examines the passages cited from the work of Hermas, and still more to any one acquainted with the history of the Logos doctrine, it will, we fear, seem wasted time to enter upon any minute refutation of such imaginary "analogies." We shall, however, as briefly as possible refer to each passage quoted.

The first is taken from an elaborate similitude with regard to true fasting, in which the world is likened to a vineyard, and, in explaining his parable, the Shepherd says: "God planted the vineyard; that is, he created the people and gave them to his Son: and the Son appointed his angels over them to keep them: and he himself cleansed their sins, having suffered many things and endured many labours.....He himself, therefore, having cleansed

¹ *Simil.*, v. 6.

² *Ib.*, ix. 2, 12.

³ *Ib.*, ix. 14.

⁴ *Ib.*, ix. 12, quoted above.

⁵ *Ib.*, ix. 12.

⁶ *On the Canon*, p. 177 f.

the sins of the people, showed them the paths of life by giving them the Law which he received from his Father."¹

It is difficult indeed to find anything in this passage which is in the slightest degree peculiar to the fourth Gospel, or apart from the whole teaching of the Epistles, and more especially the Epistle to the Hebrews. We may point out a few passages for comparison: Heb. i. 2-4; ii. 10-11; v. 8-9; vii. 12, 17-19; viii. 6-10; x. 10-16; Romans viii. 14-17; Matt. xxi. 33; Mark xii. 1; Isaiah v. 7, liii.

The second passage is taken from a similar parable on the building of the Church: (α) "And in the middle of the plain he showed me a great white rock which had risen out of the plain, and the rock was higher than the mountains, rectangular so as to be able to hold the whole world, but that rock was old, having a gate (πύλη) hewn out of it, and the hewing out of the gate (πύλη) seemed to me to be recent."² Upon this rock the tower of the Church is built. Further on an explanation is given of the similitude, in which occurs another of the passages referred to. (β) "This rock (πέτρα) and this gate (πύλη) are the Son of God. 'How, Lord,' I said, 'is the rock old and the gate new?' 'Listen,' he said, 'and understand, thou ignorant man. (γ) The Son of God is older than all of his creation (ὁ μὲν υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ πάσης τῆς κτίσεως αὐτοῦ προγενέστερός ἐστιν), so that he was a councillor with the Father in his work of creation; and for this is he old.' (δ) 'And why is the gate new, Lord?' I said. 'Because,' he replied, 'he was manifested in the last days (ἐπ' ἐσχάτων τῶν ἡμερῶν) of the dispensation; for this cause the gate was made new, in order that they who shall be saved might enter by it into the kingdom of God.'"³

And a few lines lower down the *Shepherd* further explains, referring to entrance through the gate, and introducing another of the passages cited: (ε) "'In this way,' he said, 'no one shall enter into the kingdom of God unless he receive his holy name. If, therefore, you cannot enter into the City unless through its gate, so also,' he said, 'a man cannot enter in any other way into the kingdom of God than by the name of his Son beloved by him'..... 'and the gate (πύλη) is the Son of God. This is the one entrance to the Lord.' In no other way, therefore, shall any one enter in to him, except through his Son."⁴

With regard to the similitude of a rock, we need scarcely say that the Old Testament teems with it; and we need not point to the parable of the house built upon a rock in the first Gospel.⁵

¹ *Simil.*, v. 6.

² *Ib.*, ix. 2.

³ *Ib.*, ix. 12. Philo represents the Logos as a rock (πέτρα). *Quod det. potiori insid.*, § 31, Mangey, i. 213.

⁴ *Simil.*, ix. 12.

⁵ Matt. vii. 24.

A more apt illustration is the famous saying with regard to Peter: "And upon this rock (*πέτρα*) I will build my Church," upon which, indeed, the whole similitude of Hermas turns; and in 1 Cor. x. 4 we read: "For they drank of the Spiritual Rock accompanying them; but the Rock was Christ" (*ἡ πέτρα δὲ ἦν ὁ Χριστός*). There is no such similitude in the fourth Gospel at all.

We then have the "gate," on which we presume Dr. Westcott chiefly relies. The parable in John x. 1-9 is quite different from that of Hermas,¹ and there is a persistent use of different terminology. The door into the sheepfold is always *θύρα*, the gate in the rock always *πύλη*. "I am the door"² (*ἐγὼ εἰμι ἡ θύρα*) is twice repeated in the fourth Gospel. "The gate is the Son of God" (*ἡ πύλη ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ ἐστίν*) is the declaration of Hermas. On the other hand, there are numerous passages, elsewhere, analogous to that in the *Shepherd* of Hermas. Every one will remember the injunction in the Sermon on the Mount: Matt. vii. 13, 14. "Enter in through the strait gate (*πύλη*), for wide is the gate (*πύλη*), etc., 14. Because narrow is the gate (*πύλη*) and straitened is the way which leadeth unto life, and few there be that find it."³ The limitation to the one way of entrance into the kingdom of God, "by the name of his Son," is also found everywhere throughout the Epistles, and likewise in the Acts of the Apostles; as, for instance, Acts iv. 12: "And there is no salvation in any other: for neither is there any other name under heaven given among men whereby we must be saved."

The reasons given why the rock is old and the gate new (*γ*, *δ*) have anything but special analogy with the fourth Gospel. We are, on the contrary, taken directly to the Epistle to the Hebrews in which the pre-existence of Jesus is prominently asserted, and between which and the *Shepherd*, as in a former passage, we find singular linguistic analogies. For instance, take the whole opening portion of Heb. i. 1: "God having at many times and in many manners spoken in times past to the fathers by the prophets, 2. At the end of these days (*ἐπ' ἐσχάτου τῶν ἡμερῶν τούτων*) spake to us in the Son whom he appointed heir (*κληρονόμος*)⁴ of all things, by whom he also made the worlds, 3. Who being

¹ Cf. Heb. ix. 24, 11-12, etc.

² John x. 7, 9.

³ Compare the account of the new Jerusalem, Rev. xxi. 12 f.; cf. xxii. 4, 14. In *Simil.* ix. 13 it is insisted that, to enter into the kingdom, not only "his name" must be borne, but that we must put on certain clothing.

⁴ We may remark that in the parable Hermas speaks of the son as the heir (*κληρονόμος*), and of the slave—who is the true son—also as co-heir (*συγκληρονόμος*), and a few lines below the passage above quoted, of the heirship (*κληρονομίας*). This is another indication of the use of this Epistle, the peculiar expression in regard to the son "whom he appointed heir (*κληρονόμος*) of all things" occurring here (cf. *Simil.*, v. 2, 6).

the brightness of his glory and the express image of his substance, upholding all things by the word of his power, when he had made by himself a cleansing of our sins sat down at the right hand of Majesty on high, 4. Having become so much better than the angels,"¹ etc.; and if we take the different clauses we may also find them elsewhere constantly repeated, as for instance: (γ) The son older than all his creation: compare 2 Tim. i., 9, Col. i. 15 ("who is.....the first born of all creation"—ὁς ἐστίν..... πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως), 16, 17, 18, Rev. iii. 14, x. 6. The works of Philo are full of this representation of the Logos. For example: "For the Word of God is over all the universe, and the oldest and most universal of all things created" (καὶ ὁ Λόγος δὲ τοῦ θεοῦ ὑπεράνω παντός ἐστὶ τοῦ κόσμου, καὶ πρεσβύτατος καὶ γενικώτατος τῶν ὅσα γέγονε).² Again, as to the second clause, that he assisted the Father in the work of creation, compare Heb. ii. 10, i. 2, xi. 3, Rom. xi. 36, 1 Cor. viii. 6, Col. i 15, 16.³

The only remaining passage is the following: "The name of the Son of God is great and infinite, and supports the whole world." For the first phrase, compare 2 Tim. iv. 18, Heb. i. 8; and for the second part of the sentence, Heb. i. 3, Col. i. 17, and many other passages quoted above.⁴

The whole assertion⁵ is devoid of foundation, and might well have been left unnoticed. The attention called to it, however, may not be wasted in observing the kind of evidence with which apologists are compelled to be content.

It would scarcely be necessary to refer to *The Teaching of the Twelve Apostles* in connection with the fourth Gospel, for no critic that we are aware of has claimed that it contains any

¹ Heb. i. 1 f.

² *Leg. Alleg.*, iii., § 61, Mangey, i., p. 121; cf. *De Confus. Ling.*, § 28, Mang., i., p. 427, § 14, *ib.*, i., p. 414; *De Profugis*, § 19, Mang., i. 561; *De Caritate*, § 2, Mang., ii. 385, etc. The Logos is constantly called by Philo "the first-begotten of God" (πρωτόγονος Θεοῦ Λόγος); "the most ancient son of God" (πρεσβύτατος υἱὸς Θεοῦ).

³ Cf. Philo, *Leg. Alleg.*, iii., § 31, Mangey, i. 106; *De Cherubim*, § 35, Mang., i. 162, etc.

⁴ Cf. Philo, *De Profugis*, § 20, Mangey, i. 562; *Frag. Mangey*, ii. 655; *De Somniis*, i., § 41, Mang., i. 656.

⁵ Dr. Westcott also says: "In several places also St. John's teaching on 'the Truth' lies at the ground of Hermas' words," and in a note he refers to "*Mand.* iii. = 1 John ii. 27; iv. 6," without specifying any passage of the book (*On the Canon*, p. 176, and note 4). Such unqualified assertions unsupported by any evidence cannot be too strongly condemned. Dr. Westcott's own words may be quoted against himself: "It is impossible to exaggerate the mischief done by these vague general statements, which produce a permanent impression wholly out of proportion with the minute element of truth which is hidden in them" (*On the Canon*, 4th ed., p. 156, n. 1).

quotation from that Gospel; but a few consider that in parts it exhibits a Johannine spirit which seems to indicate at least acquaintance with the fourth Gospel. This is said to be chiefly or only found in the Eucharistic prayers of the Didache ix. and x., and it may, therefore, be well to say a few words on the subject. In x. 2, the principal passage, we read: "We thank thee, holy Father, for thy holy name which thou hast caused to dwell (κατεσκήνωσας) in our hearts." This verse is supposed by those who entertain the Johannine theory to be connected with John i. 14: "The Word dwelt (ἐσκήνωσεν) amongst us," and reliance is specially placed on the use of this verb—not a very strong basis upon which to rest such a theory. Dr. Taylor has pointed out, however, that instead of there being no precedent for the transitive sense of the Greek word κατασκηνώω, to *make to dwell*, it is found in the Septuagint version of Jeremiah vii. 12: "But go ye now unto my place which was in Shiloh, where I caused my name to dwell (οὐδὲ κατεσκήνωσα τὸ ὄνομά μου ἐκεῖ ἔμπροσθεν).¹ It is all the more appropriate to find this passage in Jeremiah, as the germ of the "Two Ways," from which the Didache has grown, is also derived from the same prophet, xxi. 8. A similar phrase occurs in Neh. ii. 9, "and will bring them unto the place that I have chosen to cause my name to dwell there" (κατεσκηνώσαι τὸ ὄνομά μου ἐκεῖ).

With regard to the Eucharistic prayer which we have quoted, Dr. Taylor says: "The Thanksgiving opens with a simple Hebraism";² and, treating generally of the Eucharistic passage of the Didache, Mr. Rendel Harris has rightly and ably pointed out: "The prayers are full of reminiscence of the Jewish Passover ritual, and capable of direct illustration from the Jewish Service-books of the present day; and even in those parts of the thanksgiving where no direct parallel can be made the language of the teaching is utterly Jewish. Take, for example, the rule of prayer given in *Berachoth* f. 40 b: 'All blessing in which there is no mention of the *Name* is not a blessing';.....And the 'Name' is found in the expression, 'Thy holy Name which thou hast caused to dwell in our hearts.' Nothing could be more evidently Jewish."³

This practically disposes of the allegation which we are examining, and, for the rest, if this anonymous work had really any reminiscences of the fourth Gospel, which can fully be denied, these could do nothing to establish its authenticity or value as testimony for miracles.

Tischendorf points out two passages in the *Epistles of pseudo-*

¹ *The Teaching of the Twelve Apostles*, p. 73 f.

² *Ib.*, p. 73.

³ *The Teaching of the Apostles*, p. 89.

Ignatius which, he considers, show the use of the fourth Gospel,¹ They are as follows—Epistle to the Romans vii.: “I desire the bread of God, the bread of heaven, the bread of life, which is the flesh of Jesus Christ the son of God, who was born at a later time of the seed of David and Abraham; and I desire the drink of God (*πόμα θεοῦ*), that is his blood, which is love incorruptible, and eternal life” (*ἀένναος ζωῆ*).² This is compared with John vi. 41: “I am the bread which came down from heaven,” 48..... “I am the bread of life,” 51..... “And the bread that I will give is my flesh”; 54. “He who eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood hath everlasting life” (*ζωὴν αἰώνιον*). Scholten has pointed out that the reference to Jesus as “born of the seed of David and Abraham” is not in the spirit of the fourth Gospel; and the use of *πόμα θεοῦ* for the *πόσις* of vi. 55, and *ἀένναος ζωῆ* instead of *ζωὴ αἰώνιος*, are also opposed to the connection with that Gospel.³ On the other hand, in the institution of the Supper, the bread is described as the body of Jesus, and the wine as his blood; and reference is made there, and elsewhere, to eating bread and drinking wine in the kingdom of God,⁴ and the passage seems to be nothing but a development of this teaching.⁵ Nothing could be proved by such an analogy.

The second passage referred to by Tischendorf is in the Epistle to the Philadelphians vii.: “For if some would have led me astray according to the flesh, yet the Spirit is not led astray, being from God, for it knoweth whence it cometh and whither it goeth, and detecteth the things that are hidden.”⁶ Tischendorf considers that these words are based upon John iii. 6–8, and the last phrase, “And detecteth the hidden things,” upon verse 20. The sense of the Epistle, however, is precisely the reverse of that of the Gospel, which reads: “The wind bloweth where it listeth; and thou hearest the sound thereof, but *knowest not* whence it cometh and whither it goeth; so is every one that is born of the Spirit”;⁷ whilst the Epistle does not refer to the wind at all, but affirms that the Spirit of God does know whence it cometh, etc. The analogy in verse 20 is still more remote: “For every one that doeth evil hateth the light, neither cometh to the light, lest his deeds should be detected.”⁸ In 1 Cor. ii. 10 the sense is found more closely: “For the Spirit searcheth all things, yea, even the deep things of God.”⁹ It is evidently unreasonable to assert from such a passage

¹ *Wunn wurden, u. s. w.*, p. 22 f. Lücke does not attach much weight to any of the supposed allusions in these Epistles (*Comm. Ev. Joh.*, i., p. 43; cf. Sanday, *Gospels in Sec. Cen.*, p. 273 f.).

² *Ad Rom.*, vii.

³ *Die ält. Zeugnisse*, p. 54.

⁴ Matt. xxvi. 26–29; Mark xiv. 22–25; Luke xxii. 17–20; 1 Cor. xi. 23–25; cf. Luke xiv. 15.

⁵ Cf. Scholten, *Die ält. Zeugnisse*, p. 54.

⁶ *Ad Philadelph.*, vii.

⁷ John iii. 8.

⁸ John iii. 20.

⁹ 1 Cor. ii. 10.

the use of the fourth Gospel. Even Tischendorf recognises that in themselves the phrases which he points out in *Pseudo-Ignatius* could not, unsupported by other corroboration, possess much weight as testimony for the use of our Gospels. He says: "Were these allusions of Ignatius to Matthew and John a wholly isolated phenomenon, and one which perhaps other undoubted results of inquiry wholly contradicted, they would hardly have any conclusive weight. But——." ¹ Dr. Westcott says: The "Ignatian writings, as might be expected, are not without traces of the influence of St. John. The circumstances in which he was placed required a special enunciation of Pauline doctrine; but this is not so expressed as to exclude the parallel lines of Christian thought. Love is 'the stamp of the Christian' (*Ad Magn.* v.). 'Faith is the beginning and love the end of life' (*Ad Ephes.* xiv.). 'Faith is our guide upward' (*ἀναγωγεύς*), but love is the road that 'leads to God' (*Ad Eph.* ix.). 'The Eternal (*αἰδῖος*) Word is the manifestation of God' (*Ad Magn.* viii.), 'the door by which we come to the Father' (*Ad Philad.* ix., cf. John x. 7), 'and without Him we have not the principle of true life' (*Ad Trall.* ix. : οὐ χωρὶς τὸ ἀληθινὸν ζῆν οὐκ ἔχομεν. cf. *Ad Eph.* iii. : Ἰ.Χ. τὸ ἀδιάκριτον ἡμῶν ζῆν). The true meat of the Christian is the 'bread of God, the bread of heaven, the bread of life, which is the flesh of Jesus Christ,' and his drink is 'Christ's blood, which is love incorruptible' (*Ad Rom.* vii., cf. John vi. 32, 51, 53). He has no love of this life; 'his love has been crucified, and he has in him no burning passion for the world, but living water (as the spring of a new life), speaking within him, and bidding him come to his Father' (*Ad Rom.* i. c.). Meanwhile his enemy is the enemy of his Master, even the 'ruler of this age' (*Ad Rom.* i. c., ὁ ἄρχων τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου. Cf. John xii. 31, xvi. 11 : ὁ ἄρχων τοῦ κόσμου τούτου' and see 1 Cor. ii. 6, 8²)."

Part of these references we have already considered; others of them really do not require any notice, and the only one to which we need direct our attention for a moment may be the passage from the Epistle to the Philadelphians ix., which reads: "He is the Door of the Father, by which enter in Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob and the prophets, and the apostles, and the Church."³ This is compared with John x. 7. "Therefore said Jesus again: Verily, verily, I say unto you, I am the door of the Sheep" (*ἐγὼ εἰμι ἡ θύρα τῶν προβάτων*). We have already referred, a few pages back,⁴ to the image of the door. Here again it is obvious that there is a marked difference in the sense of the Epistle from

¹ *Wann wurden*, u. s. w., p. 23.

² Westcott, *On the Canon*, p. 32 f., and notes. We have inserted in the text the references given in the notes.

³ *Ad Philad.*, ix.

⁴ P. 438 f.