

THE
Presbyterian Quarterly.

NO. 57--OCTOBER, 1901.

I.—THE REUNION OF CHRISTENDOM.

The subject of this paper has been a good deal discussed and written about of late years. And yet it is not altogether new. Ever since the great schism in the eighth century between the Greek and Latin Churches repeated attempts have been made to effect a reunion. Since the Reformation several abortive attempts have been made to effect even partial reunion. One of the latest of these was the proposal set forth in the celebrated Lambeth Quadrilateral or the four propositions of the Convocation of English and American Bishops at Lambeth. The Northern Assembly appointed a very respectable committee to meet with a similar committee of the American Episcopal Church, and for two or three years they held a number of very pleasant joint meetings. But no real progress was made, and very few real Presbyterians ever expected any results of any value. None of the proposed articles were entirely satisfactory, but the insuperable difficulty was in the last one. Presbyterians would not object to the truly primitive and scriptural episcopate, which is the parochial episcopate, but it was obvious from the first that the Episcopalians meant the later diocesan or prelatical episcopate, and that is what Presbyterians will never accept, and they would cease to be Presbyterians if they did. It was, therefore, no more than might have been expected when the General Assembly at Saratoga in 1894 dismissed their committee and discontinued further fruitless negotiations.

The subject of union, however, still continues to be dis-

III. JUSTIN, ARISTIDES AND QUADRATUS AS WITNESSES FOR THE NEW TESTAMENT.

I. HAECKEL AND THE GOSPELS.

In Richmond, Virginia, for many years before the Civil War, there stood, or more properly, sat, a rather strange-looking, one-storied, wooden building, with a little sign over the door, on which were inscribed, if I remember aright, the words, "Select Classical School." In it was to be found during the day, except at meal times, and even before day and late into the night, an indefatigable worker—a rather short, muscular man of peculiar appearance and manners. He was one of that army of teachers from New England that invaded the South long before the cry "On to Richmond" was raised by an army of a very different kind. The South owes a great debt of gratitude to these teachers, who side by side with those educated in Southern colleges and universities, did the great work of dispensing the priceless benefits of preparatory education in advance of the organization of a public school system.

He was a good, earnest, Christian man. He had his faults, no doubt (and who of us has not some of his own?), but, except for some infirmities—or the opposite—of temper, David Turner lived for thirty or forty years in Richmond an unusually blameless and eminently useful life. The scholars who went from his school to the University of Virginia, there to attain to the degree of A. M., and thence to Germany, whence they returned with Ph. D. added to their names, were his pride; and he never failed to keep the eyes of those under his ferule on the noble heights which these heroes had gained. There must be many elderly men reared in Richmond during those years who remember with gratitude the earnest exhortations and careful training of this faithful teacher.

In the modern language department of this school there

presided, during certain hours of the day, an old Frenchman, Monsieur Michard, no less remarkable in appearance and other characteristics than his chief. He was a wizened, wrinkled, mite of a man, looking, as he went out of the door on a March day, wrapping his old surtout about his emaciated form, as if the wind would actually take him up and blow him away like the last leaf of autumn. He had been a lawyer, long ago, in Lyons, he told us; and for political reasons, had found it convenient, if not absolutely necessary, to leave his native land. Conversation was by no means forbidden in the modern language room when the lesson was through with before the hour was out, and M. Michard did not disdain to regale the inquiring minds of his pupils with other things besides the French and Spanish languages which he had to teach them. He was a Roman Catholic, and as often happens in the case of educated men in that communion, there was in him the strange combination of a certain kind of devoutness with skepticism.

One day he astonished at least one of his pupils by saying, in effect, that the New Testament could hardly be a divine revelation, because, as he asserted, besides the writings of which it was composed, there were perhaps a hundred others about as good as those which had been collected and made into the New Testament.

Providentially, an antidote was at hand. Richmond was favored with the ministry of the gifted and devoted Dr. Thomas Verner Moore at that time, and the troubled pupil found, under his ministry, a great deliverance from a terrible fate through the Gospel contained in that very New Testament on which the old teacher had cast these aspersions. He felt that it must be of God, as it brought that help in dire extremity which nothing else could furnish, and which nothing else had the slightest tendency to furnish. The conviction he had was like that of the starving man when food had been brought to save his life and he had felt its reviving and sustaining power from the first morsel he had taken. Finding, by his own experience, this Gospel

to be "The power of God unto salvation," he could not help believing that the book containing it was of God.

This incident, however, has caused that pupil of the old Frenchman to take a deep interest in several recent discoveries which have shown very clearly the falsity of the old man's assertion and of the implication contained in it.

His feeling, on coming to know, in later life, of the evidence from early Christian literature that this assertion had only a specious basis in the existence from an earlier or later time of a large number of "pious frauds" going under the general name of New Testament Apocrypha, which were never universally received by the church as inspired, was one of relief. When, in more recent years, discoveries were made which completely vindicated the genuineness of the New Testament writings, and especially the four Gospels, his feeling was like what that of a son might be whose father had died under false accusations—which he could not disprove, though absolutely sure from his knowledge of his father's character that they were false—when, among that father's papers he has found the full proof of his innocence and could publish it to the world.

The assertion of M. Michard about the selection of the New Testament books from a large number of similar writings was probably based on a story which has long been a favorite article of the stock-in-trade of infidels who make pretensions to learning, and which has been repeated in various forms in a large number of publications. A version of it may be found in the *American Review of Reviews* of only a few years ago, in an article entitled "How the Bible Came Down to Us," and one meets with it in the most unexpected places. Opening the recent work of Professor Haeckel, of Berlin, the coryphaeus of the host of atheistic evolutionists who have made so much unmelodious noise in the world—and about the world—for the last half century and more, I was surprised to find the great scientist repeating the absurd story in the pages of his *Riddle of the Universe*. This is his version of it (p. 311): "As to the four

canonical Gospels, we now know that they were selected from a host of contradictory and forged manuscripts of the first three centuries by the three hundred and eighteen bishops who assembled at the council of Nicaea in 327 [sic]. The entire list of Gospels numbered forty, and the canonical list contains four. As the contending and mutually abusive bishops could not agree about the choice, they determined to leave the selection to a miracle. They put all the books, (according to the Synodicon of Pappus), together underneath the altar, and prayed that the uncanonical books, of human origin, might remain there, and the genuine inspired books might be miraculously placed on the table of the Lord. And that, says tradition, occurred! The three synoptic Gospels, Matthew, Mark and Luke—all written after them, and not by them, at the beginning of the second century, and the very different fourth Gospel (ostensibly "after" John, written about the middle of the second century) leaped upon the table and were thenceforth recognized as the inspired (with their thousand mutual contradictions) foundations of Christian doctrine." He then goes on with sarcastic and violent raillery at Christians who could be so senseless as to believe in the uncouth miracle.

Now if before printing this nonsense, Haeckel had been prudent enough to go to Professor Adolf Harnack, in the Theological department of the great Berlin University, and tell him of it, Harnack would probably have said, had politeness allowed, something like this:

"My venerable friend, it would be wisest for us to confine ourselves to our own departments of investigation, as it is best for the shoemaker to stick to his last. Had I gone to you and told you that through scientific discoveries in this universe, of which you seem to have solved the riddle, 'we now know' that the moon is made of green cheese, and must, therefore, of course, be inhabited, I should not have made myself more ridiculous than you would make yourself by publishing this. For, in the first place, there is no evidence

that the Council of Nice did anything at all in the way of settling the canon of Scripture. The story you repeat is a baseless medieval legend.* In the second place, abundant quotations in Irenaeus from the four Gospels as well as distinct statements on the subject, show that the four Gospels were as fully accepted in the year two hundred, as the only inspired accounts of our Saviour's life on earth, as they are now, while Justin Martyr shows by his quotations from these "memoirs of the apostles" as he calls them, that the case was just the same, more than fifty years earlier. Besides this, we now have, by recent discovery, the four Gospels wrought into a continuous account in Tatian's Diatessaron (i. e. through four), the very name of which shows that there are but four Gospels recognized, fifty years after the death of the apostle John; and by necessary implication, there had been no others thus recognized by the Christian Church. Besides all this, we now have the four Gospels in Syriac, complete, with the exception of a few pages lost out of the manuscript, earlier still than this Diatessaron, as is thought, because the Diatessaron contains many of its peculiar readings. It would be best, dear friend, for you to go on solving universe riddles and leave these matters to persons who have some information about early Christianity."

It would be well in our day to recall Beza's words to

* "There is not the slightest evidence that the Council of Nice had anything whatever to do with settling the Canon of the New Testament. It was not called for any such purpose; nothing relating to the subject appears in the canons or acts of the council; no writer of the fourth, or fifth, or sixth, or seventh, or eighth century has even hinted that the matter came before the Council in any way."—*Dr. Ezra Abbott.*

The story was published by John Pappus, of Strasburg, at the beginning of the 17th century, from an anonymous manuscript which mentioned events occurring in 869 A. D., "500 years after the members of the Nicene council were dead and buried," as one has well said, and is a companion piece of many such monkish stories of uncouth miracles. It may be found republished in Fabricius' *Bibliotheca Graeca*, Vol. XI, p. 198.

Henry IV., in which he compares Christ's Church to an anvil, often struck, indeed, but wearing out many hammers.

Professor Haeckel's mistake is due to his ignorance of the fact that the positions of the famous Tübingen school,* so boldly maintained by unbelieving scholars till twenty-five years ago and later, have been made absolutely untenable by recent discoveries; and now, no one who is informed on the subject can believe either in the late origin of any of the four Gospels, or in the universal acceptance, at any time, of any of the many heretical Gospels so-called. The *Gospel of Peter*†, so-called, fragments of which were discovered a few years ago at Achmin, in Egypt, seems to be a Docetic document, dependent on, and, in its main structure, patterned after, our Gospels. The Apocryphal *Gospel according to the Hebrews*, which, perhaps, originated still earlier than that of Peter, was used by the heretical sect of the Elionites, and shows plainly, in the twenty-three quotations from it which are extant, dependence on all four of our Gospels.‡ So it comes about that these, the two oldest, apparently, of all the false Gospels that are known, when closely examined, become witnesses for the four Gospels instead of competitors with them.

It is instructive to look back over the course through which the Tübingen school has passed to its downfall, leaving so much spiritual wreck and ruin behind it in the overturning of the faith of many, during the past half century. The founder of this school of theological speculation was Frederick Christian Baur. Baur was withdrawn from the orthodox position, which his earliest productions indicated that he held, by the powerful influence of Schleiermacher, and then by that of Strauss, his own pupil, whose "Life of Jesus" seems to have been one of the means by which poor

*Haeckel, while modifying Baur's dates, emphasizes his conclusions.

†See Ante-Nicene Fathers, IX. Vol., p. 3-31. Harnack assigns it to the first quarter of the second century. Other scholars place it later.

‡See Dr. B. Weiss' Manual of Introd. to N. T., Vol. II., § 45, 5.

George Eliot was robbed of her faith. But the chief influence which drew him aside was Hegel's philosophy. We need not examine at length the course of his reasoning. Little more is necessary than the mention of his conclusions about the time when the different books of the New Testament were written. He held that Paul wrote the four epistles, to the Romans, Corinthians and Galatians, and that John, the beloved disciple, wrote the Apocalypse ; but that the other books of the New Testament are spurious productions, and especially that the four Gospels containing the facts which are the basis of Christianity were written long after their reputed authors, Matthew, Mark, Luke and John, were dead, and that they, therefore, could not have been written by them. This conclusion was founded, not upon facts, but upon *a priori* theories. Taking the opposite course from that of the Baconian method of deducing general conclusions from an induction of particular facts, he assumed certain general conclusions as true, and then proceeded to gather and arrange facts to sustain these conclusions. Assuming the impossibility of miracles, and of the supernatural in all its phases, and then adopting the Hegelian theory of the progress of every set of opinions, as going through the three stages of affirmation, contradiction and reconciliation (thesis, anti-thesis, and synthesis), he endeavored to account for the origin of the Christian Scriptures by supposing that they developed in a merely natural way by this rule.

The process, however, is of small importance. What we are concerned with is his conclusions as to the dates of these books, and especially of the four Gospels. Placing these four epistles of Paul in this first period of "affirmation," he pronounced them genuine and their traditional dates substantially correct. But, according to his theory, the so-called Synoptic Gospels, Matthew, Mark and Luke, must have originated in the second period—that of discussion and difference. So he concluded that while Matthew may have been written about 130 A. D., in the interest of

the Judaizing party, and Luke about 150 in advocacy of universality, Mark could not have originated earlier than the decade from 150 to 160, and that John must have been written in the period of synthesis or reconciliation of opposing parties, in the decade extending from 160 to 170 A. D.

II. "SUPERNATURAL RELIGION."

Now, it would not have been necessary to detain the reader with the mention of these opinions of Baur if they had been held by him alone. But this was by no means the case. His views spread rapidly among German scholars, and the very influential Tubingen school was the result. Baur died in 1860, and his influence has long since waned in Germany, as its radical unsoundness has been demonstrated, not only by reasoning, but by unexpected events. But, as its sun was going down in Germany, it was rising on England. About twenty-five years ago there appeared in England a book dealing with these questions in an apparently learned way under the title of *Supernatural Religion*.

The aim of the book was to destroy belief in the supernatural, and especially to discredit the four Gospels. It was a popular presentation in English of the Tubingen theories of Baur and his school. The author withheld his name and seems never to have revealed it, though a prominent English review writer has been suspected of the authorship. The book was ushered in with a chorus of praise from reviews, extolling its great learning and fairness in discussion. It was at a time when the Darwinian theories were most zealously propagated, and a large proportion of the most cultivated Englishmen were under the spell of the skepticism which accompanied the reception of these theories. The result was that the book had an enormous sale, passing rapidly from one edition to another, and influenced a very large number of writers and readers in such a way as to lead them, at least, to question the divine origin of the Christian religion and the sacred character of

the Holy Scriptures. One thing, which, without doubt, added greatly to the popularity of this book with its skeptical readers was the fact that it, somehow, came to be understood that the anonymous author was one of the most eminent prelates of the Church of England, a man noted for his profound and accurate scholarship and unswerving faithfulness to his sacred duties during a long life of usefulness. Whether this fiction was given out by the unknown author or by some literary Mephistopheles among his admirers will probably never be known. But the result may, perhaps, be better imagined than described. This more than "dash of heresy" in the supposed production of a bishop long venerated for his learning and piety, gave the dish a piquancy whose charm was irresistible to the palate of the skeptical public, ready at all times, and more than ready at that time, of the beginning of the Darwinian ascendancy, to break away from all the old restraints of religion. The fact that a man of such character, standing and ability, who had so long been one of the church's guides and defenders, had now, as it seemed, joined the sappers and miners who were trying to destroy her foundations, and that this whilom eminent defender had, in this work, set off a blast which made the whole edifice tremble, filled the free-thinking literati with an excitement from whose intoxication they have hardly yet recovered. The sadly wronged prelate did indeed most emphatically disclaim the authorship, but this seemed of no avail. The book is said to have passed through six editions in as many months. This is probably an exaggeration, but the fact that the assertion is made is an indication that the circulation of the book must have been rapid beyond precedent in the case of a work devoted to learned argument on such a subject.

The book which was lauded by four reviews for its fairness and directness in argument was very soon found, on examination by competent scholars, to conceal, under the guise of vaunted fairness, almost every kind of indirection and unfair dealing. Dr. Lightfoot (afterwards Bishop

of Durham) convicted the author of so misrepresenting and warping the facts with which he dealt as to show an unmistakably dishonest intention to "make the worse the better reason seem." The utter misrepresentation of the meaning of authorities quoted, whether made from ignorance or design, indicated a prejudice against the Christian religion which made the author blind to whatever was evidential of its truth and lynx-eyed to the minutest fact that could be construed as unfavorable to it. Dr. Sanday, of Oxford, showed so conclusively the fallaciousness of the writer's argument designed to prove that the Gospel of Luke was derived from the mutilated Gospel which Marcion used in propagating his heresy, that he was forced to acknowledge that the Gospel of Luke was the original which, on the other hand, Marcion trimmed and treated to make it appear to support his heresy.

Dr. Lightfoot, in a remarkable set of articles in the *Contemporary Review*, proved that the supposedly learned and fair author of *Supernatural Religion*, either from the lack of even a school-boy knowledge of Greek, or from design, mistranslated passage after passage, from Irenaeus especially, so as to make it appear that the author intended to teach exactly the reverse of that which on a proper translation and construction of his words was shown to be his real meaning.

III. TATIAN'S DIATESSARON.

The main position around which this great battle raged was The Diatessaron of Tatian, an account of which may be found in this review, Vol. XII., Nos. I. and II.

The author of *Supernatural Religion* ventured to assert that "No one seems to have seen Tatian's Harmony, probably for the reason that there was no such work." Could he have foreknown the events of the near future, he would have withheld this sarcasm.

During the very next year, 1876, there appeared a translation of Ephraem's Commentary on Tatian's Diatessaron,

made at the request of the Mechitarist Fathers of San Lazaro, Venice, by Dr. Georgius Moesinger, of the University of Salzburg.* The author of *Supernatural Religion*, in spite of this, which was a very clear proof of the existence of Tatian's Harmony, said in desperation: "It is obvious that there is no evidence of any value connecting Tatian's Gospel with those of our canon."

This he did in 1879, and he most certainly would not have said it if he could have foreseen what was to occur two years later. In 1881 Professor Zahn, of Erlangen, published a reconstruction of the Diatessaron of Tatian from Moesinger's translation of the commentary on it, and from the Homilies of Aphraates which were, also, based upon it. This made it clear that the Diatessaron was not another of the Apocryphal Gospels, nor a reproduction of the Gospel according to the Hebrews, as had been conjectured, but was a harmony made up of our four Gospels.

This work of Zahn drew attention to an Arabic manuscript marked No. XIV., in the Vatican library, which purported to be a translation of the Diatessaron itself.

Ciasca, a "lector" of the library, was urged to translate this manuscript and publish it, but was delayed by other duties in doing so, and this providential delay was overruled, like many another, for the best result in the end. There was in the library one day an ecclesiastic, the Visitor Apostolic of the Catholic Copts in Egypt. He was invited to examine the manuscript, and as a result, informed Ciasca that he knew of another like it in Egypt, and that he would have it sent to him. In due time this was done, and thus Ciasca had two Arabic copies from which to make his translation. He completed and published his translation in 1888, in time to present it to the Pope on the occasion of his jubilee in that year. Now we have it in English in a translation with notes by the Rev. Hope W. Hogg, B. D., and his wife, who gave him much assistance in the undertaking, as

*This translation was based on an earlier Latin version of the Mechitarist monk, Aucher.

well as an earlier by B. Hamlyn Hill, B. D., called *The Earliest Life of Christ*.

Two facts make it of great importance as a witness for the four Gospels. One is that it contains the whole account given of our Saviour's life and teachings contained in the Gospels, in the very words of the Gospels, woven together so as to make a continuous narrative, and is therefore appropriately named the Diatessaron, i. e., through four.

The second fact is that there is no trace of any Apocryphal Gospel in it, showing that the only Gospels recognized by the Christians of that early day, fifty or sixty years after the death of the last of the apostles, were those of Matthew, Mark, Luke and John. The preparation of a life of our Saviour out of these Gospels, and these alone, without a word of his own (as Ebed Jesu puts it, "and of his own he did not add a single saying") indicates the universal acceptance of these Gospels long before, as well as the reverential awe entertained of them, as "The memoirs of the apostles," as Tatian's teacher, Justin Martyr, called them. This is too evident to need amplification or argument.

The Diatessaron, according to the careful estimate made by Professor G. F. Moore, contains 50 per cent. of Mark, 66 per cent. of Luke, 76 5 per cent. of Matthew and 96 per cent. of John. Before the discovery of the Diatessaron, the Rev. W. M. Taylor, D. D., of New York, composed a harmony of the same character, which he named *The Life of Our Lord in the Words of the Four Evangelists*, a book which was constantly used for daily reading by one whose memory is more precious to the writer than that of any other human being; and it would be as irrational to deny that Dr. Taylor had our four Gospels before him when he arranged that harmony, as to say that Tatian did not have them when he wove them together to make his. Duplicate expressions and narratives in the different Gospels were, of course, omitted by both in a work of such a character.

The composition of the Diatessaron implies that the four

Gospels were the *only* Gospels of the Christians for a long time before it came into existence, in spite of the efforts of Basilides, Marcion and other heretics to corrupt or supplant them.

But an interesting question is, are there traces of the existence of these Gospels during the period which lies between the death of John and the composition of the Diatesaron? This period, as every student of church history is aware, lies in great obscurity. Whether from the destruction of libraries, the prevalence of persecutions or whatever cause, the distinct Christian memorials of that time are few. Indeed this may be said of the time from the close of the Acts of the apostles to the death of the Apostle John, also. Yet there are lights here and there in this dark morass where the paths are so indistinct and our footing so uncertain. I need not speak of the clear evidence of the existence of the four Gospels and other books of the New Testament furnished by the fragments of the writings of apostolic fathers which have been preserved to our time. For these testimonies the reader will turn to such textbooks on Christian evidences as that of Paley, or to the much fuller and fresher presentation of them in the almost phenomenal production of the great German scholar, Dr. Bernhard Weiss, *Manual of Introduction to the New Testament*. My purpose is to direct attention to a bridge of light which spans the dark period, and especially to three piers in it which recent discovery has brought into new prominence. Irenaeus, who quotes our four Gospels 500 times in those of his writings which have been preserved, and the Gospel of John 100 times, was a contemporary, for perhaps 25 years, of Polycarp, whose memory as his teacher he ever held in most affectionate reverence. Polycarp was the contemporary of the Apostle John for 30 years at the least. Irenaeus regarded the four Gospels just as the orthodox Christian of our day does. Now, Irenaeus has much to say of Justin and his child in the Gospel, Tatian. They lived for 30 years in one case, and perhaps 40 in the other

as his contemporaries. Tatian and Justin were contemporaries of Polycarp for the first 40 or 45 years of their lives.* The Diatessaron of Tatian frees the testimony of Justin Martyr of all possible doubt, and to that testimony our attention will now be directed. The Diatessaron has been well named "the key to Justin."

IV. JUSTIN, THE APOLOGIST AND MARTYR.

Somewhere about the time when the Apostle John died at Ephesus, there was born at the village of Sychar, by Jacob's well, where our Saviour told the Samaritan woman of the water of life, a child who was to be known through all coming ages as a martyr for his cause. But, Justin Martyr, though a native of Sychar, was not of Samaritan blood. Had we no information to the contrary, we should be likely to think that he was probably a descendant of some one of those with whom our Lord spent two days on his journey northward—two days of surpassing interest they must have been—when, after hearing his wonderful words, they said to the woman of Samaria: "Now we believe, not because of thy word, for we have heard him ourselves, and know that this is the Christ." But it is evident from all that he says that he was not of Samaritan or of Jewish blood, and that he was reared in the study of philosophy and Greek literature, and without any knowledge of the Old Testament. Philosophy was his pursuit from his youth, and he early won the right to wear the philosopher's cloak. He seems to have been in the habit of retiring to some solitude to do what almost every great thinker has done—meditate, and commune with nature. It

* "Polycarp was 86 years old at the time of his death (from his words it would seem that he had been 86 years a Christian) and Irenaeus speaks of him as a disciple of John, and as appointed Bishop of Smyrna by apostles, and again speaks of 'successors of Polycarp at the present time,' that is, from A. D. 177 to A. D. 190. . . . Living from A. D. 70 to 155, his life and work link together St. John and Irenaeus, and they became an argument for the authenticity of the fourth Gospel, the force of which it is impossible to deny." Watkins' Bampton Lectures, p. 391-2.

was such an excursion that was made, in God's providence, the occasion of his coming to the knowledge of the truth. The place was probably in the vicinity of Ephesus, as he seems to have studied there; but this is immaterial. Let us hear him tell of it: "And while I was thus disposed, when I wished at one period to be filled with great quietness, and to shun the path of men, I used to go into a certain field not far from the sea, and when I was near that spot one day, which having reached, I proposed to be by myself, a certain old man, by no means contemptible in appearance, exhibiting meek and venerable manners, followed me at a little distance."

After salutations, the venerable stranger told Justin that he had come to this place to look for friends who were absent and who might be returning. As it was in view of the sea, he was probably looking for the vessel by which they were expected.

Justin having told him that he delighted in solitary walks to meditate on the great questions of philosophy, the stranger began to discourse of the vanity of mere human speculations about the great subject of religion (for this was the field of philosophy in which Justin was most interested), and then dwelt on the need of a divine revelation such as existed in The Prophets, or Old Testament Scriptures, and of the enlightenment of the Holy Spirit, to give us a satisfactory and saving view of the truth in these great matters. Then, Justin tells us:

"When he had spoked these and many other things, he went away, bidding me attend to them, and I have not seen him since; but straightway a flame was kindled in my soul, and a love of the prophets and of those men who are the friends of Christ possessed me, and whilst revolving his words in my mind, I found this philosophy alone to be safe and profitable." (Dialogue Ch. 8.)*

* Justin seems to have been influenced, too, as we know Calvin was, by the conduct of those whom he observed under persecution. He tells us: "While I still found delight in the doctrines of Plato, and heard the Christians calumniated, but yet saw them fearless towards death, and all that men account fearful, I learned that it was impossible that they should live in sin and lust."

Thus we see how it was that Justin Martyr, though he became a Christian, never ceased to wear his philosopher's cloak. He found Christianity to be the truest and highest of all philosophy, and did not cease to be a philosopher by becoming a Christian.* * His life seems to have been one of the most fearless and straightforward of all the witnesses for Christ in that brave age. Any one who will read his two defences of Christianity will see and feel this as he cannot otherwise do.

Some years later, probably in 163, there was a thrilling scene in the court of the Roman prefect, Rusticus. The noble life was crowned with the noblest of deaths, that of a martyr for Christ.

Rusticus, the prefect of Rome, before whom Justin and other Christians were arraigned, demanded that they should deny their faith and salute the emperor as divine. "Unless," said he, "ye obey ye shall be mercilessly punished." Justin said, "Through prayer we can be saved on account of our Lord Jesus Christ, even when we have been punished, because this shall become to us salvation and confidence at the more awful judgment seat of our Lord and Saviour." Thus also said the other martyrs: "Do what you will, for we are Christians and do not sacrifice to idols."

Thus, like Moses, they endured, as "seeing Him who is invisible."

Let us now turn to the utterances of Justin Martyr addressed, in his two *Apologies*, to Antoninus Pius, the Emperor of Rome.

Dr. Basil Gildersleeve in the introduction to his edition of Justin's *Apologies*, says :

"If Justin was acquainted with the Fourth Gospel, the whole fabric of a great historical school falls to the ground."

This must be clear to all ; for if the first *Apology* was not written till as late as 147 A. D., the date which Professor

* * "The torch of Aristotle and Plato faded when he became familiar with the light of Christ."—*Watkins' Bampton Lectures*.

Gildersleeve favors, it was written several years before the date assigned to the Gospel of John by the Tübingen school, i. e., 160–170 A. D. Neander thinks the first *Apology* should be dated 139 A. D. He says: "After the death of the Emperor Hadrian, persecutions arose against the Christians, in the beginning of the reign of Antoninus Pius. Thereby Justin, who was then resident at Rome, was induced to address a writing in defence of the interests of the Christians to the emperor. Since, however, in the superscription of this work, he does not give the title of Caesar to M. Aurelius, it is probably to be inferred that it was written before his adoption into that dignity, which took place in 139 A. D."

But, taking the late date, there can be no doubt that Justin quotes it, and he surely could not have quoted it from 13 to 23 years before it was written, or one minute before it was written, for that matter.

That Justin did know John's Gospel, must be clear to any open-minded person who will read in first *Apology*, chap. 61, these words:

"Except ye be born again, ye cannot enter into the kingdom of heaven." In addition to this he goes on to mention other words spoken in this conversation of Christ with Nicodemus, recorded in the third chapter of John's Gospel.

In his dialogue with Trypho, chap. 91, we find Justin giving a comment on John 3:14, and several times he refers to the name which John gives to Christ—the Logos—"the Word."* It seems plain enough then that Justin, the successor of Aristides and Quadratus as a defender of the faith did have the Gospel of John in his hands, and therefore, "the whole fabric of a great historical school falls to the ground." Baur may hold the theory according to which the Gospel of John could not have been written till from 160 to 170 A. D.; but we find as a fact that it is quoted by

Hart and Volkmar date the first *Apology* 145-148 A. D.; Caspari and Krüger earlier.—*Watkins' Bampton Lectures*.

*Not in Philo's sense.—*Gildersleeve*.

Justin in his *Apology* addressed to the Emperor Antoninus Pius, and the theory must yield to the fact, and "fall to the ground." How is it with the three synoptic Gospels?

See how Justin speaks of all the Gospels together under a name which may be unfamiliar to some of us, but which seems a very natural designation for them. He draws, in a few words, a picture of the worship of the Christians on Sunday. He tells the emperor :

"On the day called the day of the Sun (Sunday)** there is a gathering together of all who dwell in city and country, with one accord (or in one place), and the memoirs of the apostles and the writings of the prophets are read." He continues with a further description of their worship including the administration of the Lord's supper. The significant thing for us here is that *The Memoirs of the Apostles* are read in public worship and are evidently regarded as sacred scriptures, as they are read along with Old Testament Scriptures. But a question has been raised as to whether these Memoirs of the Apostles were our Gospels, which contain apostolic memoirs of our blessed Lord. The controversy has been an earnest and prolonged one ; but it is hard to see how there can be any room for a difference of opinion about the matter. We need not go outside of the writings of Justin himself to determine without a shadow of doubt about what were the Memoirs of the Apostles. We need only cast our eyes up to the preceding chapter of the first *Apology* on the same page (1st *Apology* Ch. 66) and we read "The apostles in the memoirs drawn up by them, which are called Gospels,* thus enjoined on them, that Jesus taking bread, having blessed it, said, This do in remembrance of me ; this is my body, and taking the

** τῆ τῶν ἡλίου λεγομένη ἡμέρα

* Hostile critics have alleged that this last expression is an interpolation. But, there is no manuscript evidence to support this allegation, and the only reason they have made it seems to be that the words are so plainly fatal to their contention. The text is, so far as is known, as found here as elsewhere.

cup, and having given thanks, said this is my blood, etc.”

Surely this is conclusive as to what the Memoirs of the Apostles are. Justin calls them “Gospels” and we find in them what we find to-day in our Gospels. Now if there could be any lingering doubt that this general name—memoirs of the Apostles—means our four Gospels, we may turn to another work of Justin where it is used and see proofs which must immediately scatter these doubts to the winds. In the Dialogue with Typho, Ch. 100, we read “But also, in the Gospel it is written “All things are delivered me of my Father,” and “No man knoweth the Father but the Son; nor the Son but the Father, and they to whom the Son will reveal Him” We know, of course that this is from our Gospel of Mathew XI. 27. and so, what Justin states is written in the Gospel,* we find in our Gospel of Matthew. But he continues: Christ called one of his disciples, previously known as Simon, Peter, since he recognized Him to be the Christ, the Son of God, by the revelation of His Father; and since we find it recorded in the Memoirs of the Apostles, etc.” All will recognize this as from the 16 Chapter of Matthew, and this he says is “recorded in the Memoirs of the Apostles.” So our Matthew must be a part of these Memoirs of the Apostles. Look in a little further, and in Chapter 103 we read:

“For, if the Memoirs which I say were drawn up by the Apostles and those who followed them it is recorded that his sweat fell down like blood while he was praying and saying, If it be possible let this cup pass, etc.”

Here we find a quotation combining Luke 22. 41 and 42, and Matthew 26. 39. and he speaks of it as being “recorded in the Memoirs which were drawn up by the Apostles, and those who followed them.” Now, Matthew and John whom he quoted were Apostles and Mark

* “Gospel” is often used to mean the four Gospels, as Watkins puts it, “to express the unity of a collected plurality” Justin so uses it. See Watkins’ Bampton Lectures.

and Luke were their followers, Mark of Peter and Luke of Paul, for he quotes both of these extensively also.

If we had space, I should like to transcribe the 15th Chapter of the 1st Apology, and show how, in it he quotes, Matthew seven times, Mark 8 times, and Luke 5 times, so that in the short Chapter of less than two 12mo pages we have a mosaic of selections from the three synoptic Gospels with only a few words of his own to hold together the jewels gathered from these "Memoirs of the Apostles." I think we would be very unreasonable to demand plainer proof that Justin Martyr had just the Gospels we have and no others—and refers to them as Memoirs of the Apostles.

Prof. James Drummond, Unitarian critic, and follower of Martineau, says of the foolish charge that John was copied from Justin:

"It does seem to me surprising that any one in comparing the passages in Justin and John should doubt for one moment that the dependence is on the side of the former."

This sufficiently "Liberal" critic concludes: "I must conclude, therefore, as best satisfying, on the whole, the facts of the case, not only that Justin regarded the Fourth Gospel as one of the historical "memoirs" of Christ, but that it is not improbable that he believed in its Johannean authorship. This is a very old-fashioned conclusion, but I have endeavored simply to follow the evidence without any ulterior object and must leave the result to the judgment of the reader."

How remarkably this "old-fashioned conclusion" for which he felt bound to apologize, has been confirmed by the discovery of *The Diatessaron*. Since this discovery, no self-respecting critic, however great his prejudices, can, if fully informed, either assert the dependence of John's Gospel on Justin or deny that Justin knew our four Gospels, and them alone, as the authoritative Christian records of Christ's life and teachings.

It is very hard to see how any honest reader of Justin's Apologies and Dialogue could have any doubt of this fact,

since quotations from the Synoptic Gospels occupy a large proportion of the space these writings cover, and besides evident references to, and quotations from, the Gospel of John, the whole of these writings are permeated with the unique thought of this Gospel which stands apart from all that has ever been written by the hand of man.

The destructive critic Thoma, even, says of Justin: "He cites the Synoptics; he thinks and argues according to John."

All this was evident before the discovery of *The Diatesaron*. Now, the case is settled; for we find Tatian, who became a Christian under the instruction of Justin about 150 A. D., making a harmony out of the four Gospels, and using 96 per cent. of the Gospel of John in doing so, only 4 per cent. being omitted because duplicated by statements in the other Gospels.

"It is certain," says Dr. B. Weiss, "that Justin is also acquainted with Pauline Epistles and is influenced by them. It is characteristic throughout that what he has chiefly adopted from the Epistle to the Romans is the application of the Old Testament in the Christian sense, as appears from the many citations common to both in their form, connection and application (comp. Rom. iii. 11-17 and Dial. 27; ix. 27 ff. and Dial. 55; xi. 16 and Dial. 42; xi. 2 ff. and Dial. 39-46; xiv. 11 and Dial. 52), and the repeated statements respecting the justification of Abraham as the father of believing Gentiles, taken from Rom. iv. (Dial. 11; 23-119)"

For proof of Justin's use of other Pauline epistles see Weiss' Introduction §7. 4.

Weiss shows with equal clearness Justin's use of the Fourth Gospel. Lack of space prevents the presentation of the evidence in his words; but his conclusion is that "the opinion that Justin was not yet acquainted with the Fourth Gospel, once so obstinately adhered to by the Tübingen school, must be regarded as definitely set aside."

Justin sometimes quotes the Gospels with the formula, "It is written," indicating that he regards them as Scripture.

The use of the Epistle of James (Dial. 1.16), of 1 Peter (Dial. 72), and of Acts (1 Apology, 39, 40, 50), is clearly shown. His knowledge of the Revelation and the fact that it was written by the Apostle John, is indicated by such words as these: (Dial. 81.)

“There was a certain man with us [Christians] whose name was John, one of the apostles of Christ, who prophesied by a revelation that was made to him.” Then follows a reference to the “thousand years, the general, and, in short, eternal resurrection and judgment of all men.” Rev. xx.

It is true that Justin does not always use the precise words of our received text. He evidently wrote with a rapidly running pen, and in the case of the second Apology, written, probably, on the eve of his execution, he evidently did not turn to each passage to verify his quotations. He joins together the words of two or three of the Gospels in relating an incident or stating a truth. Yet I think no one can point out a single expression which belongs to any of the apocryphal Gospels. Evidently none of them had been produced at the time of his writing.

The apocryphal “Gospel of Peter,” discovered a few years ago at Akhmin in Egypt, which was in all probability the oldest of all the apocryphal Gospels, is not quoted once. It doubtless originated later than Justin’s time. Justin’s quotations are just such as would naturally be made by a man of great earnestness who had his memory well stored with the Scriptures, and had a vast number of quotations at his command, but did not turn to the chapter and verse, and copy every word accurately. We should remember that there were no chapters and verses then, and that Alexander Cruden was not yet born.

But, lest any should think me liable to mistake on this point, I will, before concluding, quote the words of Westcott (Canon, p. 151). Says he: “It is enough to repeat in the presence of these facts that differences from the present text of the Gospels such as are found in the present text of Justin are wholly inadequate to prove that passages so dif-

fering could not have been taken from copies of our Gospels." And this was written before the discovery of the apocryphal so-called "Gospel of Peter."

It is proper to remark that almost certainly there were some differences between the text of the Gospels used by Justin and our Received text, or that of Westcott & Hort; but the main differences between his quotations and our New Testament are due (as is plainly the case in his Old Testament quotations) to the fact that he quoted freely from memory and not with Bible and Concordance in his hands.

Dr. Purves has rendered a great service to the cause of truth and sound criticism by his L. P. Stone lectures on Justin Martyr, delivered at Princeton, and no one, unless dominated by prejudice; can rise from the perusal of his fifth lecture, in which he brings a great mass of evidence from the two Apologies and the Dialogue to show Justin's use of the writings which we now call the New Testament, without agreeing in his conclusion that Justin had "reference to a distinct Christian literature, which, while nothing definite is said of its authority in the Church, was evidently regulative of the Church's faith."

The fact that Justin speaks of the Gospels as read in the public worship of Christians along with the writings of the Prophets, that he quotes the Gospels with the formula, "It is written," together with his reverent use of what he calls "our writings" (— scriptures), indicate that, having the New Testament almost, if not quite, in its entirety*, he regarded it, though not yet "canonized" by any ecclesiastical council, as invested with the authority of Apostles who had received the Holy Spirit according to Christ's promise, and "the promise of the Father."

*Dr. Eberhard Nestle, in his work, *Introduction to Textual Criticism of New Testament*, though once a professor of Tübingen, moots the question (following Zahn), "Whether the entire New Testament, as the Doctrine of Addai says, was not a present which Tatian brought with him from Rome to his fellow-countrymen," etc.

Referring to the peculiarities of the text which Justin had before him, Dr. Purves says. (p. 218):

“ We do not mean that Justin’s text is now represented in its entirety by any one MS. or class of MSS., but that he gives evidence of that corruption of the canonical texts which, according to abundant testimony, took place even in the century immediately succeeding that in which they were written, and which most plainly appears in those MSS. which textual critics have classified as ‘Western.’ If, however, this be so, then Justin testifies, not only that our Synoptic Gospels existed in his day and were used by the Church as public documents, and were regarded as apostolic and authoritative records of the life of Christ, but he also proves, by the incidental character of his quotations and by their very variations from the text of our Gospels, that these latter were, in the middle of the second century, already ancient books, handed down from the apostolic age. No more explicit testimony to our Synoptic Gospels could well be asked of him; and the very difficulties which at first present themselves in his quotations, in the end confirm his evidence for their apostolic authority.”

Further on (p. 248) he declares, “It is clear that at least the Gospels had been formed into a sacred collection called “the Gospel” which ranked on an equality with the Old Testament, and that other apostolic books were used to regulate the faith of the Church.”

The strange mistake of Eusebius in interpreting the words of Papias seems to be responsible for the figment of a second John,* and so to have helped to fashion one feature of that persistent ghost, the “Johannean problem,” though Eusebius himself had not a shadow of a doubt that the Fourth Gospel was written by the Apostle John.

It is to be hoped that the phantom of false authorship, at least, is laid now, since *Tatian’s Diatessaron* has risen from the dust of long oblivion to show unmistakably that Tatian’s

* See Farrar’s *Early Days of Christianity*, Appendix, Eursus x 14, and Weiss’ *Introd. New Test.*, § 332.

teacher, Justin, had the Gospel of that John whom Justin describes as "one of the disciples of Christ," and the writer of the Revelation. This new light on the old monument has made its inscriptions clear to all—but the blind.

In the presence of evidence so incontrovertible, it is a strange thing to find a professor in a Congregational Theological Seminary speaking, in a late work,** of the Gospel of John as "a writing about the middle of the second century." But then, when we find that this theological professor does not believe in Christ, except as a mere man, and remember how clearly the Gospel of John teaches His divinity, we see the explanation. Something had to be done to get this Gospel out of the way; and so in the face of all the overwhelming evidence of the falsity of the Tübingen theory, he still adheres to it.

It may be true that German theological theories go to England when they die, but they do not stop there. America is receiving a full share of these unquiet and disquieting spirits to haunt her halls of Theological learning, while their carcasses pollute the religious atmosphere of Germany.

V. ARISTIDES AND QUADRATUS, THE COMPANION APOLOGISTS.

Justin Martyr had stood in the church's view, for ages, at the head of the brave band of defenders of the faith, the apologists of the second century; but the discovery of the *Apology of Aristides* in the St. Catherine convent in 1889 has given to its author the first place. Aristides now takes precedence.

But another, perhaps still more eminent Christian, Quadratus, presented a defence of the Christians at the same time with Aristides.

Of this event Eusebius gives the following account:

"But Trajan," [who became emperor of Rome before the death of the Apostle John], "having held the sovereignty

**Evolution of Trinitarianism, Prof. Paine, Bangor Theol. Sem.

twenty years wanting six months, is succeeded in the imperial office by Aelius Hadrian. To him Quadratus addressed a discourse as an apology for the religion which we profess, because certain malicious persons attempted to harass the brethren."

"The work is *still in the hands of some of the brethren, as also in our own*, from which any one may see evident proof of the understanding of the man and of his *apostolic* faith." [Italics mine] Indicating the early date at which Quadratus began his work, Eusebius continues: "This writer shows the antiquity of the age in which he lived, in these passages:

'The deeds of our Saviour,' says he, 'were always before you, for they were true miracles; those that were healed, those that were raised from the dead, who were seen, not only when healed and when raised, but were always present. They remained living a long time, not only whilst our Lord was on earth, but likewise when he had left the earth, so that some of them have also lived to our own times.' Such was Quadratus." Eusebius continues:

"Aristides, also, a man faithfully devoted to the religion we profess, like Quadratus, has left to posterity a defence of the faith addressed to Adrian. This work is, also, preserved by a great number, even to the present day."

Thus, twenty-five years after the death of the Apostle John, there occurred this event of thrilling interest. At Athens, and, possibly, on that very Mars' Hill where Paul preached, and where the court of the Areopagus held its sessions, or it may be, on the adjacent summit of the acropolis, crowned with that paragon of architecture, the Parthenon, with its frieze of Phidias, its inimitable ivory and gold Athena, within, and its colossal Athena, without, these two brave men, Aristides, the Athenian philosopher, who had become a Christian, and Quadratus, the evangelist,—the first, possibly a young man filled with enthusiasm at finding in the Gospel a philosophy infinitely transcending the noblest product even of the

Greek intellect—the other almost certainly an old man, with a life of loving labors chiefly behind him, came to acknowledge in the most public way their allegiance to their Lord. This they did by presenting to Hadrian, the Emperor of Rome, a plea for their persecuted brethren and their much-misrepresented faith.

The brave deed was not destined to be fruitless. Not only was the "Rescript of Hadrian" by which the severity of the persecution was greatly mitigated, in all probability, a result of it, but it must have served to cheer and strengthen the persecuted Christian host that stood trembling behind them, its leaders, by its high example of Christian heroism.

The Martyrologies of the middle ages, even, presented the tradition of the brave and brilliant deed, and now the Apology of Aristides has come forth from its concealment of many centuries as one of the witnesses to encourage faith, in an age of doubt.

Eusebius tells us that the Apology of Quadratus "was in his hands and in those of some of the brethren." He gives us a specimen which makes us long to see the whole of it. The extract from it which we have indicates how early he had lived. Irenaeus tells of Polycarp at whose feet he had sat in his youth, and Quadratus could probably tell of John and possibly, even of Paul and Peter, as he was of those who, in the words of Eusebius, "held the first rank in the apostolic succession," and who had seen those who were the subjects of our Saviour's miracles.

What a chasm this Apology of Quadratus, if recovered, would bridge! The half century from 75 to 125 A. D. is almost a blank to us. We have scarcely any particulars about it, and yet, in this fifty years there took place the greatest movement of all church history since the days of the apostles. The letter of a heathen, written about twelve years after John's body was laid to rest at Ephesus, throws an interesting side-light on it. Trajan's governor of Bithynia, Pliny, writing to his master, speaks of the heathen

temples "almost deserted," of "great numbers involved in the dangers of these persecutions," which were then in progress, while he asserts that "this contagious superstition is not confined to the cities only, but has spread its infection among the country villages." He tells Trajan of "this inquiry having already extended, and being still likely to extend to persons of all ages and ranks, and of both sexes. Such is the view of the results of this period of evangelization which a Roman governor has from the outside of the Christian community, and with eyes hostile to it. It is the view of a contemporary and one who is a very competent witness as far as intelligence is concerned.

Eusebius gives, at a much later time, the inside view of the agencies—the human agencies at least—which brought about these wonderful results. But he had before him the words of earlier writers who were not only witnesses within the Christian circle, but agents in the glorious work. Eusebius knew of others, but he makes a more honorable mention of none than of Quadratus. He says :

"Of those who flourished in these times, Quadratus is said to have been distinguished for prophetic gifts. There were many others, also, noted in these times, who held the first rank in the apostolic succession. These, as the holy disciples of such men, also built up the churches where foundations had been laid in every place by the apostles. They augmented the means of promulgating the Gospel more and more, and spread the seeds of salvation and of the heavenly kingdom throughout the world far and wide. For the most of the disciples at that time, animated with a more ardent love of the divine word, had first fulfilled the Saviour's precept by distributing their substance to the needy. Afterwards, leaving their country, they performed the office of evangelists to those who had not yet heard the faith; whilst with a noble ambition, they delivered to them the books of the holy Gospel. After laying the foundation of the Gospel in foreign parts, as the particular object of their mission, and after appointing

others as shepherds of the flocks, and committing to these the care of those that had been recently introduced, they went again to other regions and nations, with the grace and co-operation of God. The Holy Spirit also wrought many wonders, as yet, through them, so that as soon as the Gospel was heard, men voluntarily, and in crowds, eagerly embraced the true faith with their whole minds."

O glorious, golden age of Christianity, prophecy and promise, we trust, of a still more glorious golden age to come, when, after these times of worldliness and dearth, God will pour out His spirit upon all flesh. *Quadratus* had been, perhaps, for 50 years among these scenes so blessed and yet so full at times of suffering. Now is a time of suffering, and the old hero comes with his defence, and along with the philosopher *Aristides*, appeals to the emperor in behalf of the Christians. God seems to have blessed the brave deed. The "rescript of Hadrian" to *Fundanus*, the pro-consul of Asia, was issued after it, commanding that no Christian should be punished without examination and proof.

Now, what a boon would the full account of this glorious and yet terrible half century, written by a contemporary and thoroughly competent witness, be! For one reason one would like to live fifty years more. It is to be hoped that within that time the long lost *Apology of Quadratus* will be discovered, as that of *Aristides* has been already. *Eusebius* had it before him when he wrote his history, and gives us a very appetizing and very tantalizing morsel. What a flood of light would the re-discovered *Apology* shed on this glorious and yet almost wholly unknown half century!

Before this period we have the simplicity of apostolic Christianity. Soon after it we find the beginnings, at least of that intricate and artificial ecclesiasticism, which so sadly transformed and deformed the pure religion of Christ, The multiform errors of Gnosticism, that "hydra-headed monster," as *Hippolytus* calls it, that with the many forms

of heathen philosophies and religions, served to adulterate and ruin so much of the nominal Christianity of the time, soon came upon the scene. The influences which wrought the sad change were working, doubtless, in secret, through all this long period, but we cannot trace them. All is dim and indistinct, and to some extent uncertain, through all this tract of time. We know something of some characters in it, but they are to us at this distance like men seen through a mist, across wide gorges among mountain heights—magnified, shadowy forms, standing, we cannot tell just where, and moving, we scarcely know whither.

What a boon a flood of clear light on this period would be! That light the Apology of Quadratus, if discovered, will probably give in such a way as no other known writing does. He was a man qualified to tell of these times intelligently and reliably; and from the quotations of Eusebius from his Apology and from what Eusebius says of him, we see that he must have told much that would be intensely interesting to us after 1776 years.

Let us now turn to the Apology which Aristides addressed to Hadrian.

VI. THE APOLOGY OF ARISTIDES, AND ITS EVIDENCE FOR THE NEW TESTAMENT.

We can only indulge hopes of the discovery of the *Apology of Quadratus*; that of his companion apologist is now in our hands, coming to us in two languages, and in two different forms, in one of which we have it in its entirety, while, in the other, we possess far the greater part of it.

The *Apology of Aristides* was, for ages, supposed to have finally perished, with a vast mass of the writings of antiquity.

Jerome, about the year 420, mentions the *Apology of Aristides*, and says that it was presented to the Emperor Hadrian at the same time with the apology of Quadratus; that it was extant in his day, and was afterwards imitated by Justin Martyr. There is no later mention of its exis-

tence; but what has been called "a faint reflection" of the earlier testimony is found in the medieval martyrologies as, in, them, the 31st of August is given as the saints' day of "The blessed Aristides [to use the words of the old record] most renowned for faith and wisdom, who presented books on the Christian religion to the Prince Hadrian, and most brilliantly proclaimed in the presence of the Emperor himself how that Christ Jesus is the only God."*

In the 17th century there was a rumor that the *Apology* was in some monastic libraries in Greece, but the search made for it was fruitless.

In the spring of the year 1889 Prof. J. Rendel Harris, the distinguished scholar and lecturer of Clare College, Cambridge, found, in the library of the St. Catharine Convent on Mount Siani, where Tischendorf had thirty years before discovered the *Codex Sinaiticus*, the long lost *Apology of Aristides*. It was in the Syriac language, in a manuscript which Dr. Harris refers to the seventh century. Eleven years before this, the Mechitarist scholars in their convent of S. Lazaro, near Venice, had published a Latin translation of what was thought to be (and afterwards proved to be) the first two chapters of the *Apology* in the Armenian language. This fragment had been declared spurious by Renan and other scholars, because it contained a term describing the virgin as the "God-bearer"—a term which belonged to a much later age than that in which the *Apology of Aristides* was written. The original fragment was in the Armenian language, as has been said, and after fuller examination, the use of this term was found to have been due to a mistake of the Latin translator, and when Harris discovered the whole *Apology* in Syriac, this Armenian fragment was found to correspond with it, and its genuineness was vindicated. After the happy discovery of the *Apology* it was found, almost entire, in a slightly modified form, but in the original Greek, imbedded and concealed, like a jewel

* We find the *Apology* to be a powerful argument against polytheism and for the unity-in-trinity of God.

in common earth, in a strange story of the Middle Ages, entitled *Barlaam and Josaphat*—a tale of such interest, in the absence of anything like the modern novel, that it was translated into some twenty languages, Hebrew and Icelandic being of the number. So seriously was the romance taken by the Church of Rome that Barlaam and Josaphat, were accorded a place in the calendar of saints—a calendar, however, where much else equally as fictitious may be found.

The brilliant coryphaeus of the Ritschlians, Prof. Adolf Harnack, in a notable article in the *Prussische Jahrbucher*, said: "The discovery of this Apology is a find of the first importance." A glance at its contents will convince you that this is true. The *Apology of Aristides* is a witness not only for the Gospels, but for the whole New Testament. The name New Testament occurs a little later, as we see from a quotation in Eusebius (H. E. v. 17.)

DATE OF THE APOLOGY.

Prof. J. Rendel Harris assigns a later date than Eusebius, on account of the address of the Syriac copy which he discovered, and of the sign of the plural with the word "Majesty" in the Syriac. But, the evidence that has come in since the discovery of the MS. seems clearly to indicate that his conjecture was mistaken, founded as it was, on what now appears to be a false duplicate address on his MS. To accept this conclusion of Prof. Harris, in the words of the *Introduction to the Apology of Aristides*, in the *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, "requires us to suppose that Eusebius was wrong; that Jerome copied his error; that the Armenian version curiously fell into the same mistake; and that the Syriac translation is, at this point, exceptionally faithful." *

**Die Reinsender Kaiser Hadrian*, (Julius Durr), "shows that Hadrian visited, and lived at, Athens in 125."

Coins, inscriptions, etc., show this. The book was published ten years before the discovery of the *Apology of Aristides* at the St. Catherine convent in 1889. Expositor for Nov., 1900, p. 324.

Antonius Pius protected the Christians as far as he was able, and a not

It is extremely improbable that Eusebius should have been mistaken. Not only did he have the accounts of those who preceded him, but he had in his hands, as he tells us, the *Apology of Quadratus*, the companion of Aristides, and gives us an extract from it. He must have known to whom that was addressed. This is conclusive. Then, in the *Apology of Aristides*, the words "O King," occur a great number of times showing that it must have been addressed to only one monarch—to Hadrian alone and not to Antonius Pius also.

The Armenian Fragment, which has the address in its superscription to Hadrian alone, is now thoroughly accredited as genuine. "To the Emperor Hadrian from Aristides," is the address in the Armenian fragment.

Besides all this, the great age which the later date would require for Quadratus adds to the great improbability that it is the true one.

Yet, even if the apology had been presented to the *two* emperors, at the only possible time, the few months in 138 A. D., when they were colleagues; it would be still a very valuable witness for the genuineness of the New Testament.

VII. THE APOLOGY AND THE NEW TESTAMENT.

In examining the *Apology of Aristides* as to its dependence on the *New Testament*, there are several things to be considered. One is that it is brief, the translations of the Syriac and of the Greek, printed side by side in the *Ante-Nicene Fathers* (Vol. IX) occupying only 17 pages. The translation of the Greek, if complete, would occupy about 7 pages. Of this 7 pages, more than three-fourths of the space is occupied with arguments against the most prominent systems of polytheism, and for the unity-in-trinity of God. The arguments are chiefly philosophical, and are

improbable explanation of the duplicate address in the Syriac is that the apology may have been presented a second time on behalf of the suffering Syrian Christians when Antonius Pius became the colleague of Hadrian in A. D. 138.

simply an appeal to reason. The emperor addressed was a heathen, supposed, as is shown, to know nothing of the writings of the Christians, which he is importuned again and again to read. Hence we should not expect quotations from these writings or any mention of the names of the writers—names which would be meaningless to Hadrian.

It will be in the interest of brevity and probably more satisfactory to the reader to refrain from a lengthened discussion, and present a sample of the Apology, the whole of which may not be accessible to some. Let us take the XV section in which Aristides speaks of the origin of the Christians, and refutes the heathen charges of immorality against them. We will take the translation from the Greek fragment as being probably more literal and briefer than the translation of the Syriac, which is itself a translation, and seemingly somewhat paraphrastic. The first part—that about Christ—occurs earlier in the Syriac XV. “Now the Christians trace their origin from the Lord Jesus Christ, And He is acknowledged by the Holy Spirit to be the Son of the Most High God, who came down from heaven for the salvation of men, and being born of a pure virgin, unbegotten and immaculate, He assumed flesh and revealed Himself among men that He might recall them to himself from their wandering after many gods. And having accomplished His wonderful dispensation, by a voluntary choice, He tasted death on the cross, fulfilling an august dispensation. And after three days He came to life again and ascended into heaven. And, if you would read, O King, you may judge the glory of His presence [brightness of His coming?] from the holy gospel writing, as it is called among themselves. He had twelve disciples who, after His ascension, went forth into the provinces of the whole world, and declared His greatness. As for instance, one of them traversed the countries about us, proclaiming the doctrine of the truth. From this it is that they who still observe the righteousness enjoined by their preaching are called Christians.

And these are they who more than all the nations on the earth have found the truth. For they know God the Creator and Fashioner of all things, through the only begotten Son and the Holy Spirit; and besides Him they worship no other God. They have the commands of the Lord Jesus Christ Himself graven upon their hearts; and they observe them, looking forward to the resurrection of the dead, and life in the world to come. They do not commit adultery nor fornication, nor bear false witness, nor covet the things of others; they honor father and mother, and love their neighbors; they judge justly, and they never do to others what they would not wish to happen to themselves,* they appeal to those who injure them, and try to win them as friends; they are eager to do good to their enemies; they are gentle and easy to be entreated; they abstain from all unlawful conversation and from all impurity; they despise not the widow nor oppress the orphan; and he that has, gives ungrudgingly for the maintenance of him who has not. If they see a stranger they take him under their roof, and rejoice over him as over a very brother; for they call themselves brethren not after the flesh, but after the Spirit."

When he tells the emperor that one of the apostles "traversed the countries about us," we can hardly help believing that he refers to Paul, the Apostle who first brought

* The Syric has, also, "and the food which is consecrated to idols they do not eat."

Dr. Purves has kindly drawn my attention to the indication in this *Apology* that the text of *The Acts* which Aristides used had at that time suffered correction. The negative form of the "golden rule" here seen is noted by Seeberg, of Berlin, as an instance of "Western" corruption of Acts XV 20 and 29, and Prof. Harris, as is seen in his *Four Lectures on the Western Text*, agrees with him. As this is found in connection with the statement that "they abstain from εἰδωλοθυτα," Seeberg concluded that the interpretation was in the copy of *The Acts* used by Aristides. This would seem to indicate that *The Acts* was, as Seeberg says, "in ecclesiastical use," and that it was, even at that time, an "ancient book, handed down from the apostolic age."

My thanks are due to the Rev. T. W. Lingle, who kindly furnished me references from the *Four Lectures* to which I did not have access.

the gospel to Greece. Surely, too, it does not require a vivid imagination to hear, in the utterances of Aristides, echoes of Paul's address on Mars Hill. While there are contrasts between the *Apology of Aristides* and this address, which we may call the *Apology of Paul*—contrasts in which Prof Stokes, of Dublin; has seen a proof that *The Acts* was written in the first century—at the same time there are striking resemblances. Let us look at some of them:

Paul strove earnestly to make known to his heathen hearers "the unknown God." This we see Aristides tried to do for Hadrian, and in doing it, presented the theology—even the trinitarianism—of Paul's epistles.

Paul spoke of the folly of idolatry, and so does Aristides, with force and at length.

Paul spoke of the creation of "the world and all things therein," and so does Aristides.

Paul spoke of the resurrection, and so does Aristides. Paul spoke of the judgment, and of Christ as the Judge, and so does Aristides, in such words as these:

"So shall they appear before the awful judgment, which through Jesus the Messiah, is destined to come upon the whole human race."

Paul speaks of the great mistakes of the Athenians in their worship, and declares of God that "He is Lord of heaven and earth" and that He "dwelleth not in temples made with hands, neither is worshipped with men's hands, as though He needed anything, seeing He giveth to all life and breath and all things." Paul was speaking to philosophers in Athens. In the same Athens Aristides speaks of the writers and philosophers among them, thus:

"Herein, too, (they err) in asserting of deity that any such thing as deficiency can be present to it, as when they say that He receives sacrifice and requires burnt offering and libation and immolations of men, and temples. But God is not in need, and none of these things are necessary to Him."

When we remember that Paul's address to the Epicurean and the Stoic philosophers occupied only ten verses of the

XVII chapter of Acts, and when we see such correspondences in thought and even in diction between the two "apologies," can we resist the conviction that this passage of the Acts was in the mind of Aristides, just as we have seen that the XV chapter was?

It is clear that the thought of Aristides moved in the sphere of the Gospels, the Acts, the Epistles and the Revelation, which constitute the New Testament. How could this have been so, if what he calls "the holy gospel writing" and "their other writings" which he exhorts the emperor to read, and from which he says he derived his information, had not been the same New Testament which we now have? It is perfectly safe to say that no objector can answer the question.

But besides this general mark of the identity of the truths proclaimed by Aristides with those of the New Testament, there is a remarkable coincidence in forms of expression, as for instance:

Paul says, (Col. i. 17,) "By Him all things consist."

Aristides says, "Through Him all things consist."

Paul says the heathen "Served the creature more than the Creator."

Aristides says they "began to worship the creation more than their Creator."

James exhorts Christians to be "gentle and easy to be entreated."

Aristides says, "They are gentle and easy to be entreated."

Paul speaks of the Jews as (Ro. IX. 3) "My brethren, my kinsmen according to the flesh."

And (Ro. viii. 5) uses the expression "not after the flesh, but after the Spirit."

Aristides says, "Brethren, not after the flesh, but after the Spirit."

Peter (2 Pet. III. 16), speaking of the epistles of Paul, says: "As also in all his Epistles * * * in which are some things hard to be understood."

Aristides having told the emperor of "the holy gospel writing," says: "There are found in their other writings things

which are hard to utter and difficult for one to narrate."

In Hebrews (ii.5 vi.5) we find the phrase, "the world to come."

Aristides speaks of those who seek "the world to come."

John in the Revelation (iii.1) speaks of "the things which must come to pass (R. V.) hereafter," having already (i.19) received the command from the Saviour, "Write * * * the things which shall come to pass hereafter."

Aristides says, "Since I read in their writings, I was fully assured of these things as also of things which are to come."

Paul repeats God's promise, "I will put my laws into their hearts and in their minds will I write them."

Aristides says the Christians "have the commands of the Lord Jesus Christ Himself graven upon their hearts."

Paul exhorts Christians to give "not grudgingly."

Aristides says the Christian gives "ungrudgingly."

Peter (1 Pet. i.25) speaks of the regenerated as "born not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the Word of God which liveth and abideth forever."

Aristides says, "Let all that are without the knowledge of God, draw near there (i. e. to "their doctrine"—"the gateway of light") and they will receive incorruptible words."

John, the beloved, says, "Let us love one another."

Aristides says, "And they love one another."

Further quotation would be wearisome, and, surely, is unnecessary. No one, unless under the influence of invincible prepossessions, could doubt that what Aristides had read in what he refers to as "the Gospel," "the Holy Gospel writing, as it is called among themselves," "their writings," "their other writings," just what we read in our New Testament. These writings were not called the New Testament, as is well known, at first. But a writer against Montanism quoted by Eusebius (H. E. v. 17) speaks of them in a way which shows that they were regarded as just as sacred as the most orthodox Christian considers them now. It seems clear, too, from his language that the Book of Revelation concluded

the body of writings then, just as it does now. Speaking of opposing the doctrines of Montanus by arguments, he expresses himself as "apprehensive, lest, perhaps, I should appear to give any new injunctions, or to superadd anything to the doctrine of the New Testament, to which it is impossible that anything should be added or diminished by one who has resolved to live according to the Gospel." "The Gospel" and "their other writings" of Aristides must be the same body of writings called by this writer "the Gospel" and "the New Testament," and the quotations given indicate that it was practically identical with the New Testament in our hands to-day.

Common sense demands an answer to this question:

If these writings, evidently the same with our New Testament, were universally regarded by Christians in A. D. 125, as inspired and authoritative, and had been circulated all over the Roman world long before this and accepted everywhere as the sacred records of Christianity, how did they attain this universal acceptance in this character?

The only rational answer is that they went forth under apostolic authority. These writings, thus accepted by the great body of Christians, many thousands of whom were living at the time of this distribution, must have had apostolic authority or authorization. Any other explanation of their universal acceptance is irrational and incredible.

We have already found Justin Martyn imitating the illustrious example of his brother philosopher Aristides and presenting a more extended defence of the Christians to Antonine, the Pious, and his colleagues; and in this and the other writings of Justin we find him speaking also of "the Gospel," giving it, or rather a part of it, another name, "The Memoirs of the Apostles." We have found that these contained what our four Gospels do. Then we have seen standing by the side of Aristides at Athens in 125 a brave old man, presenting to Hadrian his defence of a somewhat different kind. This man had labored for Christ for a long term of service. He is of "the first immediate succession of the apostles," and had, not improbably, heard Paul preach, for he seems to have been a

Roman; had the gift of prophecy, and is ranked with Agabus and the daughters of Philip; had seen some of those whom our blessed Lord had healed and raised from the dead; and this man had been one of those who had not only preached the Gospel orally in many lands, but had distributed the written "Gospel" or New Testament including these "Memoirs of the Apostles and those that followed them." For, we know him as the fellow-apologist of Aristides, who, as we have seen, had these writings which Justin quotes so freely. We surely will not be asked to believe that Quadratus spent his life in distributing, as the authentic records of Christianity, Gospels which were unauthorized by the Apostles whom he immediately succeeded and whose work he, in company with others, took up. On the other hand he could not be supposed to have had a different set of Christian writings from those with which his companion apologist shows himself so familiar, and which bear so many marks of identity with those we have in our hands to-day.

In such witnesses as Justin, who sealed his testimony with his heart's blood, Aristides as courageous and faithful as his namesake who was surnamed "the Just," and Quadratus, who, true to his name, "stood four square to all the winds that blew," we have men whose evidence cannot lightly be brushed aside. As Prof. Gildersleeve has said of the first, so we may say of all of them, "They were no holiday Christians."

Aristides told Hadrian that if he would read this "Gospel," he would "perceive the power that belongs to it." All Christians experience this power; the history of the world clearly shows it too, and we could not but believe it to be true and divine, even if we knew nothing of its history; but it is a great gratification to be able to trace its utterances, by this and other lines, back to Christ and His Apostles.

Bethseda, Md.

P. P. FLOURNOY.