

that of the Gospel. In the latter Jesus is said to be the door into the Sheepfold;¹ whilst in the Epistle he is the door into the Father, through which not only the patriarchs, prophets, and apostles enter, but also the Church itself. Such distant analogy cannot warrant the conclusion that the passage shows any acquaintance with the fourth Gospel. As for the other phrases, they are not only without special bearing upon the fourth Gospel, but they are everywhere found in the canonical Epistles, as well as elsewhere. Regarding love and faith, for instance, compare Gal. v. 6, 14, 22; Rom. xii. 9, 10, viii. 39, xiii. 9; 1 Cor. ii. 9, viii. 3; Ephes. iii. 17, v. 1, 2, vi. 23; Philip. i. 9, ii. 2; 2 Thess. iii. 5; 1 Tim. i. 14, vi. 11; 2 Tim. i. 13; Heb. x. 38 f., xi., etc.

We might point out many equally close analogies in the works of Philo,² but it is unnecessary to do so, although we may indicate one or two which first present themselves. Philo equally has "the Eternal Logos" (ὁ αἰδῖος Λόγος),³ whom he represents as the manifestation of God in every way. "The Word is the likeness of God, by whom the universe was created" (Λόγος δὲ ἐστὶν εἰκὼν θεοῦ, δι' οὗ οὗτος ὁ κόσμος ἐδημιουργεῖτο).⁴ He is "the vicegerent" (ὑπαρχος) of God,⁵ "the heavenly incorruptible food of the soul," "the bread (ἄρτος) from heaven." In one place he says: "and they who inquired what is the food of the soul..... learnt at last that it is the word of God, and the Divine Logos..... This is the heavenly nourishment, and it is mentioned in the holy Scriptures.....saying, 'Lo! I rain upon you bread (ἄρτος) from heaven' (Exod. xvi. 4). 'This is the bread (ἄρτος) which the Lord has given them to eat'" (Exod. xvi. 15).⁶ And again: "For the one indeed raises his eyes towards the sky, contemplating the manna, the divine Word, the heavenly incorruptible food of the longing soul."⁷ Elsewhere: ".....but it is taught by the Hierophant and Prophet Moses, who will say: 'This is the bread (ἄρτος), the nourishment which God gave to the soul'—that he offered his own Word and his own Logos; for this is bread (ἄρτος) which he

¹ Compare the whole passage, John x. 1-16.

² Philo's birth is dated at least twenty to thirty years before our era, and his death about A.D. 40. His principal works were certainly written before his embassy to Caius. Dähne, *Gesch. Darstell. jüd. alex. Religions-Philos.*, 1834, 1 abth., p. 98, anm. 2; Delaunay, *Philon d'Alexandrie*, 1867, p. 11 f.; Ewald, *Gesch. d. V. Isr.*, vi., p. 239; Gfrörer, *Gesch. des Urchristenthums*, i., p. 5, p. 37 f., p. 45.

³ *De plant. Noe*, § 5, Mang., i. 332; *De Mundo*, § 2, Mang., ii. 604.

⁴ *De Monarchia*, ii., § 5; Mang., ii. 225.

⁵ *De Agricult.*, § 12, Mang., i. 308; *De Somniis*, i., § 41, Mang., i. 656; cf. Coloss. i. 15; Heb. i. 3; 2 Cor. iv. 4.

⁶ *De Profugis*, § 25, Mang., i. 566.

⁷ *Quis rerum Div. Heres.*, § 15, Mang., i. 484; *Quod det. potiori insid.*, § 31, Mang., i. 213.

has given us to eat, this is the Word (τὸ ῥῆμα)."¹ He also says: "Therefore he exhorts him that can run swiftly to strive with breathless eagerness towards the Divine Word, who is, above all things, the fountain of Wisdom, in order that, by drinking of the stream, instead of death he may for his reward obtain eternal life."² It is the Logos who guides us to the Father, God "by the same Logos both creating all things and leading up (ἀνάγων) the perfect man from the things of earth to himself."³ These are very imperfect examples, but it may be asserted that there is not a representation of the Logos in the fourth Gospel which has not close parallels in the works of Philo.

We have given these passages of the *Pseudo-Ignatian Epistles* which are pointed out as indicating acquaintance with the fourth Gospel, in order that the whole case might be stated and appreciated. The analogies are too distant to prove anything, but were they fifty times more close, they could do little or nothing to establish an early origin for the fourth Gospel, and nothing at all to elucidate the question as to its character and authorship.⁴ The Epistles in which the passages occur are spurious, and of no value as evidence for the fourth Gospel. Only one of them is found in the three Syriac Epistles. We have already stated the facts connected with the so-called *Epistles of Ignatius*,⁵ and no one who has attentively examined them can fail to see that the testimony of such documents cannot be considered of any historic weight, except for a period when evidence of the use of the fourth Gospel ceases to be of any significance.

It is not pretended that the so-called *Epistle of Polycarp* to the Philippians contains any references to the fourth Gospel. Tischendorf, however, affirms that it is weighty testimony for that Gospel, inasmuch as he discovers in it a certain trace of the first "Epistle of John"; and, as he maintains that the Epistle and the Gospel are the works of the same author, any evidence for the one is at the same time evidence for the other.⁶ We shall hereafter consider the point of the common authorship of the Epistles and fourth Gospel, and here confine ourselves chiefly to the alleged fact of the reference. The passage to which Tischendorf alludes we subjoin, with the supposed parallel in the Epistle.

¹ *Leg. Alleg.*, iii., § 60, Mang., i. 121; cf. *ib.*, §§ 61, 62.

² *De Profugis*, § 18, Mang., i. 560.

³ *De Sacrif. Abelis et Caini*, § 3; Mang., i. 165.

⁴ In general the Epistles follow the Synoptic narratives, and not the account of the fourth Gospel. See, for instance, the reference to the anointing of Jesus, *Ad Eph.* xvii., cf. Matt. xxvi. 7 f.; Mark xiv. 3 f., cf. John xii. 1 f.

⁵ P. 158 f.

⁶ *Wann wuract*, u. s. w., p. 24 f.

EPISTLE OF POLYCARP, VII.

For whosoever doth not confess that Jesus Christ hath come in the flesh is Antichrist, and whosoever doth not confess the martyrdom of the cross is of the devil, and whosoever doth pervert the oracles of the Lord to his own lusts, and saith that there is neither resurrection nor judgment, he is a firstborn of Satan.

Πᾶς γὰρ, ὃς ἂν μὴ ὁμολογῇ, Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν ἐν σαρκὶ ἐληλυθέναι, ἀντίχριστός ἐστιν· καὶ ὃς ἂν μὴ ὁμολογῇ τὸ μαρτύριον τοῦ σταυροῦ, ἐκ τοῦ διαβόλου ἐστίν· καὶ ὃς ἂν μεθοδεύῃ τὰ λόγια τοῦ κυρίου πρὸς τὰς ἰδίας ἐπιθυμίας, καὶ λέγει μήτε ἀνάστασιν μήτε κρίσιν, οὗτος πρωτότοκός ἐστι τοῦ Σατανᾶ.

I EPISTLE OF JOHN, IV. 3.

And every spirit that confesseth not the Lord Jesus come in the flesh is not of God, and this is the (*spirit*) of Antichrist of which ye have heard that it cometh, and now already it is in the world.

Καὶ παν πνεῦμα ὃ μὴ ὁμολογεῖ Ἰησοῦν κύριον ἐν σαρκὶ ἐληλυθότα, ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ οὐκ ἔστιν, καὶ τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ τοῦ ἀντιχρίστου, ὃ τι ἀκηκόαμεν ὅτι ἔρχεται, καὶ νῦν ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ ἐστὶν ἤδη.¹

This passage does not occur as a quotation, and the utmost that can be said of the few words with which it opens is that a phrase somewhat resembling, but at the same time materially differing from, the Epistle of John is interwoven with the text of the *Epistle to the Philippians*. If this were really a quotation from the canonical Epistle, it would indeed be singular that, considering the supposed relations of Polycarp and John, the name of the apostle should not have been mentioned, and a quotation have been distinctly and correctly made. On the other hand, there is no earlier trace of the canonical Epistle, and, as Volkmar argues, it may be doubted whether it may not rather be dependent on the *Epistle to the Philippians*, than the latter upon the Epistle of John.²

We believe, with Scholten, that neither is dependent on the other, but that both adopted a formula in use in the early Church

¹ We give the text of the *Sinaitic Codex* as the most favourable. A great majority of the other MSS., and all the more important, present very marked difference from this reading. [In reference to this, Dr. Westcott has the following note in the 4th edition of his work, *On the Canon*, p. 50, n. 2: "The author of *Supernatural Religion* gives (ii., p. 268) a good example of the facility with which similar phrases are mixed up, when, with the Greek text of St. John before him, he quotes as 'I John iv. 3,' καὶ παν πνεῦμα, κ. τ. λ. (quoting the passage in the text above). Is this also taken from an apocryphal writing?" No, as was clearly stated in the note, it is taken from the *Codex Sinaiticus*. Dr. Westcott ought to have observed this. At the end of his volume, in a page of "addenda," he says: "I should have added that the singular combination of phrases which is quoted is taken from *Cod. Sin.* The words, as they stand, are liable to be misunderstood." In this he does himself injustice. It would not be easy to misunderstand the sarcastic question, and still less the curious addition made when his mistake was pointed out to him.]

² Volkmar, *Der Ursprung*, p. 48 f.

against various heresies,¹ the superficial coincidence of which is without any weight as evidence for the use of either Epistle by the writer of the other. Moreover, it is clear that the writers refer to different classes of heretics. Polycarp attacks the Docetæ who deny that Jesus Christ has come in the flesh, that is with a human body of flesh and blood; whilst the Epistle of John is directed against those who deny that Jesus who has come in the flesh is the Christ the Son of God.² Volkmar points out that in Polycarp the word "Antichrist" is made a proper name, whilst in the Epistle the expression used is the abstract "Spirit of Antichrist." Polycarp, in fact, says that whoever denies the flesh of Christ is no Christian but anti-Christ, and Volkmar finds this direct assertion more original than the assertion of the Epistle: "Every spirit that confesseth that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is of God,"³ etc. In any case it seems to us clear that in both writings we have only the independent enunciation, with decided difference of language and sense, of a formula current in the Church, and that neither writer can be held to have originated the condemnation, in these words, of heresies which the Church had begun vehemently to oppose, and which were merely an application of ideas already well known, as we see from the expression of the Epistle in reference to the Spirit of Antichrist, "of which ye have heard that it cometh." Whether this phrase be an allusion to the Apocalypse xiii., or to 2 Thess. ii., or to traditions current in the Church, we need not inquire; it is sufficient that the Epistle of John avowedly applies a prophecy regarding Antichrist already known amongst Christians, which was equally open to the other writer, and probably familiar in the Church. This cannot under any circumstances be admitted as evidence of weight for the use of the first Epistle of John. There is no evidence of the existence of the Epistles ascribed to John previous to this date, and their origin would have to be established on sure grounds before the argument we are considering can have any value.

On the other hand, we have already seen⁴ that there is strong reason to doubt the authenticity of the Epistle attributed to Polycarp, and certainty that in any case it is, in its present form, considerably interpolated. Even if genuine in any part, the use of the first Epistle of John, if established, could not be of much value as testimony for the fourth Gospel, of which the writing does

¹ Scholten, *Die ält. Zeugnisse*, p. 45 f.; cf. Volkmar, *Der Ursprung*, p. 48 f.; cf. Irenæus, *Adv. Her.*, i. 24, § 4; pseudo-Ignatius, *Ad Smyrn.*, v., vi.

² Scholten, *Die ält. Zeugnisse*, p. 46 f.; Volkmar, *Der Ursprung*, p. 48 f.; cf. 1 John ii. 22; iv. 2, 3; v. 1, 5 f.

³ Volkmar, *Der Ursprung*, p. 49 f.; Scholten, *Die ält. Zeugnisse*, p. 46 f.

⁴ P. 175 f.

not show a trace. So far from there being any evidence that Polycarp knew the fourth Gospel, however, everything points to the opposite conclusion. About A.D. 154-155 we find them taking part in the Paschal controversy,¹ contradicting the statements of the fourth Gospel,² and supporting the Synoptic view, contending that the Christian festival should be celebrated on the 14th Nisan, the day on which he affirmed that the Apostle John himself had observed it.³ Irenæus, who represents Polycarp as the disciple of John, says of him: "For neither was Anicetus able to persuade Polycarp not to observe it (on the 14th) because he had always observed it with John the disciple of our Lord, and with the rest of the apostles with whom he consorted."⁴ Not only, therefore, does Polycarp not refer to the fourth Gospel, but he is, on the contrary, an important witness against it as the work of John, for he represents that apostle as practically contradicting the Gospel of which he is said to be the author.

The fulness with which we have discussed the character of the evangelical quotations of *Justin Martyr* renders the task of ascertaining whether his works indicate any acquaintance with the fourth Gospel comparatively easy. The detailed statements already made enable us without preliminary explanation directly to attack the problem, and we are freed from the necessity of making extensive quotations to illustrate the facts of the case.

Whilst apologists assert with some boldness that Justin made use of our Synoptics, they are evidently, and with good reason, less confident in maintaining his acquaintance with the fourth Gospel. Dr. Westcott states: "His references to St. John are uncertain; but this, as has been already remarked, follows from the character of the fourth Gospel. It was unlikely that he should quote its peculiar teaching in apologetic writings addressed to Jews and heathens; and at the same time he exhibits types of language and doctrine which, if not immediately drawn from St. John, yet mark the presence of his influence and the recognition of his authority."⁵ This apology for the neglect of the fourth

¹ The date has, hitherto, generally been fixed at A.D. 160, but the recent investigations referred to, p. 175 f., have led to the adoption of this earlier date, and the visit to Rome must, therefore, probably have taken place just after the accession of Anicetus to the Roman bishopric (cf. Lipsius, *Zeitschr. w. Theol.*, 1874, p. 205 f.).

² John xiii. 1, xvii. 28, xix. 14, 31; cf. Matt. xxvi. 17; Mark xiv. 12; Luke xxii. 8.

³ Cf. Irenæus, *Adv. Her.*, iii. 3, § 4; Eusebius, *H. E.*, iv. 14, v. 24.

⁴ Eusebius, *H. E.*, v. 24.

⁵ *On the Canon*, p. 145. In a note Dr. Westcott refers to Credner, *Beiträge*, i., p. 253 f. Credner, however, pronounces against the use of the fourth Gospel by Justin. Dr. Westcott adds the singular argument: "Justin's acquaintance with the Valentinians proves that the Gospel could not have

Gospel illustrates the obvious scantiness of the evidence furnished by Justin.

Tischendorf, however, with his usual temerity, claims Justin as a powerful witness for the fourth Gospel. He says: "According to our judgment there are convincing grounds of proof for the fact that John also was known and used by Justin, provided that unprejudiced consideration be not made to give way to antagonistic predilection against the Johannine Gospel." In order fully and fairly to state the case which he puts forward, we shall quote his own words, but to avoid repetition we shall permit ourselves to interrupt him by remarks and by parallel passages from other writings for comparison with Justin. Tischendorf says: "The representation of the person of Christ, altogether peculiar to John, as it is given particularly in his prologue i. 1 ('In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God'), and verse 14 ('and the word became flesh'), in the designation of him as Logos, as the word of God, unmistakably re-echoes in not a few passages in Justin; for instance: 'And Jesus Christ is alone the special Son begotten by God, being his Word and first-begotten and power.'"¹

With this we may compare another passage of Justin from the second Apology. "But his son, who alone is rightly called Son, the Word before the works of creation, who was both with him and begotten when in the beginning he created and ordered all things by him,"² etc.

Now the same words and ideas are to be found throughout the Canonical Epistles and other writings, as well as in earlier works. In the Apocalypse,³ the only book of the New Testament mentioned by Justin, and which is directly ascribed by him to John,⁴ the term Logos is applied to Jesus "the Lamb" (xix. 13); "and his name is called the Word of God" (καὶ κέκληται τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ ὁ Λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ). Elsewhere (iii. 14) he is called "the Beginning of the Creation of God" (ἡ ἀρχὴ τῆς κτίσεως τοῦ θεοῦ); and again in the same book (i. 5) he is "the first-begotten of the

been unknown to him" (*Dial.* 35). We have already proved that there is no evidence that Valentinus and his earlier followers knew anything of our Synoptics, and we shall presently show that this is likewise the case with the fourth Gospel.

¹ *Wann wurden, u. s. w.*, p. 32. Καὶ Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς μόνος ἰδίως υἱὸς τῷ θεῷ γεγέννηται, Λόγος αὐτοῦ ὑπάρχων καὶ πρωτότοκος καὶ δύναμις. *Apol.*, i. 23.

² Ὁ δὲ υἱὸς ἐκείνου, ὁ μόνος λεγόμενος κυρίως υἱὸς, ὁ Λόγος πρὸ τῶν ποιημάτων, καὶ συνῶν καὶ γεννώμενος, ὅτε τὴν ἀρχὴν δι' αὐτοῦ πάντα ἐκτίσε καὶ ἐκόσμησε. *Apol.*, ii. 6.

³ Written c. A. D. 68-69; Credner, *Einl. N. T.*, i., p. 704 f.; *Beiträge*, ii., p. 294; Lücke, *Comm. Offenb. Joh.*, 1852, ii., p. 840 ff.; Ewald, *Jahrb. bibl. Wiss.*, 1852-53, p. 182; *Gesch. d. V. Isr.*, vi., p. 643, etc.

⁴ *Dial.* 81.

dead" (ὁ πρωτότοκος τῶν νεκρῶν). In Heb. i. 6 he is the "first-born" (πρωτότοκος), as in Coloss. i. 15 he is "the first-born of every creature" (πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως); and in 1 Cor. i. 24 we have: "Christ the Power of God and the Wisdom of God" (Χριστὸν θεοῦ δύναμιν καὶ θεοῦ σοφίαν), and it will be remembered that "Wisdom" was the earlier term which became an alternative with "Word" for the intermediate Being. In Heb. i. 2 God is represented as speaking to us "in the Son.....by whom he also made the worlds" (ἐν υἱῷ,.....δι' οὗ καὶ ἐποίησεν τοὺς αἰῶνας). In 2 Tim. i. 9 he is "before all worlds" (πρὸ χρόνων αἰωνίων), cf. Heb. i. 10, ii. 10, Rom. xi. 36, 1 Cor. viii. 6, Ephes. iii. 9.

The works of Philo are filled with similar representations of the Logos, but we must restrict ourselves to a very few. God as a Shepherd and King governs the universe, "having appointed his true Logos, his first begotten Son, to have the care of this sacred flock, as the Vicegerent of a great King."¹ In another place Philo exhorts men to strive to become like God's "first begotten Word" (τὸν πρωτόγονον αὐτοῦ Λόγον),² and he adds, a few lines further on: "for the most ancient Word is the image of God" (θεοῦ γὰρ εἰκὼν Λόγος ὁ πρεσβύτατος). The high priest of God in the world is "the divine Word, his first-begotten son" (ὁ πρωτόγονος αὐτοῦ θεῖος Λόγος).³ Speaking of the creation of the world, Philo says: "The instrument by which it was formed is the Word of God" (ὄργανον δὲ Λόγον θεοῦ, δι' οὗ κατεσκευάσθη).⁴ Elsewhere: "For the word is the image of God by which the whole world was created" (Λόγος δὲ ἐστὶν εἰκὼν θεοῦ, δι' οὗ σύμπας ὁ κόσμος ἐδημιουργεῖτο).⁵ These passages might be indefinitely multiplied.

Tischendorf's next passage is: "The first power (δύναμις) after the Father of all and God the Lord, and Son, is the Word (Logos); in what manner having been made flesh (σαρκοποιηθεὶς) he became man, we shall in what follows relate."⁶

We find everywhere parallels for this passage without seeking them in the fourth Gospel. In 1 Cor. i. 24, "Christ the Power (δύναμις) of God and the Wisdom of God"; cf. Heb. i. 2, 3, 4, 6, 8; ii. 8. In Heb. ii. 14-18 there is a distinct account of his becoming flesh; cf. verse 7. In Phil. ii. 6-8: "Who (Jesus

¹προστησάμενος τὸν ὀρθὸν αὐτοῦ Λόγον, πρωτόγονον υἱόν, ὃς τὴν ἐπιμέλειαν τῆς ἱερᾶς ταύτης ἀγέλης οἷά τις μεγάλου βασιλέως ὑπαρχος διαδέξεται. *De Agricult.*, § 12, Mang., i. 308.

² *De Confus. ling.*, § 28, Mang., i. 427, cf. § 14, *ib.*, i. 414; cf. *De Migrat. Abrahami*, 1, Mang., i. 437; cf. Heb. i. 3; 2 Cor. iv. 4.

³ *De Somniis*, i., § 37, Mang., i. 653. ⁴ *De Cherubim*, § 35, Mang., i. 162.

⁵ *De Monarchia*, ii., § 5, Mang., ii. 225.

⁶ *Wann wurden, u. s. w.*, p. 32 (*Apol.*, i. 32).

Christ) being in the form of God, deemed it not grasping to be equal with God (7), But gave himself up, taking the form of a servant, being made in the likeness of men," etc. In Rom. viii. 3 we have: "God sending his own Son in the likeness of the flesh of sin," etc. (ὁ θεὸς τὸν ἑαυτοῦ υἱὸν πέμψας ἐν ὁμοιώματι σαρκὸς ἁμαρτίας). It must be borne in mind that the terminology of John i. 14, "and the word became flesh" (σὰρξ ἐγένετο) is different from that of Justin, who uses the word *σαρκοποιηθείς*. The sense and language here is, therefore, quite as close as that of the fourth Gospel. We have also another parallel in 1 Tim. iii. 16, "Who (God) was manifested in the flesh" (ὃς ἐφανερώθη ἐν σαρκί); cf. 1 Cor. xv. 4, 47.

In like manner we find many similar passages in the works of Philo. He says, in one place, that man was not made in the likeness of the most high God the Father of the universe, but in that of the "Second God who is his Word" (ἀλλὰ πρὸς τὸν δεύτερον θεόν, ὃς ἐστὶν ἐκείνου Λόγος).¹ In another place the Logos is said to be the interpreter of the highest God, and he continues: "that must be God of us imperfect beings" (Οὗτος γὰρ ἡμῶν τῶν ἀτελῶν ἄν εἴη θεός).² Elsewhere he says: "But the divine Word which is above these (the Winged Cherubim).....but being itself the image of God, at once the most ancient of all conceivable things, and the one placed nearest to the only true and absolute existence without any separation or distance between them";³ and a few lines further on he explains the cities of refuge to be: "The word of the Governor (of all things) and his creative and kingly power, for of these are the heavens and the whole world."⁴ "The Logos of God is above all things in the world, and is the most ancient and the most universal of all things which are."⁵ The Word is also the "Ambassador sent by the Governor (of the universe) to his subject (man)" (πρεσβευτῆς δὲ τοῦ ἡγεμόνος πρὸς τὸ ὑπήκοον).⁶ Such views of the Logos are everywhere met with in the pages of Philo.

Tischendorf continues: "The Word (Logos) of God is his Son."⁷ We have already in the preceding paragraphs abundantly illustrated this sentence, and may proceed to the next: "But since they did not know all things concerning the Logos, which is

¹ Philo, *Fragm.*, i., ex. Euseb., *Præpar. Evang.*, vii. 13, Mang., ii. 625; cf. *De Somniis*, i., § 41, Mang., i. 656; *Leg. Alleg.*, ii., § 21, *ib.*, i. 83.

² *Leg. Alleg.*, iii., § 73, Mang., i. 128.

³ *De Profugis*, § 19, Mang., i. 561.

⁴ *Ib.*, § 19.

⁵ Καὶ ὁ Λόγος δὲ τοῦ θεοῦ ὑπεράνω παντός ἐστι τοῦ κόσμου, καὶ πρεσβύτατος καὶ γενικώτατος τῶν ὅσα γέγονε. *Leg. Alleg.*, iii., § 61, Mang., i. 121; cf. *De Somniis*, i., § 41, Mang., i. 656.

⁶ *Quis rerum div. Heres.*, § 42, Mang., i. 501.

⁷ Ὁ Λόγος δὲ τοῦ θεοῦ ἐστὶν ὁ υἱὸς αὐτοῦ. (*Apol.*, i. 63).

Christ, they have frequently contradicted each other."¹ These words are used with reference to lawgivers and philosophers. Justin, who frankly admits the delight he took in the writings of Plato² and other Greek philosophers, held the view that Socrates and Plato had, in an elementary form, enunciated the doctrine of the Logos,³ although he contends that they borrowed it from the writings of Moses; and with a largeness of mind very uncommon in the early Church, and, indeed, we might add, in any age, he believed Socrates and such philosophers to have been Christians, even although they had been considered Atheists.⁴ As they did not, of course, know Christ to be the Logos, he makes the assertion just quoted. Now, the only point in the passage which requires notice is the identification of the Logos with Jesus, which has already been dealt with, and, as this was asserted in the Apocalypse xix. 13, before the fourth Gospel was written, no evidence in its favour is deducible from the statement. We shall have more to say regarding this presently.

Tischendorf continues: "But in what manner, through the Word of God, Jesus Christ our Saviour has become flesh,"⁵ etc.

It must be apparent that the doctrine here is not that of the fourth Gospel which makes "the word become flesh" simply, whilst Justin, representing a less advanced form, and more uncertain stage, of its development, draws a distinction between the Logos and Jesus, and describes Jesus Christ as being made flesh by the power of the Logos. This is no accidental use of words, for he repeatedly states the same fact, as for instance: "But why through the power of the Word, according to the will of God the Father and Lord of all, he was born a man of a Virgin,"⁶ etc.

Tischendorf continues: "To these passages out of the short second Apology we extract from the first (cap. 33).⁷ By the Spirit, therefore, and power of God (in reference to Luke i. 35: 'The Holy Spirit shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee') we have nothing else to understand but the Logos, which is the first-born of God."⁸

Here again we have the same difference from the doctrine of the fourth Gospel which we have just pointed out, which is, however,

¹ Ἐπειδὴ δὲ οὐ πάντα τὰ τοῦ Λόγου ἐγνώρισαν, ὅς ἐστι Χριστὸς, καὶ ἐναντία ἑαυτοῖς πολλάκις εἶπον. *Apol.*, ii. 10.

² *Apol.*, ii. 12; cf. *Dial.* 2 f.

³ *Ib.*, i. 60, etc.; cf. 5.

⁴ *Ib.*, i. 46.

⁵ *Wann wurden, u. s. w.*, p. 32. ἀλλ' ὅν τρόπον διὰ Λόγου θεοῦ σαρκοποιηθεὶς Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς ὁ Σωτὴρ ἡμῶν, κ.τ.λ. *Apol.*, i. 66.

⁶ *Apol.*, i. 46.

⁷ This is an error. Several of the preceding passages are out of the first Apology. No references, however, are given to the source of any of them. We have added them.

⁸ *Wann wurden, u. s. w.*, p. 32 (*Apol.*, i. 33).

completely in agreement with the views of Philo, and characteristic of a less developed form of the idea. We shall further refer to the terminology hereafter, and meantime we proceed to the last illustration given by Tischendorf.

“Out of the Dialogue (c. 105): ‘For that he was the only-begotten of the Father of all, in peculiar wise begotten of him as Word and Power (*δύναμις*), and afterwards became man through the Virgin, as we have learnt from the Memoirs, I have already stated.’”¹

The allusion here is to the preceding chapters of the Dialogue, wherein, with special reference (c. 100) to the passage which has a parallel in Luke i. 35, quoted by Tischendorf in the preceding illustration, Justin narrates the birth of Jesus.

This reference very appropriately leads us to a more general discussion of the real source of the terminology and Logos doctrine of Justin. We do not propose, in this work, to enter fully into the history of the Logos doctrine, and we must confine ourselves strictly to showing, in the most simple manner possible, that not only is there no evidence whatever that Justin derived his ideas regarding it from the fourth Gospel, but that, on the contrary, his terminology and doctrine may be traced to another source. In the very chapter (100) from which this last illustration is taken, Justin shows clearly whence he derives the expression, “only-begotten. In chap. 97 he refers to the Ps. xxii. (Sept. xxi.) as a prophecy applying to Jesus, quotes the whole Psalm, and comments upon it in the following chapters; refers to Ps. ii. 7: “Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee,” uttered by the voice at the baptism, in ch. 103, in illustration of it; and in ch. 105 he arrives, in his exposition of it, at verse 20: “Deliver my soul from the sword, and my² only-begotten (*μονογενῆ*) from the hand of the dog.” Then follows the passage we are discussing, in which Justin affirms that he has proved that he was the only-begotten (*μονογενής*) of the Father, and at the close he again quotes the verse as indicative of his sufferings. The Memoirs are referred to in regard to the fulfilment of this prophecy, and his birth as man through the Virgin. The phrase in Justin is quite different from that in the fourth Gospel, i. 14: “And the Word became flesh (*σὰρξ ἐγένετο*) and tabernacled among us, and we beheld his glory, glory as of the only-begotten from the Father” (*ὡς μονογενοῦς παρὰ πατρός*), etc. In Justin, he is “the only-begotten of the Father of all” (*μονογενῆς τῷ Πατρὶ τῶν ὅλων*), and he “became man (*ἄνθρωπος γινόμενος*) through the Virgin,” and Justin never once employs the peculiar terminology of the fourth Gospel, *σὰρξ ἐγένετο*, in any part of his writings.

¹ *Wann wurden, u. s. w.*, p. 32 (*Dial. c. Tryph.*, 105).

² This should probably be “thy.”

There can be no doubt that, however the Christian doctrine of the Logos may at one period of its development have been influenced by Greek philosophy, it was in its central idea mainly of Jewish origin, and the mere application to an individual of a theory which had long occupied the Hebrew mind. After the original simplicity which represented God as holding personal intercourse with the Patriarchs, and communing face to face with the great leaders of Israel, had been outgrown, an increasing tendency set in to shroud the Divinity in impenetrable mystery, and to regard him as unapproachable and undiscernible by man. This led to the recognition of a Divine representative and substitute of the highest God and Father, who communicated with his creatures, and through whom alone he revealed himself. A new system of interpretation of the ancient traditions of the nation was rendered necessary, and in the Septuagint translation of the Bible we are fortunately able to trace the progress of the theory which culminated in the Christian doctrine of the Logos. Wherever in the sacred records God has been represented as holding intercourse with man, the translators either symbolised the appearance or interposed an angel, who was afterwards understood to be the Divine Word. The first name under which the Divine Mediator was known in the Old Testament was Wisdom (*Σοφία*), although in its Apocrypha the term Logos was not unknown. The personification of the idea was very rapidly effected, and in the Book of Proverbs, as well as in the later Apocrypha based upon it (the Wisdom of Solomon, and the Wisdom of Sirach, "Ecclesiasticus") we find it in ever-increasing clearness and concreteness. In the School of Alexandria the active Jewish intellect eagerly occupied itself with the speculation, and in the writings of Philo especially we find the doctrine of the Logos—the term which by that time had almost entirely supplanted that of Wisdom—elaborated to almost its final point, and wanting little or nothing but its application in an incarnate form to an individual man to represent the doctrine of the earlier Canonical writings of the New Testament, and notably the Epistle to the Hebrews—the work of a Christian Philo¹—the Pauline Epistles, and lastly the fourth Gospel.

In Proverbs viii. 22 f. we have a representation of Wisdom corresponding closely with the prelude to the fourth Gospel, and still more so with the doctrine enunciated by Justin: "22. The Lord created me the Beginning of his ways for his works. 23.

¹ Ewald freely recognises that the author of this Epistle, written about A.D. 66, transferred Philo's doctrine of the Logos to Christianity. Apollos, whom he considers its probable author, impregnated the Apostle Paul with the doctrine (*Gesch. des. V. Isr.*, vi., p. 474 f., p. 638 f.; *Das Sendschr. an d. Hebräer*, p. 9 f.).

Before the ages he established me, in the beginning before he made the earth. 24. And before he made the abysses, before the springs of the waters issued forth. 25. Before the mountains were settled, and before all the hills he begets me. 26. The Lord made the lands, both those which are uninhabited and the inhabited heights of the earth beneath the sky. 27. When he prepared the heavens I was present with him, and when he set his throne upon the winds, 28, and made strong the high clouds, and the deeps under the heaven made secure, 29, and made strong the foundations of the earth, 30, I was with him adjusting, I was that in which he delighted; daily I rejoiced in his presence at all times."¹ In the *Wisdom of Solomon* we find the writer addressing God: ix. 1..... "Who madest all things by thy Word" (ὁ ποιήσας τὰ πάντα ἐν Λόγῳ σου); and further on in the same chapter, v. 9: "And Wisdom was with thee *who knoweth thy works, and was present when thou madest the world, and knew what was acceptable in thy sight, and right in thy commandments." In verse 4 the writer prays: "Give me Wisdom that sitteth by thy thrones" (Δός μοι τὴν τῶν σῶν θρόνων πάρεδρον σοφίαν). In a similar way the son of Sirach makes Wisdom say (Eccles. xxiv. 9): "He (the Most High) created me from the beginning before the world, and as long as the world I shall not fail." We have already incidentally seen how these thoughts grew into an elaborate doctrine of the Logos in the works of Philo.

Now Justin, whilst he nowhere adopts the terminology of the fourth Gospel, and nowhere refers to its introductory condensed statement of the Logos doctrine, closely follows Philo and, like him, traces it back to the Old Testament in the most direct way, accounting for the interposition of the divine Mediator in precisely the same manner as Philo, and expressing the views which had led the Seventy to modify the statement of the Hebrew original in their Greek translation. He is, in fact, thoroughly acquainted with the history of the Logos doctrine and its earlier enunciation under the symbol of Wisdom, and his knowledge of it is clearly independent of, and antecedent to, the statements of the fourth Gospel.

Referring to various episodes of the Old Testament in which God is represented as appearing to Moses and the Patriarchs, and in which it is said that "God went up from Abraham,"² or "The Lord spake to Moses,"³ or "The Lord came down to behold the town,"⁴ etc., or "God shut Noah into the ark,"⁵ and so on, Justin warns his antagonist that he is not to suppose that "the

¹ Prov. viii. 22; *Sept. vers.*

² Gen. xviii. 22.

³ Exod. vi. 29.

⁴ Gen. xi. 5.

⁵ Gen. vii. 16.

unbegotten God" (ἀγέννητος θεός) did any of these things, for he has neither to come to any place, nor walks, but from his own place, wherever it may be, knows everything, although he has neither eyes nor ears. Therefore he could not talk with anyone, nor be seen by anyone, and none of the Patriarchs saw the Father at all, but they saw "him who was according to his will both his Son (being God) and the Angel, in that he ministered to his purpose, whom also he willed to be born man by the Virgin, who became fire when he spoke with Moses from the bush."¹ He refers throughout his writings to the various appearances of God to the Patriarchs, all of which he ascribes to the pre-existent Jesus, the Word,² and in the very next chapter, after alluding to some of these, he says: "He is called Angel because he came to men, since by him the decrees of the Father are announced to men.....At other times he is also called Man and human being, because he appears clothed in these forms as the Father wills, and they call him Logos because he bears the communications of the Father to mankind."³

Justin, moreover, repeatedly refers to the fact that he was called Wisdom by Solomon, and quotes the passage we have indicated in Proverbs. In one place he says, in proof of his assertion that the God who appeared to Moses and the Patriarchs was distinguished from the Father, and was in fact the Word (ch. 66-70): "Another testimony I will give you, my friends, I said, from the Scriptures, that God begat before all of the creatures (πρὸ πάντων τῶν κτισμάτων) a Beginning (ἀρχὴν),⁴ a certain rational Power (δύναμιν λογικὴν) out of himself, who is called by the Holy Spirit, now the Glory of the Lord, then the Son, again Wisdom, again Angel, again God, and again Lord and Logos," etc., and a little further on: "The Word of Wisdom will testify to me, who is himself this God begotten of the Father of the universe, being Word, and Wisdom, and Power (δύναμις), and the Glory of the Begetter," etc.,⁵ and he quotes, from the Septuagint version, Proverbs viii. 22-36, part of which we have given above. Elsewhere, indeed, (ch. 129), he cites the passage a second time as evidence, with a

¹ *Dial.* 127; cf. 128, 63; cf. Philo, *De Somniis*, i., §§ 11 f., Mang., i. 630 f.; § 31, *ib.*, i. 648; §§ 33 f., *ib.*, i. 649 f.; §§ 39 f., *ib.*, i. 655 f. Nothing, in fact, could show more clearly the indebtedness of Justin to Philo than this argument (*Dial.* 100) regarding the inapplicability of such descriptions to the "unbegotten God." Philo in one treatise, from which we are constantly obliged to take passages as parallels for those of Justin (*de Confusione linguarum*), argues from the very same text: "The Lord went down to see that city and tower," almost in the very same words as Justin, § 27. The passage is unfortunately too long for quotation.

² *Dial.* 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 126, 127, 128, etc.; *Apol.*, i. 62, 63; cf. Philo, *Vita Mosis*, §§ 12 f., Mang., i. 91 f.; *Leg. Alleg.*, iii., §§ 25 f., *ib.*, i. 103 f., etc.

³ *Dial.* 128; cf. *Apol.*, i. 63; *Dial.* 60. ⁴ Cf. *Apoc.*, iii. 14. ⁵ *Dial.* 61.

similar context. Justin refers to it again in the next chapter, and the peculiarity of his terminology in all these passages, so markedly different from, and indeed opposed to, that of the fourth Gospel, will naturally strike the reader: "But this offspring (*γέννημα*) being truly brought forth by the Father was with the Father before all created beings (*πρὸ πάντων τῶν ποιημάτων*), and the Father communes with him, as the Logos declared through Solomon, that this same, who is called Wisdom by Solomon, had been begotten of God before all created beings (*πρὸ πάντων τῶν ποιημάτων*), both Beginning (*ἀρχή*) and Offspring (*γέννημα*)," etc.¹ In another place, after quoting the words, "No man knoweth the Father but the Son, nor the Son but the Father, and they to whom the Son will reveal him," Justin continues: "Therefore he revealed to us all that we have by his grace understood out of the Scriptures, recognising him to be indeed the first-begotten (*πρωτότοκος*) of God, and before all creatures (*πρὸ πάντων τῶν κτισμάτων*)..... and calling him Son, we have understood that he proceeded from the Father by his power and will before all created beings (*πρὸ πάντων ποιημάτων*), for in one form or another he is spoken of in the writings of the prophets as Wisdom," etc.;² and again, in two other places, he refers to the same fact.³

On further examination, we find on every side still stronger confirmation of the conclusion that Justin derived his Logos doctrine from the Old Testament and Philo, together with early New Testament writings. We have quoted several passages in which Justin details the various names of the Logos, and we may add one more. Referring to Ps. lxxii., which the Jews apply to Solomon, but which Justin maintains to be applicable to Christ, he says: "For Christ is King, and Priest, and God, and Lord, and Angel, and Man, and Captain, and Stone, and a Son born (*παιδίον γεννώμενον*), etc., as I prove by all of the Scriptures."⁴ Now these representations, which are constantly repeated throughout Justin's writings, are quite opposed to the Spirit of the fourth Gospel; but are, on the other hand, equally common in the works of Philo, and many of them also to be found in the Philonian Epistle to the Hebrews. Taking the chief amongst them, we may briefly illustrate them. The Logos as King, Justin avowedly derives from Ps. lxxii., in which he finds that reference is made to the "Everlasting King, that is to say Christ."⁵ We find this representation of the Logos throughout the writings of Philo. In one place already referred to,⁶ but which we shall now more fully quote, he says: "For God as Shepherd and King governs according to Law and justice like a flock of sheep, the earth, and water,

¹ *Dial.* 62.² *Ib.*, 100.³ *Ib.*, 126, 129.⁴ *Ib.*, 34.⁵ *Ib.*, 34.⁶ P. 450 f.

and air, and fire, and all the plants and living things that are in them, whether they be mortal or divine, as well as the course of heaven, and the periods of sun and moon, and the variations and harmonious revolutions of the other stars; having appointed his true Word (τὸν ὀρθὸν αὐτοῦ Λόγον) his first-begotten Son (πρωτόγονον υἱόν) to have the care of this sacred flock as the Vicegerent of a great King";¹ and a little further on he says: "Very reasonably, therefore, he will assume the name of a King, being addressed as a Shepherd."² In another place Philo speaks of the "Logos of the Governor, and his creative and kingly power, for of these is the heaven and the whole world."³

Then if we take the second epithet, the Logos as Priest (ἱερεύς), which is quite foreign to the fourth Gospel, we find it repeated by Justin, as, for instance: "Christ the eternal Priest" (ἱερεύς);⁴ and it is not only a favourite representation of Philo, but is almost the leading idea of the Epistle to the Hebrews, in connection with the episode of Melchisedec, in whom also both Philo⁵ and Justin⁶ recognise the Logos. In the Epistle to the Hebrews, vii. 3, speaking of Melchisedec: "but likened to the Son of God, abideth a Priest for ever"; again in iv. 14: "Seeing then that we have a great High Priest that is passed through the heavens, Jesus the Son of God," etc.; ix. 11: "Christ having appeared a High Priest of the good things to come"; xii. 21: "Thou art a Priest for ever." The passages are far too numerous to quote.⁷ They are equally numerous in the writings of Philo. In one place already quoted⁸ he says: "For there are, as it seems, two temples of God, one of which is this world, in which the High Priest is the Divine Word, his first-begotten Son" (Δύο γὰρ, ὡς ἔοικεν, ἱερά θεοῦ, ἐν μὲν ὁδε ὁ κόσμος, ἐν ᾧ καὶ ἀρχιερεύς, ὁ πρωτόγονος αὐτοῦ θεῖος Λόγος).⁹ Elsewhere, speaking of the period for the return of fugitives, the death of the high priest, which taken literally would embarrass him in his allegory, Philo says: "For we maintain the High Priest not to be a man, but the divine Word, who is without participation not only in voluntary but also in involuntary sins";¹⁰ and he goes on to speak of this priest as "the most sacred Word" (ὁ ἱερώτατος

¹ *De Agricult.*, § 12, Mang., i. 308.

² Εἰκότως τοίνυν ὁ μὲν βασιλέως ὄνομα ὑποδύσεται, ποιμὴν προσαγορευθεὶς, κ.τ.λ. § 14, cf. *De Profugis*, § 20, Mang., i. 562; *De Somniis*, ii., § 37, Mang., i. 691.

³ *De Profugis*, § 19, Mang., i. 561; cf. *de Migrat Abrahami*, § 1, Mang., i. 437.

⁵ *Legis Alleg.*, § 26, Mang., i. 104, etc.

⁷ Heb. vii. 11, 15, 17, 21 f., 26 f.; viii. 1 f.; ii. 6, 17; v. 5, 6, 10.

⁸ P. 450.

⁹ Philo, *De Somniis*, i., § 37, Mang., i. 653.

¹⁰ *De Profugis*, § 20, Mang., i. 562. Philo continues: that this priest, the Logos, must be pure, "God indeed being his Father, who is also the Father of all things, and Wisdom his mother, by whom the universe came into being."

Λόγος).¹ Indeed, in many long passages he descants upon the "high priest Word" (ὁ ἀρχιερεὺς Λόγος).²

Proceeding to the next representations of the Logos as "God and Lord," we meet with the idea everywhere. In Hebrews i. 8: "But regarding the Son he saith: Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever" (πρὸς δὲ τὸν υἱὸν Ὁ θρόνος σου, ὁ Θεὸς, εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα τοῦ αἰῶνος), etc.; and again in the Epistle to the Philippians, ii. 6: "Who (Jesus Christ), being in the form of God, deemed it not grasping to be equal with God" (ὃς ἐν μορφῇ θεοῦ ὑπάρχων οὐχ ἀρπαγμὸν ἠγήσατο τὸ εἶναι ἴσα θεῷ), etc.³ Philo, in the fragment preserved by Eusebius, to which we have already referred,⁴ calls the Logos the "Second God" (δεύτερος θεός).⁵ In another passage he has: "But he calls the most ancient God his present Logos," etc. (καλεῖ δὲ θεὸν τὸν πρεσβύτατον αὐτοῦ νυνὶ Λόγον);⁶ and a little further on, speaking of the inability of men to look on the Father himself: "Thus they regard the image of God, his Angel Word, as himself" (οὕτως καὶ τὴν τοῦ θεοῦ εἰκόνα, τὸν ἄγγελον αὐτοῦ Λόγον, ὡς αὐτὸν κατανοοῦσιν).⁷ Elsewhere discussing the possibility of God's swearing by himself, which he applies to the Logos, he says: "For in regard to us imperfect beings he will be a God, but in regard to wise and perfect beings the first. And yet Moses, in awe of the superiority of the unbegotten (ἀγεννήτου) God, says: 'And thou shalt swear by his name,' not by himself; for it is sufficient for the creature to receive assurance and testimony by the divine Word."⁸

It must be remarked, however, that both Justin and Philo place the Logos in a position more clearly secondary to God the Father than the prelude to the fourth Gospel i. 1. Both Justin and Philo apply the term θεός to the Logos without the article. Justin distinctly says that Christians worship Jesus Christ as the Son of the true God, holding him in the second place (ἐν δευτέρᾳ χώρᾳ ἔχοντες);⁹ and this secondary position is systematically defined through Justin's writings in a very decided way, as it is in the works of Philo by the contrast of the begotten Logos with the unbegotten God. Justin speaks of the Word as "the first-born of the unbegotten God" (πρωτότοκος τῷ ἀγεννήτῳ θεῷ),¹⁰ and the distinctive appellation of the "unbegotten God" applied to the Father is most common throughout his writings.¹¹ We may, in

¹ *De Profugis*, § 21.

² *De Migrat. Abrahami*, § 18, Mang., i. 452.

³ Cf. verse 11.

⁴ P. 451.

⁵ *Fragm.*, i., Mang., ii. 625; cf. *Leg. Alleg.*, ii., § 21, Mang., i. 83.

⁶ Philo, *De Somniis*, i. 39, Mang., i. 655.

⁷ *Ib.*, i., § 41, Mang., i. 656.

⁸ *Leg. Alleg.*, iii., § 73, Mang., i. 128.

⁹ *Apol.*, i. 13, cf. 60, where he shows that Plato gives the second place to the Logos.

¹⁰ *Ib.*, i. 53.

¹¹ *Ib.*, i. 49; *ib.*, ii. 6, 13; *Dial.* 126, 127.

continuation of this remark, point out another phrase of Justin which is continually repeated, but is thoroughly opposed both to the spirit and to the terminology of the fourth Gospel, and which likewise indicates the secondary consideration in which he held the Logos. He calls the Word constantly "the first-born of all created beings" (*πρωτότοκος τῶν πάντων ποιημάτων*,¹ or *πρωτότοκος πρὸ πάντων τῶν κτισμάτων*,² or *πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως*),³ "the first-born of all creation," echoing the expression of Col. i. 15—(The Son) "who is the image of the invisible God, the first-born of all creation" (*πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως*). This is a totally different view from that of the fourth Gospel, which in so emphatic a manner enunciates the doctrine: "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God"—a statement which Justin, with Philo, only makes in a very modified sense.

To return, however, the next representation of the Logos by Justin is as "Angel." This perpetually recurs in his writings.⁴ In one place, to which we have already referred, he says: "The Word of God is his Son, as we have already stated, and he is also called Angel (*Ἄγγελος*, or Messenger) and Apostle, for he brings the message of all we need to know, and is sent an Apostle to declare all the message contains."⁵ In the same chapter reference is again made to passages quoted for the sake of proving "that Jesus Christ is the Son of God and Apostle, being aforesaid the Word, and having appeared now in the form of fire and now in the likeness of incorporeal beings";⁶ and he gives many illustrations.⁷ The passages in which the Logos is called Angel are too numerous to be more fully dealt with here. It is scarcely necessary to point out that this representation of the Logos as Angel is not only foreign to, but opposed to the spirit of, the fourth Gospel, although it is thoroughly in harmony with the writings of Philo. Before illustrating this we may incidentally remark that the ascription to the Logos of the name "Apostle" which occurs in the two passages just quoted above, as well as in other parts of the writings of Justin,⁸ is likewise opposed to the fourth Gospel, although it is found in earlier writings, exhibiting a less developed form of the Logos doctrine; for the Epistle to the Hebrews, iii. 1, has: "Consider the Apostle and High Priest of our confession, Jesus," etc. (*κατανοήσατε τὸν ἀπόστολον καὶ ἀρχιερέα τῆς ὁμολογίας ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν*). We are, in fact, constantly directed by the remarks of Justin to other

¹ *Dial.* 62, 84, 100, etc. ² *Ib.*, 61, 100, 125, 129, etc. ³ *Ib.*, 85, 138, etc.

⁴ *Apol.*, i. 63; *Dial.* 34, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 127; cf. *Apol.*, i. 6.

⁵ *Apol.*, i. 63.

⁶ *Ib.*, i. 63.

⁷ Cf. *Dial.* 56-60, 127, 128.

⁸ *Apol.*, i. 12, etc.

sources of the Logos doctrine, and never to the fourth Gospel, with which his tone and terminology do not agree. Everywhere in the writings of Philo we meet with the Logos as Angel. He speaks "of the Angel Word of God" in a sentence already quoted,¹ and elsewhere in a passage, one of many others, upon which the lines of Justin which we are now considering (as well as several similar passages)² are in all probability moulded. Philo calls upon men to "strive earnestly to be fashioned according to God's first-begotten Word, the eldest Angel, who is the Archangel bearing many names, for he is called the Beginning (*ἀρχή*), and Name of God, and Logos, and the Man according to his image, and the Seer of Israel."³ Elsewhere, in a remarkable passage, he says: "To his Archangel and eldest Word, the Father, who created the universe, gave the supreme gift that having stood on the confine he may separate the creature from the Creator. The same is an intercessor on behalf of the ever-wasting mortal to the immortal; he is also the ambassador of the Ruler to his subjects. And he rejoices in the gift, and the majesty of it he describes, saying: 'And I stood in the midst between the Lord and you' (Numbers xvi. 48); being neither unbegotten like God, nor begotten like you, but between the two extremes," etc.⁴ We have been tempted to give more of this passage than is necessary for our immediate purpose, because it affords the reader another glimpse of Philo's doctrine of the Logos, and generally illustrates its position in connection with the Christian doctrine.

The last of Justin's names which we shall here notice is the

¹ Philo, *De Somniis*, i., § 41, Mang., i. 656. See p. 456 f.

² For instance, in the quotations at p. 456 f. from *Dial.* 61, and also that from *Dial.* 62, in which the Logos is also called the Beginning (*ἀρχή*). Both Philo and Justin, no doubt, had in mind Prov. viii. 22. In *Dial.* 100, for example, there is a passage, part of which we have quoted, which reads as follows: "For in one form or another he is spoken of in the writings of the prophets as Wisdom, and the Day, and the East, and a Sword, and a Stone, and a Rod, and Jacob, and Israel," etc. Now, in the writings of Philo these passages in the Old Testament are discussed and applied to the Logos, and to one in particular we may refer as an illustration. Philo says: "I have also heard of a certain associate of Moses having pronounced the following saying: 'Behold a man whose name is the East' (Zech. vi. 12). A most novel designation if you consider it to be spoken regarding one composed of body and soul; but if regarding that incorporeal Being who does not differ from the divine image, you will agree that the name of the East is perfectly appropriate to him. For indeed the Father of the Universe caused this eldest son (*πρεσβύτατον υἱόν*) to rise (*ἀνέτειλε*), whom elsewhere he names his first-begotten (*πρωτόγονον*)," etc. (*De Confus. Ling.*, § 14). Can it be doubted that Justin follows Philo in such exegesis?

³ *De Confus. Ling.*, § 28; Mang., i. 427; cf. *De Migrat. Abrahami*, § 31, Mang., i. 463.

⁴ *Quis rerum div. Heres.*, § 42, Mang., i. 501 f.

Logos as "Man" as well as God. In another place Justin explains that he is sometimes called a Man and human being, because he appears in these forms as the Father wills.¹ But here confining ourselves merely to the concrete idea, we find a striking representation of it in 1 Tim. ii. 5: "For there is one God and one mediator between God and man, the Man Christ Jesus" (εἷς γὰρ θεός, εἷς καὶ μεσίτης θεοῦ καὶ ἀνθρώπων, ἄνθρωπος Χριστὸς Ἰησοῦς); and again in Rom. v. 15: ".....by the grace of the one man Jesus Christ" (τοῦ ἐνὸς ἀνθρώπου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ), as well as elsewhere.² We have already seen in the passage quoted above from *De Confus. Ling.*, § 28, that Philo mentions, among the many names of the Logos, that of "the man according to (God's) image" (ὁ κατ' εἰκόνα ἀνθρώπου,³ or "the typical man"). If we pass to the application of the Logos doctrine to Jesus, we have the strongest reason for inferring Justin's total independence of the fourth Gospel. We have frequently pointed out that the title of Logos is given to Jesus in New Testament writings earlier than the fourth Gospel. We have remarked that, although the passages are innumerable in which Justin speaks of the Word having become man through the Virgin, he never makes use of the peculiar expression of the fourth Gospel, "the Word became flesh" (ὁ Λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο). On the few occasions on which he speaks of the Word having been *made flesh*, he uses the term *σαρκοποιηθείς*.⁴ In one instance he has *σάρκα ἔχειν*,⁵ and, speaking of the Eucharist, Justin once explains that it is the memory of Christ's having made himself *body*, *σωματοποιήσασθαι*.⁶ Justin's most common phrase, however—and he repeats it in numberless instances—is that the Logos submitted to be born, and become man (γεννηθῆναι ἄνθρωπον γενόμενον ὑπέμεινεν), by a Virgin, or he uses variously the expressions: *ἄνθρωπος γέγονε*, *ἄνθρωπος γενόμενος*, *γενέσθαι ἄνθρωπον*.⁷ In several places he speaks of him as the first production or offspring (γέννημα) of God before all created beings, as, for instance: "The Logos.....who is the first offspring of God" (ὁ ἐστὶ πρῶτον γέννημα τοῦ θεοῦ);⁸ and again, "and that this offspring was begotten of the Father absolutely before all creatures the Word was declaring" (καὶ ὅτι γεγεννῆσθαι ὑπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς τοῦτο τὸ γέννημα πρὸ πάντων ἀπλῶς τῶν κτισμάτων ὁ λόγος ἐδήλου).⁹

¹ *Dial.* 128. See the quotation p. 456 f.

² *Phil.*, ii. 8; 1 *Cor.* xv. 47.

³ Elsewhere Philo says that the Word was the archetypal model after which man and the human mind were formed. *De Exsecrat.*, § 8, *Mang.*, i. 436; *De Mundi Opificio*, § 6, *Mang.*, i. 6.

⁴ *Apol.*, i. 66 (twice); *Dial.* 45, 100.

⁵ *Dial.* 48.

⁶ *Ib.*, 70.

⁷ *Apol.*, i. 5, 23, 63; *Apol.*, ii. 6, 13; *Dial.* 34, 45, 48, 57, 63, 75, 84, 85, 105, 113, 125, 127, etc.

⁸ *Apol.*, i. 21.

⁹ *Dial.* 129, cf. 62.

We need not say more of the expressions: "first-born" (*πρωτότοκος*), "first-begotten" (*πρωτόγονος*), so constantly applied to the Logos by Justin, in agreement with Philo; nor to "only begotten" (*μονογενής*), directly derived from Ps. xxii. 20 (Ps. xxi. 20, *Sept.*).

It must be apparent to everyone who seriously examines the subject that Justin's terminology is markedly different from, and in spirit sometimes opposed to, that of the fourth Gospel, and in fact that the peculiarities of the Gospel are not found in Justin's writings at all.¹ On the other hand, his doctrine of the Logos is precisely that of Philo,² and of writings long antecedent to the fourth Gospel; and there can be no doubt, we think, that it was derived from them.

We may now proceed to consider other passages adduced by Tischendorf to support his assertion that Justin made use of the fourth Gospel. He says: "There are not lacking some passages of the Johannine Gospel to which passages in Justin can be traced. In the *Dialogue*, ch. 88, he writes of John the Baptist: 'The people believed that he was the Christ, but he cried to them: I am not the Christ, but the voice of a preacher.' This is connected with John i. 20 and 23; for no other Evangelist has reported the first words in the Baptist's reply."³ Now, the passage in Justin, with its context, reads as follows: "For John sat by the Jordan (*καθεζόμενον ἐπὶ τοῦ Ἰορδάνου*) and preached the Baptism of repentance, wearing only a leathern girdle and raiment of camel's hair, and eating nothing but locust and wild honey; men supposed (*ὑπελάμβανον*) him to be the Christ, wherefore he himself cried to them: "I am not the Christ, but the voice of one crying: For he shall come (*ἥξει*) who is stronger than I, whose shoes I am not meet (*ἱκανός*) to bear.'"⁴ The

¹ A passage is sometimes quoted in which Justin reproaches the Jews for spreading injurious and unjust reports "concerning the only blameless and righteous Light sent by God to man" (*Dial.* 17), and this is claimed as an echo of the Gospel; cf. John i. 9, viii. 12, xii. 46, etc. Now, here again we have in Philo the elaborate representation of the Logos as the sun and Light of the world; as, for instance, in a long passage in the treatise *De Somniis*, i., § 13 f., Mang., i. 631 f., of which we can only give the slightest quotation. Philo argues that Moses only speaks of the sun by symbols, and that it is easy to prove this; "since in the first place God is Light. 'For the Lord is my Light and my Saviour,' it is said in hymns, and not only Light, but archetype of every other light—nay, rather more ancient and more perfect than archetype, having the Logos for an exemplar. For indeed the exemplar was his most perfect Logos, Light," etc. (*De Somniis*, i., § 13, Mang., i. 632). And again: "But according to the third meaning he calls the divine Word the sun," and proceeds to show how by this sun all wickedness is brought to light, and the sins done secretly and in darkness are made manifest (*De Somniis*, i., § 15, Mang., i. 634; cf. *ib.*, § 19).

² If the *Cohort. ad Græcos* be assigned to Justin, it directly refers to Philo's works, c. ix.

³ *Wann wurden, u. s. w.*, p. 23.

⁴ *Dial.* 88.

only ground upon which this passage can be compared with the fourth Gospel is the reply: "I am not the Christ" (οὐκ εἰμὶ ὁ Χριστός), which in John i. 20 reads: ὅτι ἐγὼ οὐκ εἰμὶ ὁ Χριστός; and it is perfectly clear that, if the direct negation occurred in any other Gospel, the difference of the whole passage in the *Dialogue* would prevent even an apologist from advancing any claim to its dependence on that Gospel. In order to appreciate the nature of the two passages, it may be well to collect the nearest parallels in the Gospels, and compare them with Justin's narrative:—

JUSTIN, DIAL. 88.

Men (οἱ ἄνθρωποι) supposed him to be the Christ;

wherefore he cried to them: I am not the Christ (οὐκ εἰμὶ ὁ Χριστός),

but the voice of one crying:

For he shall come (ἔξει) who is stronger than I (ὁ ἰσχυρότερός μου), whose shoes I am not meet (ἰκανός) to bear.¹

JOHN I. 19-27.

19. And this is the testimony of John, when the Jews sent priests and Levites from Jerusalem to ask him: Who art thou?

24. *And they were sent by the Pharisees.

20. And he confessed, and denied not: and confessed² that: I am not the Christ (ὅτι ἐγὼ οὐκ εἰμὶ ὁ Χριστός).

21. And they asked again: Who then? Art thou, Elias? etc.

22.Who art thou? etc.

23. He said: I am the voice of one crying in the desert: Make straight the way of the Lord, as said the prophet Isaiah.

25.Why baptisest thou? etc.

26. John answered them, saying: I baptise with water, but in the midst of you standeth one whom ye know not.

27. Who cometh after me (ὁ ὀπίσω μου ἐρχόμενος), who is become before me (ὃς ἔμπροσθέν μου γέγονεν),³ the thong of whose shoes I am not worthy (ἄξιος) to unloose.

The introductory description of John's dress and habits is quite contrary to the fourth Gospel, but corresponds to some extent with Matt. iii. 4. It is difficult to conceive two accounts more fundamentally different, and the discrepancy becomes more apparent when we consider the scene and actors in the episode. In Justin,

¹ Matt. iii. 11 reads: "but he that cometh after me is stronger than I, whose shoes I am not worthy to bear" (ὁ δὲ ὀπίσω μου ἐρχόμενος ἰσχυρότερός μου ἐστίν, οὗ οὐκ εἰμὶ ἰκανός τὰ ὑποδήματα βαστάσαι). The context is quite different. Luke iii. 16 more closely resembles the version of the fourth Gospel in this part with the context of the first Synoptic.

² The second καὶ ὡμολόγησεν is omitted by the *Cod. Sin.*

³ The *Cod. Sinaiticus*, as well as most other important MSS., omits this phrase.

it is evident that the hearers of John had received the impression that he was the Christ, and the Baptist, becoming aware of it, voluntarily disabused their minds of this idea. In the fourth Gospel the words of John are extracted from him ("he confessed and denied not") by emissaries sent by the Pharisees of Jerusalem specially to question him on the subject. The account of Justin betrays no knowledge of any such interrogation. The utter difference is brought to a climax by the concluding statement of the fourth Gospel:—

JUSTIN.	JOHN I. 28.
For John sat by the Jordan and preached the Baptism of repentance, wearing, etc.	These things were done in Bethany beyond the river Jordan, where John was baptising.

In fact, the scene in the two narratives is as little the same as their details. One can scarcely avoid the conclusion, in reading the fourth Gospel, that it quotes some other account and does not pretend to report the scene direct. For instance, i. 15: "John beareth witness of him, and cried, saying, 'This was he *of whom I said*: He that cometh after me is become before me, because he was before me,'" etc. V. 19: "And this is the testimony of John, *when the Jews sent priests and Levites from Jerusalem to ask him, Who art thou?* and he confessed and denied not, and confessed that I am not the Christ," etc. Now, as usual, the Gospel which Justin uses more nearly approximates to our first Synoptic than the other Gospels, although it differs in very important points from that also; still, taken in connection with the third Synoptic and Acts xiii. 25, this indicates the great probability of the existence of other writings combining the particulars as they occur in Justin. Luke iii. 15 reads: "And as the people were in expectation, and all mused in their hearts concerning John whether he were the Christ, 16. John answered, saying to them all: I indeed baptise you with water, but he that is stronger than I cometh, the latchet of whose shoes I am not worthy to unloose: he shall baptise you with the Holy Spirit and with fire," etc.

Whilst with the sole exception of the simple statement of the Baptist that he was not the Christ, which in all the accounts is clearly involved in the rest of the reply, there is no analogy between the parallel in the fourth Gospel and the passage in Justin, many important circumstances render it certain that Justin did not derive his narrative from that source. We have already¹ fully discussed the peculiarities of Justin's account of the Baptist, and in the context to the very passage before us there are details quite foreign to our Gospels which show that Justin made use of another and different work. When Jesus stepped into the

¹ P. 199 f.

water to be baptised a fire was kindled in the Jordan, and the voice from heaven makes use of words not found in our Gospels; but both the incident and the words are known to have been contained in the Gospel according to the Hebrews and other works. Justin likewise states, in immediate continuation of the passage before us, that Jesus was considered the son of Joseph the carpenter, and himself was a carpenter and accustomed to make ploughs and yokes.¹ The Evangelical work of which Justin made use was obviously different from our Gospels, therefore, and the evident conclusion to which any impartial mind must arrive is, that there is not the slightest ground for affirming that Justin quoted the passage before us from the fourth Gospel, from which he so fundamentally differs, but every reason, on the contrary, to believe that he derived it from a Gospel different from ours.

The next argument advanced by Tischendorf is, that on two occasions he speaks of the restoration of sight to persons born blind,² the only instance of which in our Gospels is that recorded, John ix. 1. The references in Justin are very vague and general. In the first place he is speaking of the analogies in the life of Jesus with events believed in connection with mythological deities, and he says that he would appear to relate acts very similar to those attributed to Æsculapius when he says that Jesus "healed the lame and paralytic, and the maimed from birth (ἐκ γενετῆς πονηρούς), and raised the dead."³ In the *Dialogue*, again referring to Æsculapius, he says that Christ "healed those who were from birth and according to the flesh blind (τοὺς ἐκ γενετῆς καὶ κατὰ τὴν σάρκα πηρούς), and deaf, and lame."⁴ In the fourth Gospel the born-blind is described as (ix. 1) ἄνθρωπος τυφλὸς ἐκ γενετῆς. There is a variation, it will be observed, in the term employed by Justin, and that such a remark should be seized upon as an argument for the use of the fourth Gospel serves to show the poverty of the evidence for the existence of that work. Without seeking any further, we might at once reply that such general references as those of Justin might well be referred to the common tradition of the Church, which certainly ascribed all kinds of marvellous cures and miracles to Jesus. It is, moreover, unreasonable to suppose that the only Gospel in which the cure of one born blind was narrated was that which is the fourth in our Canon. Such a miracle may have formed part of a dozen similar collections extant at the time of Justin, and in no case could such an allusion be recognised as evidence of the use of the

¹ *Dial.* 88.

² *Apol.*, i. 22; *Dial.* 69. On the second occasion Justin seems to apply the "from their birth" not only to the blind, but to the lame and deaf.

³ *Apol.*, i. 22.

⁴ *Dial.* 69.

fourth Gospel. But in the *Dialogue*, along with this remark, Justin couples the statement, that although the people saw such cures "they asserted them to be magical illusion; for they also ventured to call him a magician and deceiver of the people."¹ This is not found in our Gospels, but traces of the same tradition are met with elsewhere, as we have already mentioned;² and it is probable that Justin either found all these particulars in the Gospel of which he made use, or that he refers to traditions familiar to the early Christians.

Tischendorf's next point is that Justin quotes the words of Zechariah xii. 10, with the same variation from the text of the Septuagint as John xix. 37—"They shall look on him whom they pierced" (ὄψονται εἰς ὃν ἐξεκέντησαν³ instead of ἐπιβλέψονται πρὸς μὲ, ἀνθ' ὃν κατωρχήσαντο), arising out of an emendation of the translation of the Hebrew original. Tischendorf says: "Nothing can be more opposed to probability than the supposition that John and Justin have here, independently of each other, followed a translation of the Hebrew text which elsewhere has remained unknown to us."⁴ The fact is, however, that the translation which has been followed is not elsewhere unknown. We meet with the same variation, much earlier, in the only book of the New Testament which Justin mentions, and with which, therefore, he was beyond any doubt well acquainted—Rev. i. 7: "Behold he cometh with clouds, and every eye shall see him (ὄψεται αὐτόν), and they which pierced (ἐξεκέντησαν) him, and all the tribes of the earth shall bewail him. Yea, Amen." This is a direct reference to the passage in Zech. xii. 10. It will be remembered that the quotation in the Gospel, "They shall look upon him whom they pierced," is made solely in reference to the thrust of the lance in the side of Jesus, while that of the Apocalypse is a connection of the prophecy with the second coming of Christ, which, except in a spiritual sense, is opposed to the fourth Gospel. Justin upon each occasion quotes the whole passage also in reference to the second coming of Christ as the Apocalypse does, and this alone settles the point so far as these two sources are concerned. If Justin derived his variation from either of the canonical works, therefore, we should be bound to conclude that it must have been from the Apocalypse. The correction of

¹φαντασίαν μαγικὴν γίνεσθαι ἔλεγον. Καὶ γὰρ μάγον εἶναι αὐτὸν ἐτόλμων λέγειν καὶ λαοπλάνον. *Dial.* 69.

² P. 204 f.

³ Justin has, *Apol.*, i. 52, ὄψονται εἰς ὃν ἔξεκέντησαν. *Dial.* 14, καὶ ὄψεται ὁ λαὸς ὑμῶν καὶ γνωριεῖ εἰς ὃν ἐξεκέντησαν, and, *Dial.* 32, speaking of the two comings of Christ; the first, in which he was pierced (ἐξεκεντήθη), "and the second in which ye shall know whom ye have pierced"; δευτέραν δὲ ὅτε ἐπιγνώσεσθε εἰς ὃν ἐξεκεντήσατε.

⁴ *Wann wurden, u. s. w.*, p. 34.

the Septuagint version, which has thus been traced back as far as A.D. 68, when the Apocalypse was composed, was noticed by Jerome in his Commentary on the text;¹ and Aquila, a contemporary of Irenæus, and later Symmachus and Theodotion, as well as others, similarly adopted ἐξεκέντησαν. Ten important MSS., of the Septuagint, at least, have the reading of Justin and of the Apocalypse, and these MSS. likewise frequently agree with the other peculiarities of Justin's text. In all probability, as Credner, who long ago pointed out all these circumstances, conjectured, an emendation of the rendering of the LXX. had early been made, partly in Christian interest and partly for the critical improvement of the text,² and this amended version was used by Justin and earlier Christian writers. Ewald³ and some others suggest that probably ἐκκεντέιν originally stood in the Septuagint text. Every consideration is opposed to the dependence of Justin upon the fourth Gospel for the variation.

The next and last point advanced by Tischendorf is a passage in *Apol.*, i. 61, which is compared with John iii. 3-5, and in order to show the exact character of the two passages we shall place them in parallel columns:—

JUSTIN, APOL., I. 61.

For the Christ also said :

Unless ye be born again (ἀναγεννηθῆτε) ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven.

Now that it is impossible for those who have once been born to go (ἐμβῆναι) into the matrices of the parents⁴ (εἰς τὰς μήτρας τῶν τεκουσῶν) is evident to all.

Καὶ γὰρ ὁ Χριστὸς εἶπεν· Ἄν μὴ

JOHN III. 3-5.

3. Jesus answered and said unto him : Verily, verily, I say unto thee : Except a man be born from above (γεννηθῆ ἄνωθεν) he cannot see the kingdom of God.

4. Nicodemus saith unto him : How can a man be born when he is old ? Can he enter (εἰσελθεῖν) a second time into his mother's womb (εἰς τὴν κοιλίαν τῆς μητρὸς αὐτοῦ) and be born ?

5. Jesus answered : Verily, verily, I say unto thee : Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into⁵ the kingdom of God.⁶

3. Ἀπεκρίθη Ἰησοῦς καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ· Ἄμην ἀμην λέγω σοι, εἰ μὴ τις

¹ "Quod ibi (1 Regg. ii. 18) errore interpretationis accidit, etiam hic factum deprehendimus. Si enim legatur Dacaru, ἐξεκέντησαν, i.e., compunxerunt sive confixerunt accipitur: sin autem contrario ordine, literis commutatis Racadu, ὠρχήσαντο, i.e., saltaverunt intelligitur et ob similitudinem literarum error est natus."

² Credner, *Beiträge*, ii., p. 293 f. Cf. Sanday, *Gospels in Sec. Cent.*, p. 281.

³ *Comm. in Apoc. Joh.*, 1829, p. 93, anm. 1; cf. *Die Joh. Schriften*, 1862, p. 112, anm. 1; Lücke, *Offenb. Joh.*, ii., p. 446 f.

⁴ Τεκούσα, a mother, instead of μήτηρ.

⁵ The *Cod. Sinaiticus* reads: "he cannot see."

⁶ The *Cod. Sinaiticus* has been altered here to: "of heaven."

JUSTIN, APOL., I. 61.

ἀναγεννηθῆτε, οὐ μὴ εἰσέλθητε εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν οὐρανῶν. Ὅτι δὲ καὶ

ἀδύνατον εἰς τὰς μήτρας τῶν τεκουσῶν τοὺς ἅπαξ γεννωμένους ἐμβῆναι, φανερὸν πᾶσιν ἐστι.

JOHN III. 3-5.

γεννηθῆ ἄνωθεν, οὐ δύναται ἰδεῖν τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ.

4. Λέγει πρὸς αὐτὸν ὁ Νικόδημος· Πῶς δύναται ἄνθρωπος γεννηθῆναι γέρων ὢν; μὴ δύναται εἰς τὴν κοιλίαν τῆς μητρὸς αὐτοῦ δεύτερον εἰσελθεῖν καὶ γεννηθῆναι;

5. Ἀπεκρίθη Ἰησοῦς· Ἀμὴν ἀμὴν λέγω σοι, ἐὰν μὴ τις γεννηθῆ ἐξ ὕδατος καὶ πνεύματος, οὐ δύναται εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ.²

This is the most important passage by which apologists endeavour to establish the use of the fourth Gospel by Justin, and it is that upon which the whole claim may be said to rest. We shall be able to appreciate the nature of the case by the weakness of its strongest evidence. The first point which must have struck any attentive reader is the singular difference of the language of Justin, and the absence of the characteristic peculiarities of the Johannine Gospel. The double "verily, verily," which occurs twice even in these three verses, and constantly throughout the Gospel,³ is absent in Justin; and apart from the total difference of the form in which the whole passage is given (the episode of Nicodemus being entirely ignored), and omitting minor differences, the following linguistic variations occur:

Justin has:

ἂν μὴ ἀναγεννηθῆτε	instead of	ἐὰν μὴ τις γεννηθῆ ἄνωθεν
οὐ μὴ εἰσέλθητε εἰς	"	οὐ δύναται ἰδεῖν ⁴
βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν	"	βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ
ἀδύνατον	"	μὴ δύναται
τὰς μήτρας	"	τὴν κοιλίαν
τῶν τεκουσῶν	"	τῆς μητρὸς αὐτοῦ
ἐμβῆναι	"	εἰσελθεῖν
τοὺς ἅπαξ γεννωμένους	"	ἄνθρωπος γεννηθῆναι γέρων ὢν.

It is almost impossible to imagine a more complete difference, both in form and language, and it seems to us that there does not exist a single linguistic trace by which the passage in Justin can be connected with the fourth Gospel. The fact that Justin knows nothing of the expression γεννηθῆ ἄνωθεν ("born from above"), upon which the whole statement in the fourth Gospel

¹ The *Cod. Sinaiticus* reads *ιδεῖν* for *εἰσελθεῖν εἰς* here.

² The *Cod. Sin.* has *τῶν οὐρανῶν*, but *τοῦ θεοῦ* is substituted by a later hand. The former reading is only supported by a very few obscure and unimportant codices. The *Codices Alex.* (A) and *Vatic.* (B), as well as all the most ancient MSS., read *τοῦ θεοῦ*.

³ Cf. i. 51; iii. 11; v. 19, 24, 25; vi. 26, 32, 47, 53; viii. 34, 51, 58; x. 1, 7; xii. 24; xiii. 16, 20, 21, 38; xiv. 12; xvi. 20, 23; xxi. 18, etc.

⁴ It is very forced to jump to the end of the fifth verse to get *εἰσελθεῖν εἰς*, and even in that case the *Cod. Sinaiticus* reads again, precisely as in the third, *ιδεῖν*.

turns, but uses a totally different word, ἀναγεννηθῆτε (born again), is of great significance. Tischendorf wishes to translate ἀνωθεν “anew” (or again), as the version of Luther and the authorised English translation read, and thus render the ἀναγεννηθῆναι of Justin a fair equivalent for it; but even this would not alter the fact that so little does Justin quote the fourth Gospel that he has not even the test word of the passage. The word ἀνωθεν, however, certainly cannot here be taken to signify anything but “from above”¹—from God, from heaven—and this is not only its natural meaning, but the term is several times used in other parts of the fourth Gospel, always with this same sense,² and there is nothing which warrants a different interpretation here. On the contrary, the same signification is manifestly indicated by the context, and forms the point of the whole lesson.

“Except a man be born of water and of Spirit³ he cannot enter into the kingdom of God. 6. That which hath been born of the flesh is flesh, and that which hath been born of the Spirit is Spirit. 7. Marvel not that I said unto thee: ye must be born from above” (γεννηθῆναι ἀνωθεν). The explanation of ἀνωθεν is given in verse 6. The birth “of the Spirit” is the birth “from above,” which is essential to entrance into the kingdom of God.⁴

The sense of the passage in Justin is different and much more simple. He is speaking of regeneration through baptism, and the manner in which converts are consecrated to God when they are made new (καινοποιηθέντες) through Christ. After they are taught to fast and pray for the remission of their sins, he says: “They are then taken by us where there is water, that they may be regenerated (‘born again,’ ἀναγεννώνται), by the same manner of regeneration (‘being born again,’ ἀναγεννήσεως) by which we also were regenerated (‘born again,’ ἀναγεννήθημεν). For in the name of the Father of the Universe the Lord God, and of our Saviour Jesus Christ, and of the Holy Spirit, they then make the washing with the water. For the Christ also said, ‘Unless ye be born again (ἀναγεννηθῆτε), ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven.’

¹ Credner, *Beiträge*, i., p. 253; Davidson, *Introd. N. T.*, ii., p. 375; Hilgenfeld, *Die Evv. Justin's*, p. 214; Lange, *Ev. n. Joh.*, 1862, p. 84 f.; Lightfoot, *Horæ Hebr. et Talm. on John*, iii. 3; *Works*, xii., p. 254 f.; J. B. Lightfoot, *A Fresh Revision of the New Test.*, 1871, p. 142; Lücke, *Comment. Ev. Joh.*, i., p. 516 f.; Meyer, *Ev. Joh.*, 1869, p. 154 f.; Reuss, *Hist. Théol. Chrét.*, ii., p. 521 f., 523, n. 2; Scholten, *Die ält. Zeugnisse*, p. 36; *Het Ev. n. Joh.*, 1865, pp. 21, 105, 237, 272, 387; Späth, *Protestanten Bibel*, 1874, p. 276 f.; Stemler, *Het Ev. v. Joh.*, 1868, pp. 250, 338, 344, 400; Suicer, *Thesaurus s. v. ἀνωθεν*; de Wette, *Ev. u. Br. Joh.*, 1863, pp. 61; Wordsworth, *Gk. Test., The Four Gospels*, p. 280; Zeller, *Theol. Jahrb.*, 1855, p. 140. Cf. Bretschneider, *Probabilia*, p. 193.

² Cf. i. 31; xix. 11, 23.

³ Cf. Ezekiel xxxvi. 25-27.

⁴ Cf. Lightfoot, *Horæ Hebr. et Talm.*; *Works*, xii., p. 256.

Now that it is impossible for those who have once been born to go into the matrices of the parents is evident to all." And then he quotes Isaiah i. 16-20, "Wash you, make you clean," etc., and proceeds: "And regarding this (Baptism) we have been taught this reason. Since at our first birth we were born without our knowledge, and perforce, etc., and brought up in evil habits and wicked ways, therefore in order that we should not continue children of necessity and ignorance, but become children of election and knowledge, and obtain in the water remission of sins which we had previously committed, the name of the Father of the Universe and Lord God is pronounced over him who desires to be born again (*ἀναγεννηθῆναι*), and has repented of his sins," etc.¹ It is clear that, whereas Justin speaks simply of regeneration by baptism, the fourth Gospel indicates a later development of the doctrine by spiritualising the idea, and requiring not only regeneration through the water ("Except a man be born of water"), but that a man should be born from above ("and of the Spirit"), not merely *ἀναγεννηθῆναι*, but *ἀνωθεν γεννηθῆναι*. The word used by Justin is that which was commonly employed in the Church for regeneration, and other instances of it occur in the New Testament.²

The idea of regeneration, or being born again, as essential to conversion, was quite familiar to the Jews themselves, and Lightfoot gives instances of this from Talmudic writings: "If any one become a proselyte he is like a child 'new born.' The Gentile that is made a proselyte and the servant that is made free he is like a child new born."³ This is, of course, based upon the belief in special privileges granted to the Jews, and the Gentile convert admitted to a share in the benefits of the Messiah became a Jew by spiritual new birth. Justin, in giving the words of Jesus, clearly professed to make an exact quotation⁴: "For Christ also said: Unless ye be born again," etc. It must be remembered, however, that Justin is addressing the Roman emperors, who would not understand the expression that it was necessary to be "born again" in order to enter the kingdom of heaven. He therefore explains that he does not mean a physical new birth by men already born; and this explanation may be regarded as natural, under the circumstances, and independent of any written source. In any case, the striking difference of his language from that of the fourth Gospel at least forbids the inference that it must necessarily have been derived from that Gospel. To argue otherwise would be to assume that sayings of Jesus which are maintained to be historical were not recorded in

¹ *Apol.*, i. 61.

³ Lightfoot, *Works*, xii., p. 255 f.

² Cf. I Peter i. 3, 28.

⁴ Bretschneider, *Probabilia*, p. 193.

more than four Gospels, and indeed in this instance were limited to one. This is not only in itself inadmissible, but historically untrue,¹ and a moment of consideration must convince every impartial mind that it cannot legitimately be asserted that an express quotation of a supposed historical saying must have been taken from a parallel in one of our Gospels, from which it differs so materially in language and circumstance, simply because that Gospel happens to be the only one now surviving which contains particulars somewhat similar. The express quotation fundamentally differs from the fourth Gospel, and the natural explanation of Justin which follows is not a quotation at all, and likewise fundamentally differs from the Johannine parallel. Justin not only ignores the peculiar episode in the fourth Gospel in which the passage occurs, but neither here nor anywhere throughout his writings makes any mention of Nicodemus. The accident of survival is almost the only justification of the affirmation that the fourth Gospel is the source of Justin's quotation. On the other hand, we have many strong indications of another source. In our first Synoptic (xviii. 3) we find traces of another version of the saying of Jesus, much more nearly corresponding with the quotation of Justin: "And he said, verily I say unto you: Except ye be turned and become as the little children ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven."² The last phrase of this saying is literally the same as the quotation of Justin, and gives his expression, "kingdom of heaven," so characteristic of his Gospel, and so foreign to the Johannine. We meet with a similar quotation in connection with baptism, still more closely agreeing with Justin, in the *Clementine Homilies*, xi. 26: "Verily I say unto you: Except ye be born again (*ἀναγεννηθῆτε*) by living water in the name of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven."³ Here, again, we have both the *ἀναγεννηθῆτε* and the *βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν*, as well as the reference only to water in the baptism, and this is strong confirmation of the existence of a version of the passage, different from the Johannine, from which Justin quotes. As both the author of the *Clementines* and Justin probably made use of the Gospel according to the Hebrews, some most competent critics have, with reason, adopted the conclusion that the passage we are discussing

¹ Cf. Luke i. 1.

² καὶ εἶπεν, Ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, ἐὰν μὴ στραφῆτε καὶ γένησθε ὡς τὰ παιδία, οὐ μὴ εἰσέλθητε εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν οὐρανῶν. Matt. xviii. 3.

³ *Hom.*, xi. 26; cf. *Recogn.*, vi. 9: "Amen dico vobis, nisi quis denuo renatus fuerit ex aqua, non introibit in regna cælorum." Cf. *Clem. Hom. Epitome*, § 18. In this much later compilation the passage, altered and manipulated, is of no interest. Uhlhorn, *Die Homilien u. Recogn.*, 1854, p. 43 f.; Schliemann, *Die Clementinen*, 1844, p. 334 f.

was probably derived from that Gospel ; at any rate, it cannot be maintained as a quotation from our fourth Gospel, and it is, therefore, of no value as evidence even for its existence. Were it successfully traced to that work, however, the passage would throw no light on the authorship and character of the fourth Gospel.

If we turn for a moment from this last of the points of evidence adduced by Tischendorf for the use of the fourth Gospel by Justin, to consider how far the circumstances of the history of Jesus narrated by Justin bear upon this quotation, we have a striking confirmation of the results we have otherwise attained. Not only is there a total absence from his writings of the peculiar terminology and characteristic expressions of the fourth Gospel, but there is no allusion made to any of the occurrences exclusively narrated by that Gospel, although many of these, and many parts of the Johannine discourses of Jesus, would have been peculiarly suitable for his purpose. We have already pointed out the remarkable absence of any use of the expressions by which the Logos doctrine is stated in the prologue. We may now add that Justin makes no reference to any of the special miracles of the fourth Gospel. He is apparently quite ignorant even of the raising of Lazarus. On the other hand, he gives representations of the birth, life, and death of Jesus, which are ignored by the Johannine Gospel, and are opposed to its whole conception of Jesus as the Logos ; and when he refers to circumstances which are also narrated in that Gospel, his account is different from that which it gives. Justin perpetually speaks of the birth of Jesus by the Virgin of the race of David and the Patriarchs : his Logos thus becomes man¹ (not "*flesh*"—*ἄνθρωπος*, not *σάρξ*) ; he is born in a cave in Bethlehem ;² he grows in stature and intellect by the use of ordinary means like other men ; he is accounted the son of Joseph the carpenter and Mary : he himself works as a carpenter, and makes ploughs and yokes.³ When Jesus is baptised by John, a fire is kindled in Jordan ; and Justin evidently knows nothing of John's express declaration in the fourth Gospel, that Jesus is the Messiah, the Son of God.⁴ Justin refers to the change of name of Simon in connection with his recognition of the Master as "Christ the Son of God,"⁵ which is narrated quite differently in the fourth Gospel (i. 40-42), where such a declaration is put into the mouth of Nathaniel (i. 49), which Justin ignores. Justin does not mention Nicodemus either in connection with the statement regarding the necessity of being "born from above," or with the entombment (xix. 39). He has the prayer and agony in the garden,⁶ which the fourth Gospel

¹ *Dial.* 100, etc.

⁴ *Ib.*, 88.

² *Ib.*, 78.

⁵ *Ib.*, 100.

³ *Ib.*, 88.

⁶ *Ib.*, 99, 103.

excludes, as well as the cries on the cross which that Gospel does not contain. Then, according to Justin, the last supper takes place on the 14th Nisan,¹ whilst the fourth Gospel, ignoring the Passover and last supper, represents the last meal as eaten on the 13th Nisan (John xiii. 1 f., cf. xviii. 28). He likewise contradicts the fourth Gospel in limiting the work of Jesus to one year. In fact, it is impossible for writings, so full of quotations of the words of Jesus and of allusions to the events of his life, more completely to ignore or vary from the fourth Gospel throughout; and if it could be shown that Justin was acquainted with such a work, it would follow certainly that he did not consider it an Apostolical or authoritative composition.

We may add that, as Justin so distinctly and directly refers to the Apostle John as the author of the Apocalypse,² there is confirmation of the conclusion, otherwise arrived at, that he did not, and could not, know the Gospel and also ascribe it to him. Finally, the description which Justin gives of the manner of teaching of Jesus excludes the idea that he knew the fourth Gospel: "Brief and concise were the sentences uttered by him; for he was no Sophist, but his word was the power of God."³ No one could for a moment assert that this description applies to the long and artificial discourses of the fourth Gospel, whilst, on the other hand, it eminently describes the style of teaching in the Synoptics, with which the numerous Gospels in circulation amongst early Christians were, of course, more nearly allied.

The inevitable conclusion at which we must arrive is that, far from indicating any acquaintance with the fourth Gospel, the writings of Justin not only do not furnish the slightest evidence of its existence, but offer presumptive testimony against its Apostolical origin.

Tischendorf only devotes a short note to Hegesippus,⁴ and does not pretend to find in the fragments of his writings preserved to us by Eusebius, or the details of his life which he has recorded, any evidence for our Gospels. Apologists generally admit that this source, at least, is barren of all testimony for the fourth Gospel, but Dr. Westcott cannot renounce so important a witness without an effort, and he therefore boldly says: "When he (Hegesippus) speaks of 'the door of Jesus' in his account of the death of St. James, there can be little doubt that he alludes to the language of our Lord recorded by St. John."⁵ The passage to

¹ "And it is written that on the day of the Passover you seized him, and likewise during the Passover you crucified him" (*Dial.* III; cf. *Dial.* 70; *Matt.* xxvi. 2, 17 f., 30, 57).

² *Dial.* 81.

³ *Apol.*, i. 14.

⁴ *Wann wurden*, u. s. w., p. 19, anm. 1.

⁵ *On the Canon*, p. 182 f.

which Dr. Westcott refers, but which he does not quote, is as follows:—"Certain, therefore, of the seven heretical parties amongst the people, already described by me in the Memoirs, inquired of him, what was the door of Jesus; and he declared this (τοῦτον—Jesus) to be the Saviour. From which some believed that Jesus is the Christ. But the aforementioned heretics did not believe either a resurrection, or that he shall come to render to every one according to his works. As many as believed, however, did so through James." The rulers, fearing that the people would cause a tumult from considering Jesus to be the Messiah (Χριστός), entreat James to persuade them concerning Jesus, and prevent their being deceived by him; and in order that he may be heard by the multitude, they place James upon a wing of the temple, and cry to him: "O, just man, whom we all are bound to believe, inasmuch as the people are led astray after Jesus, the crucified, declare plainly to us what is the door of Jesus."¹ To find in this a reference to the fourth Gospel requires a good deal of apologetic ingenuity. It is perfectly clear that, as an allusion to John x. 7, 9, "I am the door," the question, "What is the door of Jesus?" is mere nonsense, and the reply of James totally irrelevant. Such a question in reference to the discourse in the fourth Gospel, moreover, in the mouths of the antagonistic Scribes and Pharisees, is quite inconceivable, and it is unreasonable to suppose that it has any connection with it. Various emendations of the text have been proposed to obviate the difficulty of the question, but none of these have been adopted, and it has now been generally accepted that *θύρα* is used in an idiomatic sense. The word is very frequently employed in such a manner, or symbolically, in the New Testament,² and by the Fathers. The Jews were well acquainted with a similar use of the word in the Old Testament, in some of the Messianic Psalms, as for instance: Ps. cxviii. 19, 20 (cxvii. 19, 20, *Sept.*). 19, "Open to me the gates (πύλας) of righteousness; entering into them, I will give praise to the Lord"; 20, "This is the gate (ἡ πύλη) of the Lord; the righteous shall enter into it."³ Quoting this passage, Clement of Alexandria remarks: "But explaining the saying of the prophet, Barnabas adds: Many gates (πυλῶν) being open, that which is in righteousness is in Christ, in which all those who enter are blessed."⁴ Grabe explains the passage of Hegesippus by a refer-

¹ Eusebius, *H. E.*, ii. 23.

² Cf. Acts xiv. 27; 1 Cor. xvi. 9; 2 Cor. ii. 12; Col. iv. 3; James v. 9; Rev. iii. 8, 20; iv. 1.

³ Cf. Ps. xxiv. 7-8 (xxiii. 7-8, *Sept.*).

⁴ *Strom.* vi. 8, § 64. This passage is not to be found in the Epistle of Barnabas.

ence to the frequent allusions in Scripture to the two ways: one of light, the other of darkness; the one leading to life, the other to death; as well as the simile of two gates which is coupled with them, as in Matt. vii. 13 f. He, therefore, explains the question of the rulers, "What is the door of Jesus?" as an inquiry into the judgment of James concerning him: whether he was a teacher of truth or a deceiver of the people; whether belief in him was the way and gate of life and salvation, or of death and perdition.¹ He refers as an illustration to the Epistle of Barnabas, xviii.: "There are two ways of teaching and of power: one of light, the other of darkness. But there is a great difference between the two ways." The Epistle, under the symbol of the two ways, classifies the whole of the moral law.² In the *Clementine Homilies*, xviii. 17, there is a version of the saying, Matt. vii. 13 f., derived from another source, in which "way" is more decidedly even than in our first Synoptic made the equivalent of "gate": "Enter ye through the narrow and straitened way (ὁδός) through which we shall enter into life." Eusebius himself, who has preserved the fragment, evidently understood it distinctly in the same sense, and he gives its true meaning in another of his works, where he paraphrases the question into an inquiry, as to the opinion which James held concerning Jesus (τίνα περὶ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ ἔχοι δόξαν).³ This view is supported by many learned men, and Routh has pointed out that Ernesti considered he would have been right in making διδαχή, doctrine, teaching, the equivalent of θύρα, although he admits that Eusebius never uses it in his history in connection with Christian doctrine.⁴ He might, however, have instanced this passage, in which it is clearly used in this sense, and so explained by Eusebius. There is evidently no intention on the part of the Scribes and Pharisees to ridicule, in asking, "What is the door of Jesus?" but they desire James to declare plainly to the people the teaching of Jesus, and his personal pretension. To suppose that the rulers of the Jews set James upon a wing of the temple, in order that they might ask him a question, for the benefit of the

¹ *Spicil. Patr.*, ii., p. 254.

² In like manner the *Clementine Homilies* give a peculiar version of Deut. xxx. 15: "Behold I have set before thy face the way of life, and the way of death" (*Hom.*, xviii. 17, cf. vii. 7). We have already shown (p. 150 f.) that *The Teaching of the Twelve Apostles* (i.-vi.) is based upon this text.

³ *Demonstrat. Evang.*, iii. 7; Routh, *Rel. Sacr.*, i., p. 235.

⁴ "Si ego in Glossis ponerem: θύρα, διδαχή, rectum esset. Sed respicerem ad loca Græcorum theologorum v. c. Eusebii in *Hist. Eccl.* ubi non semel θύρα Χριστοῦ (sic) de doctrina Christiano dicitur." *Dissert. De Usu Glossariorum.* Routh, *Reliq. Sacra.*, i., p. 236. Donaldson gives as the most probable meaning; "To what is it that Jesus is to lead us? And James' answer is therefore: 'To salvation'" (*Hist. Chr. Lit. and Doctr.*, iii., p. 190, note).

multitude, based upon a discourse in the fourth Gospel, unknown to the Synoptics, and even in relation to which such an inquiry as, "What is the door of Jesus?" becomes mere ironical nonsense, surpasses all that we could have imagined even of apologetic zeal.

We have already said all that is necessary with regard to Hegesippus, in connection with the Synoptics, and need not add more here. It is certain that had he written anything interesting about our Gospels, and, we may say, particularly about the fourth, the fact would have been recorded by Eusebius.¹

Nor need we add much to our remarks regarding Papias of Hierapolis.² It is perfectly clear that the works of Matthew and Mark,³ regarding which he records such important particulars, are not the Gospels in our Canon, which pass under their names; he does not seem to have known anything of the third Synoptic; and there is no reason to suppose that he referred to the fourth Gospel or made use of it. He is, therefore, at least, a total blank so far as the Johannine Gospel and our third Synoptic are concerned, but he is more than this, and it may, we think, be concluded that Papias was not acquainted with any such Gospels which he regarded as Apostolic compositions, or authoritative documents. Had he said anything regarding the composition or authorship of the fourth Gospel, Eusebius would certainly have mentioned the fact; and this silence of Papias is strong presumptive evidence against the Johannine Gospel. Tischendorf's argument in regard to the Phrygian Bishop is mainly directed to this point, and he maintains that the silence of Eusebius does not make Papias a witness against the fourth Gospel, and does not involve the conclusion that he did not know it, inasmuch as it was not, he affirms, the purpose of Eusebius to record the mention or use of the books of the New Testament which were not disputed.⁴ It might be contended that this reasoning is opposed to the practice and express declaration of Eusebius himself, who says: "But in the course of the history I shall, with the successions (from the Apostles), carefully intimate what ecclesiastical writers of the various periods made use of the *Antilegomena* (or disputed writings), and which of them, and what has been stated by these as well regarding the collected (*ἐνδιαθήκοι*) and *Homologoumena*

¹ See remarks regarding the Silence of Eusebius; Preface to Complete ed., p. xviii. f.

² P. 276 f.; Preface to Complete ed., p. xxi. f.

³ It is evident that Papias did not regard the works by "Matthew" and "Mark" which he mentions, as of any authority. Indeed, all that he reports regarding the latter is merely apologetic, and in deprecation of criticism.

⁴ *Wann wurden, u. s. w.*, p. 112 f.

(or accepted writings), as regarding those which are not of this kind."¹ It is not worth while, however, to dwell upon this here. The argument in the case of Papias stands upon a broader basis. It is admitted that Eusebius engages carefully to record what ecclesiastical writers state regarding the *Homologoumena*, and that he actually does so. Now Papias has himself expressed the high value he attached to tradition, and his eagerness in seeking information from the Presbyters. The statements regarding the Gospels composed by Matthew and Mark, quoted by Eusebius, are illustrative at once both of the information collected by Papias and of that cited by Eusebius. How comes it, then, that nothing whatever is said about the fourth Gospel, a work so peculiar and of such exceptional importance, said to be composed by the Apostle whom Jesus loved? Is it possible to suppose that, when Papias collected from the Presbyter the facts which he has recorded concerning Matthew and Mark, he would not also have inquired about a Gospel by John, had he known of it? Is it possible that he could have had nothing interesting to tell about a work presenting so many striking and distinctive features? Had he collected any information on the subject, he would certainly have recorded it, and as certainly Eusebius would have quoted what he said,² as he did the account of the other two Gospels, for he even mentions that Papias made use of the 1st Epistle of John and 1st Epistle of Peter, two equally accepted writings. The legitimate presumption, therefore, is that, as Eusebius did not mention the fact, he did not find anything regarding the fourth Gospel in the work of Papias, and that Papias was not acquainted with it. This presumption is confirmed by the circumstance that when Eusebius writes, elsewhere (*H. E.*, iii. 24), of the order of the Gospels, and the composition of John's Gospel, he has no greater authority to give for his account than vague tradition: "they say" (*φασί*).

Proceeding from this merely negative argument, Tischendorf endeavours to show that not only is Papias not a witness against the fourth Gospel, but that he presents evidence in its favour. The first reason he advances is that Eusebius states: "The same (Papias) made use of testimonies out of the first Epistle of John, and likewise out of that of Peter."³ On the supposed identity of the authorship of the Epistle and Gospel, Tischendorf, as in the case of Polycarp, claims this as evidence for the fourth Gospel. Eusebius, however, does not quote the passages upon which he bases this statement, and, knowing his inaccuracy and the hasty and uncritical manner in which he and the Fathers generally jump

¹ Eusebius, *H. E.*, iii. 3; cf. iii. 24.

² Cf. Preface to 6th ed., p. xi. f., xxi. f.

³ Eusebius, *H. E.*, iii. 39.

at such conclusions, we must reject this as sufficient proof that Papias really did use the Epistle, and that Eusebius did not adopt his opinion from a mere superficial analogy of passages; but, if it were certain that Papias actually quoted from the Epistle, it does not in the least follow that he ascribed it to the Apostle John, and the use of the Epistle would scarcely affect the question as to the character and authorship of the fourth Gospel.

The next testimony advanced by Tischendorf is, indeed, of an extraordinary character. There is a Latin MS. (*Vat. Alex. 14*) in the Vatican, which Tischendorf assigns to the ninth century, in which there is a preface, by an unknown hand, to the Gospel according to John, which commences as follows: "*Evangelium iohannis manifestatum et datum est ecclesiis ab iohanne adhuc in corpore constituto, sicut papias nomine hierapolitanus discipulus iohannis carus in exotericis id est in extremis quinque libris retulit*" ("The Gospel of John was published and given to the churches by John whilst he was still in the flesh, as Papias, named of Hierapolis, an esteemed disciple of John, related in his *Exoterics*, that is his last five books"). Tischendorf says: "There can, therefore, be no more decided declaration made of the testimony of Papias for the Johannine Gospel."¹ He wishes to end the quotation here, and only refers to the continuation, which he is obliged to admit to be untenable, in a note. The passage proceeds: "*Disscripsit vero evangelium dictante iohanne recte*" ("He [Papias] indeed wrote out the Gospel, John duly dictating"); then follows another passage regarding Marcion, representing him also as a contemporary of John, which Tischendorf likewise confesses to be untrue.² Now, Tischendorf admits that the writer desires it to be understood that he derived the information that Papias wrote the fourth Gospel at the dictation of John likewise from the work of Papias, and, as it is perfectly impossible, by his own admissions, that Papias, who was not a contemporary of the Apostle, could have stated this, the whole passage is clearly fabulous and written by a person who never saw the book at all. This extraordinary piece of evidence is so obviously absurd that it is passed over in silence by other critics, even of the strongest apologetic tendency, and it stands here a pitiable instance of the arguments to which destitute criticism can be reduced.

In order to do full justice to the last of the arguments of Tischendorf, we shall give it in his own words: "Before we leave Papias, we have still to consider one testimony for the Gospel of John which Irenæus, v. 36, § 2, quotes out of the very mouth of the Presbyters, those high authorities of Papias: 'And therefore, say they, the Lord declared: In my Father's house are many

¹ *Wann wurden, u. s. w.*, p. 119.

² *Ib.*, p. 119, anm. 1.

mansions' (John xiv. 2). As the Presbyters set this declaration in connection with the blessedness of the righteous in the City of God, in Paradise, in Heaven, according as they bear fruit thirty, sixty, or one hundred-fold, nothing is more probable than that Irenæus takes this whole declaration of the Presbyters, which he gives, §§ 1-2, like the preceding description of the thousand years' reign, from the work of Papias. But whether this be its origin or not, the authority of the Presbyters is in any case higher than that of Papias," etc.¹ Now in the quotation from Irenæus given in this passage Tischendorf renders the oblique construction of the text by inserting "say they," referring to the Presbyters of Papias; and, as he does not give the original, he should at least have indicated that these words are supplementary. We shall endeavour as briefly as possible to state the facts of the case.

Irenæus, with many quotations from Scripture, is arguing that our bodies are preserved, and that the Saints who have suffered so much in the flesh shall in that flesh receive the fruits of their labours. In v. 33, § 2, he refers to the saying given in Matt. xix. 29 (Luke xviii. 29, 30), that whosoever has left lands, etc., because of Christ shall receive a hundred-fold in this world, and in the next, eternal life; and then, enlarging on the abundance of the blessings in the Millennial kingdom, he affirms that Creation will be renovated, and the earth acquire wonderful fertility; and he adds, § 3, "As the Presbyters who saw John, the disciple of the Lord, remember that they heard from him, how the Lord taught concerning those times and said," etc. (*"Quemadmodum presbyteri meminērunt, qui Joannem discipulum Domini viderunt audisse se ab eo, quemadmodum de temporibus illis docebat Dominus, et dicebat,"* etc.); and then he quotes the passage, "The days will come in which vines will grow each having ten thousand Branches," etc.; and "In like manner that a grain of wheat would produce ten thousand ears," etc. With regard to these, he says, at the beginning of the next paragraph, v. 33, § 4: "These things are testified in writing by Papias, a hearer of John and associate of Polycarp, an ancient man in the fourth of his books: for there were five books composed by him.² And he added, saying: 'But these things are credible to believers. And Judas the traitor not believing, and asking how shall such growths be effected by the Lord, the Lord said: They who shall come to them shall see.' Prophesying of these times, therefore, Isaiah says: 'The Wolf also shall feed with the Lamb,' etc. (quoting Isaiah xi. 6-9); and

¹ *Wann wurden, u. s. w.*, p. 119 f.

² Eusebius has preserved the Greek of this passage (*H. E.*, iii. 39), and goes on to contradict the statement of Irenæus that Papias was a hearer and contemporary of the Apostles. Eusebius states that Papias, in his preface, by no means asserts that he was.

again he says, recapitulating: 'Wolves and lambs shall then feed together,' etc. (quoting Isaiah lxv. 25), and so on, continuing his argument. It is clear that Irenæus introduces the quotation from Papias, and, ending his reference at "They who shall come to them shall see," he continues, with a quotation from Isaiah, his own train of reasoning. We give this passage to show the manner in which Irenæus proceeds. He then continues with the same subject, quoting (v. 34, 35) Isaiah, Ezekiel, Jeremiah, Daniel, the Apocalypse, and sayings found in the New Testament bearing upon the Millennium. In c. 35 he argues that the prophecies he quotes of Isaiah, Jeremiah, and the Apocalypse must not be allegorised away, but that they literally describe the blessings to be enjoyed after the coming of Antichrist and the resurrection in the New Jerusalem on earth; and he quotes Isaiah vi. 12, lx. 5, 21, and a long passage from Baruch iv. 36, v. 9 (which he ascribes to Jeremiah), Isaiah xlix. 16, Galatians iv. 26, Rev. xxi. 2, xx. 2-15, xxi. 1-6, all descriptive, as he maintains, of the Millennial kingdom prepared for the saints; and then, in v. 36, the last chapter of his work on heresies, as if resuming his previous argument, he proceeds¹: "§ 1. And that these things shall ever remain without end Isaiah says: 'For like as the new heaven and the new earth which I make remain before me, saith the Lord, so shall your seed and your name continue,'² and, as the Presbyters say, then those who have been deemed worthy of living in heaven shall go thither, and others shall enjoy the delights of Paradise, and others shall possess the glory of the City; for everywhere the Saviour shall be seen as those who see him shall be worthy. § 2. But that there is this distinction of dwelling (εἶναι δὲ τὴν διαστολὴν ταύτην τῆς οἰκήσεως) of those bearing fruit the hundred-fold, and of the (bearers) of the sixty-fold, and of the (bearers of) the thirty-fold: of whom some indeed shall be taken up into the heavens, some shall live in Paradise, and some shall inhabit the City, and that for this reason (διὰ τοῦτο—*propter hoc*) the Lord declared: In the.....(plural) of my Father are many mansions (ἐν τοῖς τοῦ πατρὸς μου μοναῖς εἶναι πολλάς).³ For all

¹ We have the following passage only in the old Latin version, with fragments of the Greek preserved by Andrew of Cæsarea in his *Comment. in Apoc.*, xviii., lxiv., and elsewhere.

² Isaiah lxvi. 22, *Sept.*

³ With this may be compared John xiv. 2, ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ τοῦ πατρὸς μου μοναὶ πολλαὶ εἰσιν. If the passage be maintained to be from the Presbyters, the variations from the text of the Gospel are important. Doubtless the expression, τὰ τοῦ πατρὸς μου, may mean "my father's house," and this sense is ancient, but a wider sense is far from excluded, and the plural is used. In Luke ii. 49 the very phrase occurs, ἐν τοῖς τοῦ πατρὸς μου, and in the authorised version is translated "about my father's business" (cf. 1 Tim. iv. 15). The best commentators are divided in opinion regarding the passage in Luke. It is

things are of God, who prepares for all the fitting habitation, as his Word says that distribution is made to all by the Father according as each is or shall be worthy. And this is the couch upon which they recline who are invited to banquet at the Wedding. The Presbyters, the disciples of the Apostles, state that this is the order and arrangement of those who are saved, and that by such steps they advance,"¹ etc.

It is impossible for any one who attentively considers the whole of this passage, and who makes himself acquainted with the manner in which Irenæus conducts his argument, and interweaves it with quotations, to assert that the phrase we are considering must have been taken from a book referred to three chapters earlier, and was not introduced by Irenæus from some other source. In the passage from the commencement of the second paragraph Irenæus enlarges upon, and illustrates, what "the Presbyters say" regarding the blessedness of the saints, by quoting the view held as to the distinction between those bearing fruit thirty-fold, sixty-fold, and one hundred-fold,² and the interpretation given of the saying regarding "many mansions"; but the source of his quotation is quite indefinite, and may simply be the exegesis of his own day. That this is probably the case is shown by the continuation: "And this is the Couch upon which they recline who are invited to banquet at the Wedding"—an allusion to the marriage supper upon which Irenæus had previously discoursed;³ immediately after which phrase, introduced by Irenæus himself, he says: "The Presbyters, the disciples of the Apostles, state that this is the order and arrangement of those who are saved," etc. Now, if the preceding passages had been a mere quotation from the Presbyters of Papias, such a remark would have been out of place and useless; but, being the exposition of the prevailing views, Irenæus confirms it and prepares to wind up the whole subject by the general statement that the Presbyters, the disciples of the Apostles, affirm that this is the order and arrangement of those who are saved, and that by such steps they advance and ascend through the Spirit to the Son, and through the Son to the Father, etc.; and a few sentences after he closes his work.

In no case can it be legitimately affirmed that the citation of "the Presbyters," and the "Presbyters, disciples of the Apostles," is a reference to the work of Papias. When quoting

necessary, in a case like the present, to convey the distinct difference between the words as they stand in Irenæus and the saying in the fourth Gospel. Dr. Sanday has "In my Father's realm" (*Gospels in Sec. Cent.*, p. 297).

¹ Irenæus, *Adv. Hær.*, v. 36, §§ 1, 2.

² Matt. xiii. 8; Mark iv. 20; cf. Matt. xxv. 14-29; Luke xix. 12-26; xii. 47, 48.

³ *Adv. Hær.*, iv. 36, §§ 5, 6.

“the Presbyters who saw John, the disciple of the Lord,” three chapters before, Irenæus distinctly states that Papias testifies what he quotes in writing in the fourth of his books; but there is nothing to indicate that “the Presbyters” and “the Presbyters, disciples of the Apostles,” subsequently referred to, after a complete change of context, have anything to do with Papias. The references to Presbyters in this work of Irenæus are very numerous, and when we remember the importance which the Bishop of Lyons attached to “that tradition which comes from the Apostles, which is preserved in the Churches by a succession of Presbyters,”¹ the reference before us assumes a very different complexion. In one place, Irenæus quotes “the divine Presbyter” (ὁ θεῖος πρεσβύτερος), “the God-loving Presbyter” (ὁ θεοφιλὴς πρεσβύτερος),² who wrote verses against the heretic Marcus. Elsewhere he supports his extraordinary statement that the public career of Jesus, instead of being limited to a single year, extended over a period of twenty years, and that he was nearly fifty when he suffered,³ by the appeal: “As the gospel and all the Presbyters testify, who in Asia met with John the disciple of the Lord (stating) that these things were transmitted to them by John. For he continued among them till the times of Trajan.”⁴ That these Presbyters are not quoted from Papias may be inferred from the fact that Eusebius, who had his work, cites the passage from Irenæus without allusion to Papias; and as he adduces two witnesses only, Irenæus and Clement of Alexandria, to prove the assertion regarding John, he would certainly have referred to the earlier authority, had the work of Papias contained the statement, as he does for the stories regarding the daughters of the Apostle Philip, the miracle in favour of Justus, and other matters.⁵ We need not refer to Clement, nor to Polycarp, who had been “taught by Apostles,” and the latter of whom Irenæus knew in his youth.⁶ Irenæus in one place also gives a long account of the teaching of some one upon the sins of David and other men of old, which he introduces: “As I have heard from a certain Presbyter, who had heard it from those who had seen the Apostles, and from those

¹ *Adv. Hær.*, iii. 2, § 2; cf. i. 10, § 1; 27, §§ 1, 2; ii. 22, § 5; iii. *præf.* 3, § 4; 21, § 3; iv. 27, § 1; 32, § 1; v. 20, § 2; 30, § 1.

² *Ib.*, i. 15, § 6.

³ *Ib.*, ii. 22, §§ 4, 6.

⁴ *Adv. Hær.*, ii. 22, § 5; cf. Eusebius, *H. E.*, iii. 23. “In Asia” evidently refers chiefly to Ephesus, as is shown by the passage quoted immediately after by Eusebius from *Adv. Hær.*, iii. 3, § 4, “the Church in Ephesus also..... where John continued until the times of Trajan, is a witness to the truth of the apostolic tradition.”

⁵ Eusebius, *H. E.*, iii. 39.

⁶ *Adv. Hær.*, iii. 3, §§ 3, 4. Fragment from his Epistle to Florinus preserved by Eusebius, *H. E.*, v. 20.

who learnt from them,"¹ etc. Further on, speaking evidently of a different person, he says: "In this manner also a Presbyter disciple of the Apostles reasoned regarding the two Testaments":² and quotes fully. In another place Irenæus, after quoting Gen. ii. 8, "And God planted a Paradise eastward in Eden," etc., states: "Wherefore the Presbyters, who are disciples of the Apostles (*οἱ πρεσβύτεροι, τῶν ἀποστόλων μαθηταί*) say that those who were translated had been translated thither," there to remain, till the consummation of all things, awaiting immortality; and Irenæus explains that it was into this Paradise that Paul was caught up (2 Cor. xii. 4).³ It seems highly probable that these "Presbyters, the disciples of the Apostles," who are quoted on Paradise, are the same "Presbyters, the disciples of the Apostles," referred to here on the same subject (v. 36, §§ 1, 2); but there is nothing to connect them with Papias. He also speaks of the Septuagint translation of the Bible as the version of the "Presbyters,"⁴ and on several occasions he calls Luke "the follower and disciple of the Apostles" (*Sectator et discipulus apostolorum*),⁵ and characterises Mark as "the interpreter and follower of Peter" (*interpretes et sectator Petri*),⁶ and refers to both as having learnt from the words of the Apostles.⁷ Here is, therefore, a wide choice of Presbyters, including even Evangelists, to whom the reference of Irenæus may with equal right be ascribed,⁸ so that it is unreasonable to claim it as an allusion to the work of Papias.⁹ In fact, Dr. Tischendorf and Dr. Westcott¹⁰ stand almost alone in advancing this passage as evidence

¹ *Quemadmodum audivi a quodam presbytero, qui audierat ab his qui apostolos viderant, et ab his qui didicerant, etc.* (*Adv. Hær.*, iv. 27, § 1; cf. § 2; 30, § 1). This has been variously conjectured to be a reference to Polycarp, Papias, and Pothinus, his predecessor at Lyons; but it is admitted by all to be impossible to decide upon the point.

² *Hujusmodi quoque de duobus testamentis senior apostolorum discipulus disputabat, etc.* (*Adv. Hær.*, iv. 32, § 1).

³ *Adv. Hær.*, v. 5, § 1.

⁴ *Ib.*, iii. 21, §§ 3, 4.

⁵ *Ib.*, i. 23, § 1; iii. 10, § 1; 14, § 1. ⁶ *Ib.*, iii. 10, § 6. ⁷ *Ib.*, iii. 15, § 4.

⁸ In the New Testament the term Presbyter is even used in reference to Patriarchs and Prophets (Heb. xi. 2; cf. Matt. xv. 2, Mark vii. 3, 5).

⁹ With regard to the Presbyters quoted by Irenæus generally. Cf. Routh, *Reliq. Sacra*, i., p. 47 f.

¹⁰ Dr. Westcott affirms: "In addition to the Gospels of St. Matthew and St. Mark, Papias appears to have been acquainted with the Gospel of St. John."⁽³⁾ He says no more, and offers no evidence for this assertion in the text. There are two notes, however, on the same page, which we shall now quote, the second being that to which ⁽³⁾ above refers. "² No conclusion can be drawn from Eusebius' silence as to express testimonies of Papias to the Gospel of St. John, as we are ignorant of his special plan, and the title of his book shows that it was not intended to include 'all the oracles of the Lord' (see p. 61, note 2)." The second note is: "³ There is also (!?) an allusion to it in the quotation from the 'Elders' found in Irenæus (lib. v.

that either Papias or his Presbyters were acquainted with the fourth Gospel; and this renders the statement which is made by them without any discussion all the more indefensible. Scarcely a single writer, however apologetic, seriously cites it amongst the external testimonies for the early existence of the Gospel, and the few who do refer to the passage merely mention, in order to abandon, it. So far as the question as to whether the fourth Gospel was mentioned in the work of Papias is concerned, the passage has practically never entered into the controversy at all, the great mass of critics having recognised that it is of no evidential value, and, by common consent, tacitly excluded it. It is admitted that the Bishop of Hierapolis cannot be shown to have known the fourth Gospel, and the majority affirm that he actually was not acquainted with it. Being, therefore, so completely detached from Papias, it is obvious that the passage does not in any way assist the fourth Gospel, but becomes assignable to vague tradition, and subject to the cumulative force of objections, which prohibit an early date being ascribed to so indefinite a reference.

Before passing on there is one other point to mention: Andrew of Cæsarea, in the preface to his *Commentary on the Apocalypse*, mentions that Papias maintained "the credibility" (τὸ ἀξιόπιστον) of that book, or, in other words, its apostolic origin.¹ His strong millenarian opinions would naturally make such a composition stand high in his esteem, if indeed it did not materially contribute to the formation of his views, which is still more probable. Apologists admit the genuineness of this statement; nay, claim it as undoubted evidence of the acquaintance of Papias with the

ad. f.) which probably was taken from Papias (fr. v. *Routh et Nott.*). The Latin passage containing a reference to the Gospel which is published as a fragment of 'Papias' by Grabe and Routh (fr. xi.) is taken from the 'Dictionary' of a mediæval Papias quoted by Grabe upon the passage, and not from the present Papias. The 'Dictionary' exists in MS. both at Oxford and Cambridge. I am indebted to the kindness of a friend for this explanation of what seemed to be a strange forgery" (*On the Canon*, p. 65). The note 2, p. 61, referred to in note 2 quoted above, says on this subject: "The passage quoted by Irenæus from 'the Elders' may probably be taken as a specimen of his style of interpretation" (!), and then follows a quotation, "as the Presbyters say," down "to many mansions." Dr. Westcott then continues: "Indeed, from the similar mode of introducing the story of the vine which is afterwards referred to Papias, it is reasonable to conjecture that this interpretation is one from Papias' *Exposition*." We have given the whole of the passages to show how little evidence there is for the statement which is made. The isolated assertion in the text, which is all that most readers would see, is supported by no better testimony than that in the preceding note inserted at the foot of an earlier page.

¹ Andreas, *Proleg. in Apocalypsin*; Routh, *Rel. Sacrae*, i., p. 15.

Apocalypse.¹ Dr. Westcott, for instance, says: "He maintained, moreover, 'the divine inspiration' of the Apocalypse, and commented, at least, upon part of it."² He must, therefore, have recognised the book as the work of the Apostle John, and we shall, hereafter, show that it is impossible that the author of the Apocalypse was the author of the Gospel; therefore, in this way also, Papias is a witness against the Apostolic origin of the fourth Gospel.

We must now turn to the *Clementine Homilies*, although, as we have shown,³ the uncertainty as to the date of this spurious work, and the late period which must undoubtedly be assigned to its composition, render its evidence of very little value for the canonical Gospels. The passages pointed out in the Homilies as indicating acquaintance with the fourth Gospel were long advanced with hesitation, and were generally felt to be inconclusive; but on the discovery of the concluding portion of the work, and its publication by Dressel in 1853, it was found to contain a passage which apologists now claim as decisive evidence of the use of the Gospel, and which even succeeded in converting some independent critics.⁴ Tischendorf⁵ and Dr. Westcott,⁶ in the few lines devoted to the *Clementines*, do not refer to the earlier proof passages, but rely entirely upon that last discovered. With a view, however, to making the whole of the evidence clear, we shall give all of the supposed allusions to the fourth Gospel, confronting them with the text. The first is as follows:—

HOM. III. 52.

Wherefore he, being the true prophet, said:

I am the gate of life: he coming in through me cometh in unto life, as there is no other teaching which is able to save.

Διὰ τοῦτο αὐτὸς ἀληθῆς ὢν προφήτης ἔλεγεν·

Ἐγὼ εἰμι ἡ πύλη τῆς ζωῆς· ὁ δι' ἐμοῦ εἰσερχόμενος εἰσέρχεται εἰς τὴν ζωὴν ὡς οὐκ οὐσης ἑτέρας τῆς σώζειν δυναμένης διδασκαλίας.

JOHN X. 9.

I am the door (of the sheepfold); if anyone enter through me he shall be saved, and shall go in and shall go out and shall find pasture.

Ἐγὼ εἰμι ἡ θύρα· δι' ἐμοῦ ἐάν τις εἰσέλθῃ, σωθήσεται, καὶ εἰσελεύσεται καὶ ἐξελεύσεται καὶ νομὴν εὕρησει.

¹ Lücke, *Einl. Offenb. Joh.*, 1852, ii., p. 526; Ewald, *Die Joh. Schriften*, ii., p. 371 f.; Guericke, *Gesamtgesch. N. T.*, p. 536; Tischendorf, *Wann wurden*, u. s. w., p. 116, etc.

² *On the Canon*, p. 65.

³ P. 300 f.
⁴ Hilgenfeld, who had maintained that the *Clementines* did not use the fourth Gospel, was induced by the passage to which we refer to admit its use. Cf. *Die Evv. Justin's*, p. 385 f.; *Die Evangelien*, p. 346 f.; *Der Kanon*, p. 29; *Theol. Jahrb.*, 1854, p. 534, anm. 1; *Zeitschr. wiss. Theol.*, 1865, p. 338. Volkmar is inclined to the same opinion, although not with the same decision. *Theol. Jahrb.*, 1854, p. 448 f.

⁵ *Wann wurden*, u. s. w., p. 90 f.

⁶ *On the Canon*, p. 252.

The first point which is apparent here is that there is a total difference both in the language and real meaning of these two passages. The Homily uses the word *πύλη* instead of the *θύρα* of the Gospel, and speaks of the gate of life instead of the door of the Sheepfold. We have already¹ discussed the passage in the *Shepherd* of Hermas, in which similar reference is made to the gate (*πύλη*) into the kingdom of God, and need not here repeat our argument. In Matt. vii. 13, 14 we have the direct description of the gate (*πύλη*) which leads to life (*εἰς τὴν ζωὴν*), and we have elsewhere quoted the Messianic Psalm cxviii. 19, 20: "This is the gate of the Lord (*αὕτη ἡ πύλη τοῦ Κυρίου*);² the righteous shall enter into it." In another place the author of the *Homilies*, referring to a passage parallel to, but differing from, Matt. xxiii. 2, which we have elsewhere considered,³ and which is derived from a Gospel different from ours, says: "Hear *them* (Scribes and Pharisees who sit upon Moses's seat), he said, as entrusted with the key of the kingdom which is knowledge, which alone is able to open the gate of life (*πύλη τῆς ζωῆς*), through which alone is the entrance to Eternal life."⁴ Now, in the very next chapter to that in which the saying which we are discussing occurs, a very few lines after it, indeed, we have the following passage: "Indeed, he said further: 'I am he concerning whom Moses prophesied, saying: 'a prophet shall the Lord our God raise up to you from among your brethren as also (he raised) me; hear ye him regarding all things, but whosoever will not hear that prophet he shall die.'"⁵ There is no such saying in the canonical Gospels or other books of the New Testament attributed to Jesus, but a quotation from Deuteronomy xviii. 15 f., materially different from this, occurs twice in the Acts of the Apostles, once being put into the mouth of Peter applied to Jesus,⁶ and the second time also applied to him, being quoted by Stephen.⁷ It is quite clear that the writer is quoting from uncanonical sources, and here is another express declaration regarding himself: "I am he," etc., which is quite in the spirit of the preceding passage which we are discussing, and probably derived from the same source. In another place we find the following argument: "But the way is the manner of life, as also Moses says: 'Behold I have set before thy face the way of life, and the way of death';⁸ and in agreement the teacher said: 'Enter ye through the narrow and straitened way through which ye shall enter into life'; and in another place, a certain person inquiring, 'What shall I do to inherit eternal life?' he intimated the Commandments of the Law."⁹ It has to be observed that the *Homilies* teach the doctrine

¹ P. 438 f.⁴ *Hom.*, iii. 18.⁷ *Ib.*, vii. 37.² Ps. cxvii. 20, *Sept.*⁵ *Ib.*, iii. 53.⁸ Deut. xxx. 15.³ P. 308 f.⁶ Acts iii. 22.⁹ *Hom.*, xviii. 17.

that the spirit in Jesus Christ had already appeared in Adam, and by a species of transmigration passed through Moses and the Patriarchs and prophets: "who from the beginning of the world, changing names and forms, passes through Time (*τὸν αἰῶνα τρέχει*), until, attaining his own seasons, being on account of his labours anointed by the mercy of God, he shall have rest for ever."¹ Just in the same way, therefore, as the *Homilies* represent Jesus as quoting a prophecy of Moses, and altering it to a personal declaration, "I am the prophet," etc., so here again they make him adopt this saying of Moses and, "being the true prophet," declare: "I am the gate or the way of life"—inculcating the same commandments of the law which the Gospel of the *Homilies* represents Jesus as coming to confirm and not to abolish. The whole system of doctrine of the *Clementines*, as we shall presently see, indicated here even by the definition of "the true prophet," is so fundamentally opposed to that of the fourth Gospel that there is no reasonable ground for supposing that the author made use of it; and this brief saying, varying as it does in language and sense from the parallel in the Gospel, cannot prove acquaintance with it. There is good reason to believe that the author of the fourth Gospel, who most undeniably derived materials from earlier Evangelical works, may have drawn from a source likewise used by the Gospel according to the Hebrews, and thence many analogies might well be presented with quotations from that or kindred Gospels. We find, further, this community of source in the fact that in the fourth Gospel, without actual quotation, there is a reference to Moses, and, no doubt, to the very passage (Deut. xviii. 15) which the Gospel of the *Clementines* puts into the mouth of Jesus, John v. 46: "For had ye believed Moses ye would believe me, for he wrote of me." Whilst the Ebionite Gospel gave prominence to this view of the case, the dogmatic system of the Logos Gospel did not permit of more than mere reference to it.

The next passage pointed out as derived from the Johannine Gospel occurs in the same chapter: "My sheep hear my voice."

ΗΟΜ. ΙΙΙ. 52.

Τὰ ἐμὰ πρόβατα ἀκούει τῆς ἐμῆς φωνῆς.

JOHN X. 27.

Τὰ πρόβατα τὰ ἐμὰ τῆς φωνῆς μου ἀκούει.

There was no more common representation amongst the Jews of the relation between God and his people than that of a Shepherd and his sheep,² nor any more current expression than "hearing his voice." This brief anonymous saying was in all probability derived from the same source as the preceding, which cannot be

¹ *Hom.*, iii. 20.

² Cf. Isaiah xl. 11; liii. 6; Ezek. xxxiv.; Zech. xi.; Hebrews xiii. 20.

identified with the fourth Gospel. Tradition, and the acknowledged existence of other written records of the teaching of Jesus, oppose any exclusive claim to this fragmentary saying.

We have already discussed the third passage regarding the new birth in connection with Justin,¹ and may therefore pass on to the last and most important passage, to which we have referred as contained in the concluding portion of the *Homilies* first published by Dressel in 1853. We subjoin it in contrast with the parallel in the fourth Gospel:—

HOM. XIX. 22.

Wherefore also our Teacher when we inquired regarding the man blind from birth and whose sight was restored by him if this man had sinned or his parents that he should be born blind, answered in explanation: Neither this man sinned at all nor his parents, but that through him the power of God might be made manifest, healing the sins of ignorance.

"Ὅθεν καὶ διδάσκαλος ἡμῶν περὶ τοῦ ἐκ γενετῆς πηροῦ καὶ ἀναβλέψαντος παρ' αὐτοῦ ἐξετάζων ἐρωτήσασιν, εἰ οὗτος ἤμαρτεν ἢ οἱ γονεῖς αὐτοῦ, ἵνα τυφλὸς γεννηθῆ, ἀπεκρίνατο· οὔτε οὗτός τι ἤμαρτεν, οὔτε οἱ γονεῖς αὐτοῦ, ἀλλ' ἵνα δι' αὐτοῦ φανερωθῆ ἡ δύναμις τοῦ θεοῦ τῆς ἀγνοίας ἰωμένη τὰ ἀμαρτήματα.

JOHN IX. 1-3.

And as he was passing by, he saw a man blind from birth.

2. And his disciples asked him saying: Rabbi, who sinned, this man or his parents that he should be born blind?

3. Jesus answered, Neither this man sinned, nor his parents, but that the works of God might be made manifest in him.

1. Καὶ παράγων εἶδεν ἄνθρωπον τυφλὸν ἐκ γενετῆς. 2. Καὶ ἠρώτησαν αὐτὸν οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ λέγοντες· Ῥαββεί, τίς ἤμαρτεν, οὗτος ἢ οἱ γονεῖς αὐτοῦ, ἵνα τυφλὸς γεννηθῆ; 3. Ἀπεκρίθη Ἰησοῦς· Οὔτε οὗτος ἤμαρτεν οὔτε οἱ γονεῖς αὐτοῦ, ἀλλ' ἵνα φανερωθῆ τὰ ἔργα τοῦ θεοῦ ἐν αὐτῷ.

It is necessary that we should consider the context of this passage in the Homily, the characteristics of which are markedly opposed to the theory that it was derived from the fourth Gospel. We must mention that, in the *Clementines*, the Apostle Peter is represented as maintaining that the Scriptures are not all true, but are mixed up with what is false, and that on this account, and in order to inculcate the necessity of distinguishing between the true and the false, Jesus taught his disciples, "Be ye approved money-changers"²—an injunction not found in our Gospels. One of the points which Peter denies is the fall of Adam—a doctrine which, as Neander remarked, "he must combat as blasphemy."³ At

¹ P. 472 f.

² *Hom.*, iii. 50, cf. 9, 42 f.; ii. 38. The author denies that Moses wrote the Pentateuch (*Hom.*, iii. 47 f.).

³ *Hom.*, iii. 20 f., 42 f., viii. 10. "Die Lehre von einem Sündenfalle des ersten Menschen musste der Verfasser der Clementinen als Gotteslästerung bekämpfen" (Neander, *K. G.*, ii., p. 612 f.). The Jews at that period held a similar belief (Eisenmenger, *Entd. Judenthum*, i., p. 336). Adam, according to the *Homilies*, not only did not sin, but, as a true prophet possessed of the Spirit of God which afterwards was in Jesus, he was incapable of sin (Schliemann, *Die Clementinen*, pp. 130, 176 f., 178 f.).

the part we are considering he is discussing with Simon—under whose detested personality, as we have elsewhere shown, the Apostle Paul is really attacked—and refuting the charges he brings forward regarding the origin and continuance of evil. The Apostle Peter, in the course of the discussion, asserts that evil is the same as pain and death, but that evil does not exist eternally, and, indeed, does not really exist at all, for pain and death are only accidents without permanent force—pain is merely the disturbance of harmony, and death nothing but the separation of soul from body.¹ The passions also must be classed amongst the things which are accidental, and are not always to exist; but these, although capable of abuse, are in reality beneficial to the soul when properly restrained, and carry out the will of God. The man who gives them unbridled course ensures his own punishment.² Simon inquires why men die prematurely and diseases periodically come, and also visitations of demons and of madness and other afflictions; in reply to which Peter explains that parents, by following their own pleasure in all things and neglecting proper sanitary considerations, produce a multitude of evils for their children, and this either through carelessness or ignorance.³ Then follows the passage we are discussing: “Wherefore also our Teacher,” etc., and at the end of the quotation he continues: “and truly such sufferings ensue in consequence of ignorance”; and, giving an instance,⁴ he proceeds: “Now the sufferings which you before mentioned are the consequence of ignorance, and certainly not of an evil act, which has been committed,”⁵ etc. It is quite apparent that the peculiar variation from the parallel in the fourth Gospel in the latter part of the quotation is not accidental, but is the point upon which the whole propriety of the quotation depends. In the Gospel of the *Clementines* the man is not blind from his birth, “that the works of God might be made manifest in him”—a doctrine which would be revolting to the author of the *Homilies*—but the calamity has befallen him in consequence of some error of ignorance on the part of his parents which brings its punishment; and “the power of God” is made manifest in healing the sins of ignorance. The reply of Jesus is a professed quotation, and it varies very substantially from the parallel

¹ *Hom.*, xix. 20.

² *Ib.*, xix. 21. According to the author of the *Clementines*, evil is the consequence of sin, and is, on one hand, necessary for the punishment of sin; but, on the other, beneficial as leading men to improvement and upward progress. Suffering is represented as wholesome, and intended for the elevation of man (cf. *Hom.*, ii. 13; vii. 2; viii. 11). Death was originally designed for man, and was not introduced by Adam’s “fall,” but is really necessary to nature, the Homilist considers (cf. Schliemann, *Die Clementinen*, p. 177, p. 168 f.).

³ *Ib.*, xix. 22.

⁴ *Ib.*, xix. 22.

⁵ *Ib.*, xix. 22.

in the Gospel, presenting evidently a distinctly different version of the episode. The substitution of *πηρός* for *τυφλός* in the opening is also significant, more especially as Justin likewise in his general remark, which we have discussed, uses the same word. Assuming the passage in the fourth Gospel to be the account of a historical episode, as apologists, of course, maintain, the case stands thus:—The author of the *Homilies* introduces a narrative of a historical incident in the life of Jesus, which may have been, and probably was, reported in many early Gospels in language which, though analogous to, is at the same time decidedly different, in the part, which is a professed quotation, from that of the fourth Gospel, and presents another and natural comment upon the central event. The reference to the historical incident is, of course, no evidence of dependence on the fourth Gospel, which, although it may be the only accidentally surviving work which contains the narrative, had no prescriptive and exclusive property in it; and so far from the partial agreement in the narrative proving the use of the fourth Gospel, the only remarkable point is, that all narratives of the same event and reports of words actually spoken do not more perfectly agree, while, on the other hand, the very decided variation in the reply of Jesus, according to the Homily, from that given in the fourth Gospel leads to the distinct presumption that it is not the source of the quotation.

It is unreasonable to assert that such a reference, without the slightest indication of the source from which the author derived his information, must be dependent on one particular work, more especially when the part which is given as distinct quotation substantially differs from the record in that work. We have already illustrated this on several occasions, and may once more offer an instance. If the first Synoptic had unfortunately perished, like so many other gospels of the early Church, and in the *Clementines* we met with the quotation, "Blessed are the poor in spirit, for theirs is the kingdom of heaven" (*Μακάριοι οἱ πτωχοὶ τῷ πνεύματι, ὅτι αὐτῶν ἐστὶν ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν*), apologists would certainly assert, according to the principle upon which they act in the present case, that this quotation was clear evidence of the use of Luke vi. 20, "Blessed are ye poor, for yours is the kingdom of God" (*Μακάριοι οἱ πτωχοί, ὅτι ὑμετέρα ἐστὶν ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ*), more especially as a few codices actually insert *τῷ πνεύματι*, the slight variations being merely ascribed to free quotation from memory. In point of fact, however, the third Synoptic might not at the time have been in existence, and the quotation might have been derived, as it is, from Matt. v. 3. Nothing is more certain and undeniable than the fact that the author of the fourth Gospel made use of materials derived from oral tradition and earlier records for its composition.

It is equally undeniable that other gospels had access to the same materials, and made use of them; and a comparison of our three Synoptics renders very evident the community of materials, including the use of the one by the other, as well as the diversity of literary handling to which those materials were subjected. It is impossible with reason to deny that the Gospel according to the Hebrews, for instance, as well as other earlier evangelical works now lost, may have drawn from the same sources as the fourth Gospel, and that narratives derived from the one may present analogies with the other whilst still perfectly independent of it. Whatever private opinion, therefore, any one may form as to the source of the anonymous quotations which we have been considering, it is evident that they are totally insufficient to prove that the author of the *Clementine Homilies* must have made use of the fourth Gospel, and consequently they do not establish even the contemporary existence of that work. If such quotations, moreover, could be traced with fifty times greater probability to the fourth Gospel, it is obvious that they could do nothing towards establishing its historical character and apostolic origin.

Leaving, however, the few and feeble analogies by which apologists vainly seek to establish the existence of the fourth Gospel and its use by the author of the *Pseudo-Clementine Homilies*, and considering the question for a moment from a wider point of view, the results already attained are more than confirmed. The doctrines held and strongly enunciated in the *Clementines* seem to us to exclude the supposition that the author can have made use of a work so fundamentally at variance with all his views as the fourth Gospel, and it is certain that, holding those opinions, he could hardly have regarded such a Gospel as an apostolic and authoritative document. Space will not permit our entering adequately into this argument, and we must refer our readers to works more immediately devoted to the examination of the *Homilies* for a close analysis of their dogmatic teaching; but we may in the briefest manner point out some of their more prominent doctrines in contrast with those of the Johannine Gospel.

One of the leading and most characteristic ideas of the *Clementine Homilies* is the essential identity of Judaism and Christianity. Christ revealed nothing new with regard to God, but promulgated the very same truth concerning him as Adam, Moses, and the Patriarchs, and the right belief is that Moses and Jesus were essentially one and the same.¹ Indeed, it may be said that the teaching of the *Homilies* is more Jewish than Christian. In the preliminary Epistle of the Apostle Peter to the Apostle James, when sending the book, Peter entreats that

¹ *Hom.*, xvii. 4; xviii. 14; viii. 6.

James will not give it to any of the Gentiles,¹ and James says: "Necessarily and rightly our Peter reminded us to take precautions for the security of the truth, that we should not communicate the books of his preachings, sent to us, indiscriminately to all, but to him who is good and discreet and chosen to teach, and who is *circumcised*,² being faithful,"³ etc. Clement also is represented as describing his conversion to Christianity in the following terms: "For this cause I fled for refuge to the Holy God and Law of the Jews, with faith in the certain conclusion that, by the righteous judgment of God, both the Law is prescribed and the soul beyond doubt everywhere receives the desert of its actions."⁴ Peter recommends the inhabitants of Tyre to follow what are really Jewish rites, and to hear "as the God-fearing Jews have heard."⁵ The Jew has the same truth as the Christian: "For as there is one teaching by both (Moses and Jesus), God accepts him who believes either of these."⁶ The Law was in fact given by Adam as a true prophet knowing all things, and it is called "Eternal," and neither to be abrogated by enemies nor falsified by the impious.⁷ The author, therefore, protests against the idea that Christianity is any new thing, and insists that Jesus came to confirm, not abrogate, the Mosaic Law.⁸ On the other hand, the author of the fourth Gospel represents Christianity in strong contrast and antagonism to Judaism. In his antithetical system, the religion of Jesus is opposed to Judaism as well as all other belief, as light to darkness and life to death.⁹ The Law which Moses gave is treated as merely national, and neither of general application nor intended to be permanent, being only addressed to the Jews. It is perpetually referred to as the "Law of the Jews," "your Law"—and the Jewish festivals as Feasts of the Jews; and Jesus neither held the one in any consideration nor did he scruple to show his indifference to the other.¹⁰ The very name of "the Jews," indeed, is used as an equivalent for the enemies of Christ.¹¹ The religion of Jesus is not only absolute, but it communicates knowledge of the Father which the Jews did not previously possess.¹² The inferiority of Mosaism is everywhere represented: "And out of his fulness all we received, and grace for grace. *Because the Law* was given

¹ *Ep. Petri ad Jacob.*, § 1.

³ *Contestatio*, § 1.

⁵ *Ib.*, vii. 4; cf. ii. 19, 20; xiii. 4.

⁷ *Ib.*, viii. 10.

⁹ John xii. 46; i. 4, 5, 7 f.; iii. 19-21; v. 24; viii. 12; ix. 5; xii. 35 f.; xiv. 6.

¹⁰ *Ib.*, ii. 13; iv. 20 f.; v. 1, 16, 18; vi. 4; vii. 2, 19, 22; viii. 17; ix. 16, 28, 29; x. 34; xv. 25, etc.

¹¹ *Ib.*, vi. 42, 52, etc.

¹² *Ib.*, i. 18; viii. 19, 31 f., 54, 55; xv. 21 f.; xvii. 25, 26.

² Cf. Galatians ii. 7.

⁴ *Hom.*, iv. 22.

⁶ *Ib.*, viii. 6, cf. 7.

⁸ *Ib.*, iii. 51.

through Moses; *grace and truth* came through Jesus Christ."¹ "Verily, verily I say unto you: Moses did not give you the bread from Heaven, but my Father giveth you the true bread from heaven."² The fundamental difference of Christianity from Judaism will further appear as we proceed.

The most essential principle of the *Clementines*, again, is Monotheism — the absolute oneness of God — which the author vehemently maintains as well against the ascription of divinity to Christ as against heathen Polytheism and the Gnostic theory of the Demiurge as distinguished from the Supreme God. Christ not only is not God, but he never asserted himself to be so.³ He wholly ignores the doctrine of the Logos, and his speculation is confined to the *Σοφία*, the Wisdom of Proverbs viii., etc., and is, as we shall see, at the same time a less developed and very different doctrine from that of the fourth Gospel.⁴ The idea of a hypostatic Trinity seems to be quite unknown to him, and would have been utterly abhorrent to his mind as sheer Polytheism. On the other hand, the fourth Gospel proclaims the doctrine of a hypostatic Trinity in a more advanced form than any other writing of the New Testament. It is, indeed, the fundamental principle of the work, as the doctrine of the Logos is its most characteristic feature. In the beginning the Word not only was with God, but "the Word was God" (*θεὸς ἦν ὁ Λόγος*).⁵ He is the "only begotten God" (*μονογενὴς θεός*),⁶ and his absolutely divine nature is asserted both by the Evangelist and in express terms in the discourses of Jesus.⁷ Nothing could be more opposed to the principles of the *Clementines*.

According to the *Homilies*, the same Spirit, the *Σοφία*, appeared in Adam, Enoch, Noah, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Moses, and finally in Jesus, who are the only "true prophets," and are called the seven Pillars (*ἑπτὰ στῦλοι*) of the world.⁸ These seven persons, therefore, are identical, the same true Prophet and Spirit "who from the beginning of the world, changing names and forms, passes through time,"⁹ and these men were thus essentially the same as Jesus. As Neander rightly observes, the author of the *Homilies* "saw in Jesus a new appearance of that Adam whom he had ever venerated as the source of all the true and divine in man."¹⁰ We need not point out how different these views are from

¹ John i. 16, 17; cf. x. 1, 8.

² *Ib.*, vi. 32 f.

³ *Hom.*, xvi. 15 f.

⁴ Cf. Dorner, *Lehre Pers. Christi*, i., p. 334.

⁵ John i. 1.

⁶ *Ib.*, i. 18. This is the reading of the *Cod. Sinaiticus*, of the *Cod. Vaticanus*, and *Cod. C.*, as well as of other ancient MSS., and it must be accepted as the best authenticated.

⁷ *Ib.*, i. 2; v. 17 f.; x. 30 f., 38; xiv. 7 f., 23; xvii. 5, 21 f., etc.

⁸ *Hom.*, iii. 20 f.; ii. 15; viii. 10; xvii. 4; xviii. 14.

⁹ *Ib.*, iii. 20.

¹⁰ *K. G.*, ii., p. 622; cf. *Hom.*, iii. 18 f.

the Logos doctrine of the fourth Gospel. In other points there is an equally wide gulf between the *Clementines* and the fourth Gospel. According to the author of the *Homilies*, the chief dogma of true religion is Monotheism. Belief in Christ, in the specific Johannine sense, is nowhere inculcated, and where belief is spoken of it is merely belief in God. No dogmatic importance whatever is attached to faith in Christ or to his sufferings, death, and resurrection, and of the doctrines of Atonement and Redemption there is nothing in the *Homilies*—everyone must make his own reconciliation with God, and bear the punishment of his own sins.¹ On the other hand, the representation of Jesus as the Lamb of God taking away the sins of the world² is the very basis of the fourth Gospel. The passages are innumerable in which belief in Jesus is insisted upon as essential. "He that believeth in the Son hath eternal life, but he that believeth not the Son shall not see life, but the wrath of God abideth on him"³....."for if ye believe not that I am he, ye shall die in your sins."⁴ In fact, the whole of Christianity, according to the author of the fourth Gospel, is concentrated in the possession of faith in Christ.⁵ Belief in God alone is never held to be sufficient; belief in Christ is necessary for salvation; he died for the sins of the world, and is the object of faith, by which alone forgiveness and justification before God can be secured. The same discrepancy is apparent in smaller details. In the *Clementines* the Apostle Peter is the principal actor, and is represented as the chief amongst the Apostles. In the Epistle of Clement to James, which precedes the *Homilies*, Peter is described in the following terms: "Simon, who, on account of his true faith and of the principles of his doctrine, which were most sure, was appointed to be the foundation of the Church; and for this reason his name was by the unerring voice of Jesus himself changed to Peter; the first-fruit of our Lord; the first of the Apostles; to whom first the Father revealed the son; whom the Christ deservedly pronounced blessed; the called and chosen and companion and fellow-traveller (of Jesus); the admirable and approved disciple, who as fittest of all was commanded to enlighten the West, the darker part of the world, and was enabled to guide it aright," etc.⁶ He is here represented as the Apostle to the Heathen, the hated Apostle Paul being robbed of that honourable title; and he is, in the spirit of this introduction, made to play, throughout, the first part amongst the Apostles. In the

¹ *Hom.*, iii. 6 f.

² John i. 29; cf. iii. 14 f., iv. 42, etc.

³ *Ib.*, iii. 36; cf. 16 f.

⁴ *Ib.*, viii. 24.

⁵ *Ib.*, iii. 14 f.; v. 24 f.; vi. 29, 35 f., 40, 47, 65; vii. 38; viii. 24, 51; ix. 25 f.; x. 9, 28; xi. 25 f.; xii. 47; xiv. 6; xv. 5 f.; xvi. 9; xvii. 2 f.; xx. 31.

⁶ *Ep. Clem. ad. Jacobum*, § 1.

fourth Gospel, however, he is assigned a place quite secondary to John, who is the disciple whom Jesus loved, and who leans on his bosom.¹ We shall only mention one other point. The Homilist, when attacking the Apostle Paul, under the name of Simon the Magician, for his boast that he had not been taught by man, but by a revelation of Jesus Christ,² whom he had only seen in a vision, inquires: "Why, then, did the Teacher remain and discourse a whole year to us who were awake, if you became his Apostle after a single hour of instruction?"³ As Neander aptly remarks: "If the author had known from the Johannine Gospel that the teaching of Christ had continued for *several years*, he would certainly have had particularly good reason instead of one year to set *several*."⁴ It is obvious that an author with so vehement an animosity against Paul would assuredly have strengthened his argument by adopting the more favourable statement of the fourth Gospel as to the duration of the ministry of Jesus, had he been acquainted with that work.

Our attention must now be turned to the anonymous composition known as the *Epistle to Diognetus*, general particulars regarding which we have elsewhere given.⁵ This Epistle, it is admitted, does not contain any quotation from any evangelical work, but on the strength of some supposed references it is claimed by apologists as evidence for the existence of the fourth Gospel. Tischendorf, who only devotes a dozen lines to this work, states his case as follows: "Although this short apologetic Epistle contains no precise quotation from any gospel, yet it has repeated references to evangelical, and particularly to Johannine, passages. For when the author writes, ch. 6: 'Christians dwell in the world, but they are not of the world'; and in ch. 10: 'For God has loved men, for whose sakes he made the world.....to whom he sent his only begotten Son,' the reference to John xvii. 11 ('But they are in the world'); 14 ('The world hateth them, for they are not of the world'); 16 ('They are not of the world as I am not of the world'); and to John iii. 16 ('God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son'), is hardly to be mistaken."⁶

Dr. Westcott still more emphatically claims the Epistle as evidence for the fourth Gospel, and we shall, in order impartially to consider the question, likewise quote his remarks in full upon

¹ Cf. John xiii. 23-25; xix. 26 f.; xx. 2 f.; xxi. 3 f., 7, 20 f.

² Gal. i. 12 f.

³ *Hom.*, xvii. 19.

⁴ *K. G.*, ii., p. 624, anm. 1.

⁵ P. 320 f.

⁶ *Wann wurden, u. s. w.*, p. 40. We may mention that neither Tischendorf nor Dr. Westcott gives the Greek of any of the passages pointed out in the Epistle, nor do they give the original text of the parallels in the Gospel.

the point; but, as he introduces his own paraphrase of the context in a manner which does not properly convey its true nature to a reader who has not the Epistle before him, we shall take the liberty of putting the actual quotations in italics, and the rest must be taken as purely the language of Dr. Westcott. We shall hereafter show also the exact separation which exists between phrases which are here, with the mere indication of some omission, brought together to form the supposed references to the fourth Gospel. Dr. Westcott says: "In one respect the two parts of the book are united,¹ inasmuch as they both exhibit a combination of the teaching of St. Paul and St. John. The love of God, it is said in the letter to Diognetus, is the source of love in the Christian, who must needs '*love God who thus first loved him*' (*προαγαπήσαντα*), and find an expression for this love by loving his neighbour, whereby he will be '*an imitator of God.*' '*For God loved men, for whose sakes He made the world, to whom He subjected all things that are in the earth.....unto whom (πρός) He sent His only begotten Son, to whom He promised the kingdom in heaven (τὴν ἐν οὐρανῷ βασιλείαν), and will give it to those who love him.*' God's will is mercy; '*He sent His Son as wishing to save (ὡς σώζων).....and not to condemn,*' and as witnesses of this '*Christians dwell in the world, though they are not of the world.*'"² At the close of the paragraph he proceeds: "The presence of the teaching of St. John is here placed beyond all doubt. There are, however, no direct references to the Gospels throughout the letter, nor indeed any allusions to our Lord's discourses."³

As we have already stated, the writer of the *Epistle to Diognetus* is unknown; Diognetus, the friend to whom it is addressed, is equally unknown; the letter is neither mentioned nor quoted by any of the Fathers, nor by any ancient writer, and there is no external evidence as to the date of the composition. It existed

¹ This is a reference to the admitted fact that the first ten chapters are by a different author from the writer of the last two.

² *On the Canon*, p. 77. Dr. Westcott continues, referring to the later and more recent part of the Epistle: "So in the conclusion we read that 'the Word who was from the beginning.....at His appearance speaking boldly manifested the mysteries of the Father to those who were judged faithful by Him.' And these again to whom the Word speaks, 'from love of that which is revealed to them,' share their knowledge with others." It is not necessary to discuss this, both because of the late date of the two chapters and because there is certainly no reference at all to the Gospel in the words. We must, however, add that, as the quotation is given, it conveys quite a false impression of the text. We may just mention that the phrase which Dr. Westcott quotes as "the Word who was from the beginning" is in the text, "This is he who was from the beginning" (*οὗτος ὁ ἀπ' ἀρχῆς*), although "the Word" is in the context, and no doubt intended.

³ *Ib.*, p. 78.

only in one codex, destroyed at Strasburg during the Franco-German war, the handwriting of which was referred to the thirteenth or fourteenth century; but it is far from certain that it was so old. The last two chapters are a falsification by a later writer than the author of the first ten. There is no internal evidence in this brief didactic composition requiring or even suggesting its assignment to the second or third centuries; but, on the contrary, we venture to assert that there is evidence, both internal and external, justifying the belief that it was written at a comparatively recent date. Apart from the uncertainty of date, however, there is no allusion in it to any Gospel. Even if there were, the testimony of a letter by an unknown writer at an unknown period could not have any weight; but, under the actual circumstances, the *Epistle to Diognetus* furnishes absolutely no testimony at all for the apostolical origin and historical character of the fourth Gospel.¹

The fulness with which we have discussed the supposed testimony of Basilides² renders it unnecessary for us to re-enter at any length into the argument as to his knowledge of the fourth Gospel. Tischendorf³ and Dr. Westcott⁴ assert that two passages—namely: “The true light which lighteth every man came into the world,” corresponding with John i. 9; and: “mine hour is not yet come,” agreeing with John ii. 4, which are introduced by Hippolytus in his work against Heresies⁵ with a subjectless *φησί*, “he says”—are quotations made in some lost work by Basilides. We have shown that Hippolytus and other writers of his time were in the habit of quoting passages from works by the founders of sects and by their later followers without any distinction, an utterly vague *φησί* doing service equally for all. This is the case in the present instance, and there is no legitimate reason for assigning these passages to Basilides himself, but, on the contrary, many considerations which forbid our doing so, which we have elsewhere detailed.

These remarks most fully apply to Valentinus, whose supposed quotations we have exhaustively discussed,⁶ as well as the one passage given by Hippolytus containing a sentence found in John x. 8,⁷ the only one which can be pointed out. We have distinctly proved that the quotations in question are not assignable to Valentinus himself—a fact which even apologists admit. There is no just ground for asserting that his terminology was derived from

¹ Readers interested in more minutely discussing the point whether the *Epistle* even indicates the existence of the fourth Gospel are referred to the complete edition, 1879, ii., pp. 355–368, in which the question was argued and printed in smaller type.

² P. 322 f.

⁴ *On the Canon*, p. 256, note 3.

⁶ P. 330 f.

³ *Wann wurden, u. s. w.*, p. 52.

⁵ vii. 22, 27.

⁷ *Adv. Hær.*, vi. 35.

the fourth Gospel, the whole having been in current use long before that Gospel was composed. There is no evidence whatever that Valentinus was acquainted with such a work.

We must generally remark, however, with regard to Basilides, Valentinus, and all such Heresiarchs and writers, that, even if it could be shown, as actually it cannot, that they were acquainted with the fourth Gospel, the fact would only prove the existence of the work at a late period in the second century, but would furnish no evidence of the slightest value regarding its apostolic origin, or towards establishing its historical value. On the other hand, if, as apologists assert, these heretics possessed the fourth Gospel, their deliberate and total rejection of the work furnishes evidence positively antagonistic to its claims. It is difficult to decide whether their rejection of the Gospel or their ignorance of its existence is the more unfavourable alternative.

The dilemma is the very same in the case of Marcion. We have already fully discussed his knowledge of our Gospels, and need not add anything here. It is not pretended that he made any use of the fourth Gospel, and the only ground upon which it is argued that he supplies evidence even of its existence is the vague general statement of Tertullian, that Marcion rejected the Gospels "which are put forth as genuine, and under the name of Apostles, or, at least, of contemporaries of the Apostles," denying their truth and integrity, and maintaining the sole authority of his own Gospel.¹ We have shown how unwarrantable it is to affirm from such data that Marcion knew, and deliberately repudiated, the four canonical Gospels. The Fathers, with uncritical haste and zeal, assumed that the Gospels adopted by the Church at the close of the second and beginning of the third centuries must equally have been invested with canonical authority from the first, and Tertullian took it for granted that Marcion, of whom he knew very little, must have actually rejected the four Gospels of his own Canon. Even Dr. Westcott admits that "it is uncertain whether Tertullian in the passage quoted speaks from a knowledge of what Marcion may have written on the subject, or simply from his own point of sight."² There is not the slightest evidence that Marcion knew the fourth Gospel, and, if he did, it would be perfectly inexplicable that he did not adopt it as peculiarly favourable to his own views. If he was acquainted with the work, and, nevertheless, rejected it as false and adulterated, his testimony is obviously opposed to the Apostolic origin and historical accuracy of the fourth Gospel, and the critical acumen which he exhibited in his selection of the Pauline Epistles renders his judgment of greater weight than that of most of the Fathers.

¹ *Adv. Marc.*, iv. 3, 4.

² *On the Canon*, p. 276, note 1.

We have now reached an epoch when no evidence regarding the fourth Gospel can have much weight, and the remaining witnesses need not detain us long.

We have already discussed at length the evidence of Tatian in connection with the Synoptics,¹ and shall presently return to the question of the *Diatessaron* as it affects the fourth Gospel. We have now briefly to refer to the address to the Greeks (*Λόγος πρὸς Ἕλληνας*), and to ascertain what testimony it bears regarding that Gospel. It was composed after the death of Justin, and scarcely dates earlier than the beginning of the last quarter of the second century. No Gospel and no work of the New Testament is mentioned in this composition, but Tischendorf² and others point out one or two supposed references to passages in the fourth Gospel. The first of these in order is one indicated by Dr. Westcott,³ but to which Tischendorf does not call attention: "God was in the beginning; but we have learned that the beginning is the power of Reason (*Θεὸς ἦν ἐν ἀρχῇ, τὴν δὲ ἀρχὴν λόγου δύναμιν παρειλήφμεν*). For the Lord of the Universe (*δεσπότης τῶν ὅλων*) being himself the substance (*ὑπόστασις*) of all, in that creation had not been accomplished was alone, but inasmuch as he was all power, and himself the substance of things visible and invisible, all things were with him (*σὺν αὐτῷ τὰ πάντα*). With him by means of rational power the Reason (*Λόγος*) itself also which was in him subsisted. But by the will of his simplicity, Reason (*Λόγος*) springs forth; but the Reason (*Λόγος*) not proceeding in vain, because the first-born work (*ἔργον πρωτότοκον*) of the Father. Him we know to be the Beginning of the world (*Τοῦτον ἴσμεν τοῦ κόσμου τὴν ἀρχήν*). But he came into existence by division, not by cutting off, for that which is cut off is separated from the first; but that which is divided, receiving the choice of administration, did not render him defective from whom it was taken, etc. And as the Logos (Reason), in the beginning begotten, begat again our creation, himself for himself creating the matter (*Καὶ καθάπερ ὁ Λόγος, ἐν ἀρχῇ γεννηθεὶς, ἀντεγέννησε τὴν καθ' ἡμᾶς ποίησιν, αὐτὸς ἑαυτῷ τὴν ὕλην δημιουργήσας*), so I," etc.⁴

¹ P. 366 f.

² *Wann wurden, u. s. w.*, p. 17.

³ *On the Canon*, p. 278, note 2. [In the 4th ed., however, Dr. Westcott puts it within brackets, adding: "This reference is not certain"—p. 317, n. 2.]

⁴ *Orat. ad Græcos*, § 5. As this passage is of some obscurity, we subjoin, for the sake of impartiality, an independent translation taken from Dr. Donaldson's able *History of Christ. Lit. and Doctrine*, iii., p. 42: "God was in the beginning, but we have understood that the beginning was a power of reason. For the Lord of all, Himself being the substance of all, was alone in so far as the creation had not yet taken place, but as far as He was all power and the substance of things seen and unseen, all things were with Him: along with Him also by means of rational power, the reason which was in Him supported them. But by the will of his simplicity, the reason leaps forth; but the reason,

It is quite evident that this doctrine of the Logos is not that of the fourth Gospel, from which it cannot have been derived. Tatian himself¹ seems to assert that he derived it from the Old Testament. We have quoted the passage at length that it might be clearly understood; and with the opening words, we presume, for he does not quote at all, but merely indicates the chapter, Dr. Westcott compares John i. 1: "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God" (Ἐν ἀρχῇ ἦν ὁ Λόγος, κ.τ.λ.). The statement of Tatian is quite different—"God was in the beginning" (Θεὸς ἦν ἐν ἀρχῇ); and he certainly did not identify the Word with God, so as to transform the statement of the Gospel into this simple affirmation. In all probability his formula was merely based upon Genesis i. 1: "In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth" (ἐν ἀρχῇ ἐποίησεν ὁ Θεὸς κ.τ.λ.).² The expressions: "But we have learned that the Beginning (ἀρχή) was the power of Reason," etc., "but the Reason (Λόγος) not proceeding in vain became the first-born work (ἔργον πρωτότοκον) of the Father. Him we know to be the Beginning (ἀρχή) of the world," recall many early representations of the Logos, to which we have already referred: Prov. viii. 22: "The Lord created me the Beginning (ἀρχή) of his ways for his works (ἔργα), 23. Before the ages he established me, in the beginning (ἐν ἀρχῇ) before he made the earth," etc. In the Apocalypse also the Word is called "the Beginning (ἀρχή) of the creation of God," and it will be remembered that Justin gives testimony from Prov. viii. 21 f., "that God begat before all the creatures a Beginning (ἀρχήν), a certain rational Power (δύναμιν λογικήν), out of himself,"³ etc.; and elsewhere: "As the Logos declared through Solomon, that this same.....had been begotten of God, before all created beings, both Beginning (ἀρχή)," etc.⁴ We need not, however, refer to the numerous passages in Philo and in Justin, not derived from the fourth Gospel, which point to a different source for Tatian's doctrine. It is sufficient that both his opinions and his terminology differ distinctly from that Gospel.⁵

not having gone from one who became empty thereby, is the first-born work of the Father. Him we know to be the beginning of the world. But He came into existence by sharing (μερισμός), not by cutting off; for that which is cut off is separated from the first; but that which is shared, receiving a selection of the work, did not render Him defective from whom it was taken, etc. And as the Word begotten in the beginning begot in his turn our creation, He Himself fashioning the material for Himself, so I, etc." (cf. Dorner, *Lehre Pers. Christi*, i., p. 437 f.).

¹ § 12, cf. § 20.

² Donaldson, *Hist. Chr. Lit. and Doctr.*, iii., p. 43.

³ *Dial.* 61.

⁴ *Ib.*, 62.

⁵ We have already mentioned that the Gospel according to Peter contained the doctrine of the Logos.

The next passage we subjoin in contrast with the parallel in the fourth Gospel :—

ORAT. AD GRÆCOS, § XIII.

And this, therefore, is (the meaning of) the saying :

The darkness comprehends not the light.

Καὶ τοῦτο ἔστιν ἄρα τὸ εἰρημένον·
Ἡ σκοτία τὸ φῶς οὐ καταλαμβάνει.

JOHN I. 5.

And the light shineth in the darkness ;

and the darkness comprehended it not.

Καὶ τὸ φῶς ἐν τῇ σκοτίᾳ φαίνει, καὶ ἡ σκοτία αὐτὸ οὐ κατέλαβεν.

The context to this passage in the Oration is as follows : Tatian is arguing about the immortality of the soul, and he states that the soul is not in itself immortal, but mortal ; but that, nevertheless, it is possible for it not to die. If it do not know the truth, it dies, but rises again at the end of the world, receiving eternal death as a punishment. “ Again, however, it does not die, though it be for a time dissolved if it has acquired knowledge of God ; for, in itself, it is darkness, and there is nothing luminous in it ; and this, therefore, is (the meaning of) the saying, The darkness comprehends not the light. For the soul (*ψυχὴ*) did not itself save the spirit (*πνεῦμα*), but was saved by it, and the light comprehended the darkness. The Logos (Reason) truly is the light of God, but the ignorant soul is darkness (*Ὁ Λόγος μὲν ἔστι τὸ τοῦ θεοῦ φῶς, σκότος δὲ ἡ ἀνεπιστήμων ψυχὴ*). For this reason, if it remain alone, it tends downwards to matter, dying with the flesh,” etc.¹ The source of “ the saying ” is not mentioned, and it is evident that, even if it were taken to be a reference to the fourth Gospel, nothing would thereby be proved but the mere existence of the Gospel. “ The saying,” however, is distinctly different in language from the parallel in the Gospel, and it may be from a different Gospel. We have already remarked that Philo calls the Logos “ the light,”² and, quoting in a peculiar form Ps. xxvi. 1, “ For the Lord is my light (*φῶς*) and my Saviour,” he goes on to say that, as the sun divides day and night, so, Moses says, “ God divides light and darkness ” (*τὸν θεὸν φῶς καὶ σκότος διατειχίσαι*).³ When we turn away to things of sense we use “ another light,” which is in no way different from “ darkness.”⁴ The constant use of the same similitude of light and darkness in the canonical Epistles⁵ shows how current it was in the Church ; and nothing is more certain than the fact that it was neither originated by, nor confined to, the fourth Gospel.

¹ *Orat. ad Græcos*, § 13.

² *De Somniis*, i., § 13, Mangey, i. 632 ; cf. § 14 f., *De Mundi op.*, § 9, *ib.*, i. 7 (see p. 463, note 1).

³ *De Somniis*, i., § 13.

⁴ *Ib.*, i., § 14.

⁵ 2 Cor. iv. 6 ; Ephes. v. 8–14 ; Coloss. i. 12, 13 ; 1 Thess. v. 5 ; 1 Tim. vi. 16 ; 1. Pet. ii. 9 ; cf. Rev. xxi. 23, 24 ; xxii. 5.

The third and last passage is as follows :—

ORAT. AD GRÆCOS, XIX.

We being such as this, do not pursue us with hatred, but, rejecting the Demons, follow the one God.

All things were by (ὑπό) him, and without him was not anything made.

Πάντα ὑπ' αὐτοῦ, καὶ χωρὶς αὐτοῦ γέγονεν οὐδὲ ἓν.

JOHN I. 3.

All things were made by (διὰ) him, and without him was not anything made that was made.

Πάντα δι' αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο, καὶ χωρὶς αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο οὐδὲ ἓν ὃ γέγονεν.

Tatian here speaks of God, and not of the Logos, and in this respect, as well as in language and context, the passage differs from the fourth Gospel. The phrase is not introduced as a quotation, and no reference is made to any Gospel. The purpose for which the words are used, again, rather points to the first chapters of Genesis than to the dogmatic prologue enunciating the doctrine of the Logos.¹ Under all these circumstances, the source from which the expression may have been derived cannot with certainty be ascertained, and, as in the preceding instance, even if it be assumed that the words show acquaintance with the fourth Gospel, nothing could be proved but the mere existence of the work about a century and a half after the events which it records. It is obvious that in no case does Tatian afford the slightest evidence of the Apostolic origin or historical veracity of the fourth Gospel.

Dr. Lightfoot points out another passage, § 4, πνεῦμα ὁ Θεός, which he compares with John iv. 24, where the same words occur. It is right to add that he himself remarks: "If it had stood alone I should certainly not have regarded it as decisive. But the epigrammatic form is remarkable, and it is a characteristic passage of the fourth Gospel."² Neither Tischendorf nor Dr. Westcott refers to it. The fact is, however, that the epigrammatic form only exists when the phrase is quoted without its context. "God is a spirit, not pervading matter, but the creator of material spirits, and of the forms that are in it. He is invisible and impalpable," etc. Further on, Tatian says (§ 15): "For the perfect God is without flesh, but man is flesh," etc. A large part of the oration is devoted to discussing the nature of God, and the distinction between spirit (πνεῦμα) and soul (ψυχή), and it is unreasonable to assert that a man like Tatian could not make the declaration that God is a spirit without quoting the fourth Gospel.

Returning to the *Diatessaron*, the position of which in regard to Tatian we have already fully discussed, we must now briefly

¹ Cf. 1 Cor. viii. 6; Ephes. iii. 9; Heb. i. 2.

² *Contemp. Rev.*, 1877, p. 1135.

consider how it affects the argument as to the date and authorship of the fourth Gospel. It is needless to point out that no ascription of the work to the Apostle could be made in the Harmony. Let us suppose it to be even demonstrated beyond doubt that the *Diatessaron* of Tatian was compiled from our four canonical Gospels, in what degree does this establish the authenticity of the fourth Gospel as the work of the Apostle John? Even according to apologetic critics, as we have seen, the composition of the *Diatessaron* must be assigned to A.D. 170, and there are good reasons for dating it some years later.¹ Of course, the fourth Gospel must have been in existence before that date if it formed part of the *Diatessaron*. It must be remembered, however, that the Harmony was not an official or ecclesiastical compilation involving the idea of contents already recognised as canonical by the Church. On the contrary, the *Diatessaron* was the work of a heretic, and, so far from having ecclesiastical sanction on any grounds, it was condemned by the Church in the person of Theodoret, and the copies of it circulating in his diocese were confiscated. The grounds for this suppression which are stated are, it is true, the omission of genealogies; but still the tendency was considered mischievous. This judgment was pronounced little short of 300 years after its composition; but still, as the work of a heretic and an irresponsible writer, it is not possible to maintain that the Gospels out of which it was compiled must previously have long enjoyed the sanction of the Church.

How long must the fourth Gospel have been in existence before its supposed use by Tatian becomes reasonable? It has to be borne in mind that, in those days of manuscript books, a Gospel did not issue from the hands of the scribe like a volume from the University Press, with its author's name and a date on the title-page. A work of the literary excellence of the fourth Gospel, evidently pretending to have been written by the Apostle John, calling himself—for no one else did so—the "beloved disciple," would, in such an age, rapidly attain to acceptance, especially as it would, for the mass of Christians, if not for all without exception, have been impossible, even a year after such a manuscript work was circulated, to say when it had actually been composed. If we suppose it to have been in circulation twenty or twenty-five years, which would have been more than ample for the purpose, that would only carry back the date of the fourth Gospel to the middle of the second century; or if we even allow thirty or thirty-five years—an age at such a period—we do not get back beyond

¹ Zahn, for instance, as has already been pointed out, dates it "soon after A.D. 173" (*Forsch.*, p. 290 f.).

A.D. 140. More than this, if even so much need be conceded, is not demanded by the hypothesis that it was used by Tatian, and its presence in the *Diatessaron*, whilst giving us no information whatever as to the authorship or authenticity, would thus in no way warrant the ascription of the fourth Gospel to the Apostle John. As evidence for miracles and the reality of Divine revelation it has no real importance.

We have generally discussed the testimony of Dionysius of Corinth,¹ Melito of Sardis,² and Claudius Apollinaris,³ and need not say more here. The fragments attributed to them neither mention nor quote the fourth Gospel, but in no case could they furnish evidence to authenticate the work. The same remarks apply to Athenagoras.⁴ Dr. Westcott only ventures to say that he "appears to allude to passages in St. Mark and St. John, but they are all anonymous."⁵ The passages in which he speaks of the Logos, which are those referred to here, are certainly not taken from the fourth Gospel, and his doctrine is expressed in terminology which is different from that of the Gospel, and is deeply tinged with Platonism. He appeals to Proverbs viii. 22, already so frequently quoted by us, for confirmation by the Prophetic Spirit of his exposition of the Logos doctrine.⁶ He nowhere identifies the Logos with Jesus; indeed, he does not once make use of the name of Christ in his works. He does not show the slightest knowledge of the doctrine of salvation so constantly enunciated in the fourth Gospel. There can be no doubt, as we have already shown,⁷ that he considered the Old Testament to be the only inspired Holy Scriptures. Not only does he not mention or quote any of our Gospels, but the only instance in which he makes any reference to sayings of Jesus otherwise than by the indefinite *φησὶ*, "he says," is one in which he introduces a saying which is not found in our Gospels by the words: "The Logos again saying to us:" (*πάλιν ἡμῖν λέγοντος τοῦ Λόγου*), etc. From the same source, which was obviously not our canonical Gospels, we have, therefore, reason to conclude that Athenagoras derived his knowledge of Gospel history and doctrine. We need not add that this writer affords no testimony as to the origin or character of the fourth Gospel.

It is scarcely worth while to refer to the Epistle of Vienne and Lyons, a composition dating at the earliest A.D. 177-178, in which no direct reference is made to any writing of the New Testament.⁸ Acquaintance with the fourth Gospel is argued from the following passage:—

¹ P. 381 f.

² P. 387 f.

³ P. 395 f.

⁴ P. 398 f.

⁵ *On the Canon*, p. 103.

⁶ *Leg. pro Christ.*, § 10.

⁷ P. 404.

⁸ P. 404 f.

EPISTLE, § IV.

And thus was fulfilled the saying of our Lord :

The time shall come in which every one that killeth you shall think that he offereth a service unto God.

Ἐλεύσεται καιρὸς ἐν ᾧ πᾶς ὁ ἀποκτείνων ὑμᾶς, δόξει λατρείαν προσφέρειν τῷ θεῷ.

JOHN XVI. 2.

But the hour cometh that every one that killeth you may think that he offereth a service unto God.

ἀλλ' ἔρχεται ὥρα ἵνα πᾶς ὁ ἀποκτείνων ὑμᾶς δόξῃ λατρείαν προσφέρειν τῷ θεῷ.

Such a passage cannot prove the use of the fourth Gospel. No source is indicated in the Epistle from which the saying of Jesus, which, of course, apologists assert to be historical, was derived. It presents decided variations from the parallel in the fourth Gospel; and in the Synoptics we find sufficient indications of similar discourses¹ to render it very probable that other Gospels may have contained the passage quoted in the Epistle. In no case could an anonymous reference like this be of any weight as evidence for the Apostolic origin of the fourth Gospel.

We need not further discuss Ptolemæus and Heracleon. We have shown² that the date at which these heretics flourished places them beyond the limits within which we propose to confine ourselves. In regard to Ptolemæus, all that is affirmed is that, in the Epistle to Flora ascribed to him, expressions found in John i. 3 are used. The passage as it is given by Epiphanius is as follows: "Besides, that the world was created by the same, the Apostle states (saying all things have been made (γεγονέναι) by him and without him nothing was made)" ("Ἐτι γὰρ τὴν τοῦ κόσμου δημιουργίαν ἰδίαν λέγει εἶναι (ἅτε πάντα δι' αὐτοῦ γεγονέναι, καὶ χωρὶς αὐτοῦ γέγονεν οὐδέν) ὁ ἀπόστολος).³ Now, the supposed quotation is introduced here in a parenthesis interrupting the sense, and there is every probability that it was added as an illustration by Epiphanius, and was not in the Epistle to Flora at all. Omitting the parenthesis, the sentence is a very palpable reference to the Apostle Paul and Coloss. i. 16. In regard to Heracleon, it is asserted, from the unsupported references of Origen,⁴ that he wrote a commentary on the fourth Gospel. Even if this be a fact, there is not a single word of it preserved by Origen which in the least degree bears upon the apostolic origin and trustworthiness of the Gospel. Neither of these heresiarchs, therefore, is of any value as a witness for the authenticity of the fourth Gospel.

The heathen Celsus, as we have shown,⁵ wrote at a period when no evidence which he could well give of his own could have been

¹ Matt. x. 16-22, xxiv. 9 f. ; Mark xiii. 9-13 ; Luke xxi. 12-17.

² P. 408 f.

³ Epiphanius, *Hær.*, xxxiii., § 3.

⁴ The passages are quoted by Grabe (*Spicil. Patr.*, ii., p. 85 f.).

⁵ P. 422 f.