

NOTES AND STUDIES

MACARIUS MAGNES, A NEGLECTED APOLOGIST.

II

I HAVE ventured to claim¹ that the case of Macarius Magnes should be re-heard, before he is finally relegated to the limbo of fifth-century mediocrity. The arguments which I have set forward suggest that his date is much earlier, and therefore the value of his book greater than has been recognized. If they are to be trusted, we are taken back to the years just before the persecution of 303 A.D., and if the *Apocritica* be founded on a dialogue between Hierocles and Macarius, we have a valuable example of the Neoplatonist attacks of Porphyry and his school. I now proceed to consider the objections which have been alleged against this early date.

1. I have left to this place the discussion of the one clear and direct internal evidence of date. Twice the statement is made that 300 years have passed since Christianity began.² These plain statements may seem to suggest a date nearer 350 than 300 A.D. But let us note at the outset that both passages occur in the *questions*, not the answers. Such an explanation, therefore, as that the opponent was really Hierocles, but that he was only answered many years afterwards, does not solve the difficulty. Questions and answers stand or fall together.

It might be urged that the very fact of the statement forming part of the *pagan's* argument serves to somewhat discount it. In both cases his temptation was to exaggerate; the greater the number of years he stated, the more fully would he prove the falsification of Christian expectation. He might well choose the nearest round number on the upward grade. And it is quite possible that he made an inaccurate statement in good faith. He had studied the Christian writings in order to refute them, but after all, he was a pagan, and need not have known the exact date of their beginning. He would scarcely trouble to reckon the time from St Paul, and would be likely to date it from Christ Himself, thinking of Him as of the generation before his own hero Apollonius. And it must be remembered that in any case time

¹ *J.T.S.*, April 1907 (vol. viii, no. 31).

² *Apocr.* iv 3, p. 160, l. 6 *ἔτη ἐξ οὗ λέγει (ὁ Παῦλος) τριακόσια*, and yet no one has yet been 'caught up'.

Ib. iv 5. Since the time of Christ *τριακόσια ἢ καὶ περαιτέρω διέπνευσεν ἔτη*, and yet no Anti-Christ has arisen.

was not yet reckoned by the Christian era, and a looseness of expression would be natural then which would be unnatural now. His two statements occur quite close together, and if it is a dialogue, we can well understand how the second time, with the recollection of '300 years' still in his mind, he tries to improve on it by adding 'or even more'.¹

But if the statements are wrong, why did not Macarius say so in his answer? Surely because that is not the line of defence he adopts. It makes not the slightest difference to his arguments whether the number of years be less or more. Take a modern parallel. Suppose some one mocked at the Book of Common Prayer, as a mere survival of a past age—a mechanical formulary long since out of date, which actually had not been altered for 300 years. It is most remotely improbable that we should find it necessary in our defence of it to state that it was only 246 years since the last alteration took place! So I venture to think that this apparently convincing proof must be content to give way to other considerations.

2. We have now to face the argument brought by Dr Salmon, that the opponent of Macarius shews an indebtedness to *Julian, and the author himself to Epiphanius*. It is evidently this which induces him to accept the theory of the later date, 403 A. D. The first likeness to Julian lies in the fact that both use Exod. xxii 28 'Thou shalt not revile the gods'² in defence of polytheism. But for a Pagan who could quote the Scriptures, whether he were a Hierocles or a Julian, the use of the passage is too obvious to suggest borrowing. The second likeness to Julian is in the use of the passage 1 Cor. vi 12, 'Such were some of you.' Hierocles develops 'such' into criminals, &c., and then mocks at the washing of Baptism. Julian does the same. But we can well imagine that the passage touching as it does one of the vital points of Christianity, and implicating its initiatory rite, would be a favourite object of pagan scoffs. Neither of the two objectors need have originated this means of attack, but if one of them did so, there is nothing whatever to prove that it was Julian and not Hierocles. Neumann's conclusion is '*Philosophi fragmentum non depromptum est ex Iuliani libris*'.³ The likeness of Macarius to *Epiphanius* may not be so easily disposed of.

¹ Similarly inexact expressions are common. Justin Martyr *Apol.* i 46, says it was 150 years since Christ was born. Tertullian, *ad Nat.* i 7, says *aetati nostrae nondum anni CCL*, but immediately afterwards, i 9 *ut supra edidimus, aetatis nostrae nondum anni trecenti*. And Arnobius, writing within a year or two of the time at which I suppose Macarius to have written, says, *adv. gentes* i 13 *trecenti sunt anni ferme minus vel plus aliquid ex quo coepimus esse Christiani*.

² *Apocr.* iv 23.

³ Neumann *Iuliani Imp. Contra Christianos* p. 20. Ed. Nestle, Leips. 1880.

Put briefly, the case stands thus. Macarius mentions the Encratites among heretics, and assigns to them almost the same countries as Epiphanius does, and gives them the same epithet *κεκαυμένοι*. But he is alone in giving *Dositheus* as their leader. Now Epiphanius was in search of details, and would not omit such a name from his work if he had seen it in another man's writings. Also he introduces the details about the countries much the more naturally of the two. Therefore he did not borrow from Macarius. So far, we must needs agree. But must we draw the further conclusion, 'therefore Macarius borrowed from *him*'? We can only answer after studying the details.

Hierocles, in arguing against the Christian exaltation of virginity, has quoted 1 Tim. iv 1 *Ἐν ὑστέροις καιροῖς ἀποστήσονται τινες τῆς πίστεως, προσέχοντες πνεύμασι πλάνης (sic), κωλύοντες γαμῆν, ἀπέχεσθαι βρωμάτων.*¹ Macarius in his answer refers to the passage even more briefly, two words of the verse quoted from St Paul with four words of the next verse, viz., *ἀναστήσονται (sic) τινες κεκαυτηριασμένοι τὴν ἰδίαν συνείδησιν*. He then proceeds to explain *κεκαυτηριασμένοι* as *κεκαυμένους* . . . οὓς ἡ φλόγωσις τῆς Χαλδαϊκῆς καμίνου κατέπρησεν, and to give examples of sects with such tenets, whom the Christians regarded as wicked heretics.² *Τοιοῦτοι δὲ Μανιχαίων παῖδες ἐξεφοίτησαν τοιαύτας αἵρέσεις ἡ τῶν Πισσιδέων ἔχει καὶ τῶν Ἰσαύρων χώρα, Κιλικία τε καὶ Λυκαονία καὶ πᾶσα Γαλατία, ὧν καὶ τὰς ἐπωνυμίας ἐργῶδες ἀπαγγέλλαι. Ἐγκρατηταὶ γὰρ καὶ Ἀποτακῖται καὶ Ἐρημίται καλοῦνται, οὐ Χριστιανοὶ τινες.* He adds that their *κορυφαῖος* was Dositheus, who powerfully expounded their doctrine in eight books, from which he quotes the interesting sentence *Διὰ μὲν κοινωνίας ὁ κόσμος τὴν ἀρχὴν ἔσχεν· διὰ δὲ τῆς ἐγκρατείας τὸ τέλος θέλει λαβεῖν.*

This passage is supposed to be indebted to Epiphanius, *Haeres.* xlviij,³ where the Encratites are localized as *ἐν τῇ Πισσιδίᾳ, καὶ ἐν τῇ Φρυγίᾳ τῇ κεκαυμένη οὕτω λεγομένη . . . ἴσως . . . διὰ τοῦ κεκαῦσθαι τοὺς οἰκήτορας κ.τ.λ.* Then Epiphanius adds that they are *καὶ ἐν μέρεσι τῆς Ἀσίας, καὶ ἐν τῇ Ἰσαύρων, καὶ Παμφύλων, καὶ Κιλικίων γῆ, καὶ ἐν Γαλατίᾳ,* and also *ἐπὶ τῆς Ἀντιοχείων τῆς Συρίας,* but not everywhere. From the Encratites he passes on to fuller details about the Montanists of Phrygia.⁴

It is obvious at once that the argument from the recurrence of *κεκαυμένοι* is valueless. Macarius's use of it is simply in explanation of *κεκαυτηριασμένοι* in the passage of St Paul just partially quoted by Hierocles. But need his application of it to the Encratites imply obligation to Epiphanius? The absurdity of the suggestion is seen at once when we discover that Hippolytus had connected them with

¹ *Apoc.* iii 36, p. 131.

² *Ib.* iii 43, p. 151.

³ Epiph. *Haeres.* xlviij. Migne *P. G.* tom 41, p. 850.

⁴ *Op. cit.* p. 855.

the *κεκατηριασμένοι* of 1 Timothy long before in his *Refutatio*. And there is nothing unnatural about Macarius's detailed remarks concerning this particular sect in this place, for they were suggested to him as the special heretics to whom the passage referred.

But the list of countries is said to be almost identical. Certainly four are the same, though the wording is totally different, but this is out of five localities mentioned in all by Macarius, and eight by Epiphanius. If the former was the copyist, how came he to merely insert Lycaonia in place of the larger tracts of Phrygia and other parts of Asia, and to omit altogether the very region in which his own interest is seen elsewhere to centre (see *Apocrit.* ii 7), 'The district of Antioch in Syria'?

The absence of mention of Dositheus by Epiphanius certainly indicates that he was not borrowing from the *Apocritica*, but I do not wish for a moment to suggest that he was. If it be a fact (and it is generally accepted as such) that the Encratites flourished in various parts of Asia Minor, it is only to be expected that two independent authorities would give somewhat similar lists of localities. Nor must it be forgotten that a heresy which affected the south-east of Asia Minor and extended to Syria would be within the sphere of special knowledge shewn elsewhere by Macarius. And if he went out of his way to mention one famous Cilician in Aratus,¹ it is not strange that he should mention another in Dositheus. Nor does it seem that his introduction of the latter (who cannot be identical with the Samaritan heresiarch, and therefore is otherwise unknown to us) was the result of copying from any one, for in a quite different passage and connexion he includes in a list of false Christs 'Dositheus the Cilician'.² I conclude, therefore, that the suggestion that he borrowed from Epiphanius is unfounded.

3. Another argument for a post-Nicene date, which both Möller³ and Zahn⁴ bring forward, is that the practice of the ascetic life is so revealed in *Apocr.* ii 7 as to suggest a developed monasticism, which could not be earlier than the latter part of the fourth century. Macarius is speaking of the Gospel as the sword which divides parents from children, &c. (St Matt. x 34 et seq.). He certainly points to the present condition of Antioch and the East as shewing such a state of things. But he says nothing about the children *joining* in their *ἀσκησις*. Rather does he seem to be simply pointing to the contemporary successors of the first martyrs and other devoted Christians, such as Thecla; and so, when he speaks of the separation, it is in the past

¹ *Apocr.* iv 17, p. 191 l. 17.

² *Ib.* iv 15, p. 184 l. 15.

³ Möller *Theologische Literaturzeitung*, 1877, p. 521 sqq.

⁴ Zahn *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte* 2. Band, 1878, p. 450 sqq.

tense,¹ implying no novel innovation in the Church, but such ascetic practice as was inherited from an earlier time. Instead of stating that in his time the children left their parents and set up separate communities, he merely says of the daughters that they are divided from their mothers by themselves refusing to be mothers.² The sons likewise are εὐαγγελικῆ διδασκαλίᾳ πατρῶας σχέσεως φιλικῶς διχαζόμενοι. It is true that with those who seek ταῖς ἐταίραις συννεῖναι, he contrasts others who ταῖς μονηρίαις θέλουσι συναυλίζεσθαι. But surely such language may have been used long before the end of the fourth century. It is perhaps sufficient to mention the words of Eusebius about the μονήρεις, and οἱ τὸν μονήρη καὶ ἀγνὸν κατορθῶντες βίον.³

4. Zahn (loc. cit.) gives as a positive proof that the book dates from 403 A.D., the fact that Macarius states that in St Paul's time the market dealers were mostly heathen.⁴ This is taken to imply that they were not heathen in his own time. Here we may note that, if the whole chapter be read, we find a passage at the end where the use of the present tense suggests that they were *still* heathen.⁵ And in any case his former statement about St Paul's time is limited by the words ὡς ἐπὶ τὸ πλεῖστον. If he allowed that a few were Christians in St Paul's days, how many more would be so by 300 A.D.! If he had written when they were *all* Christian, he would surely have said that they were *all* heathen in the first days. The difference from his own time is in degree, not in kind, and suggests a much earlier date than Zahn allows.

5. Möller asserts that Macarius has borrowed from Gregory of Nyssa, both in his language concerning the deception of the devil by the Incarnate Christ, and in his sacramental doctrine. It is true that Macarius's explanation of the prayer of Christ in Gethsemane closely resembles Gregory's more general statement that He deceived the deceiver by covering His Godhead with His humanity.⁶ Both authors say that Christ's miracles may have made the devil afraid to make the final attack, and he therefore needed to be enticed to do so. And there is the same elaborate simile of Satan, like a fish, gulping down the bait of His humanity, and so being caught by the hook of His Divinity. It would be possible to point out that there is little correspondence in the actual language used, even in the list of miracles, and

¹ *Apocr.* ii 7, p. 6 l. 21 πατέρες τέκνων ἐχωρίσθησαν κτλ.

² *Ib.* p. 7 l. 5.

³ *Comment. in Psalm. lxxviii 7.* Montfaucon *Coll. Patr.-Graec.* p. 348, in a comment on the rendering κατοικίξει μονοζώνους ἐν οἴκῳ.

⁴ *Apocr.* iii 42, p. 145 l. 4, where the actual word is Ἑλλήνων.

⁵ *Ib.* p. 147 ll. 17-19 τίνι γούν οἱ προύχοντες τῶν εἰδώλων θύουσι; . . . οἱ δ' ἐν μακελλείῳ τὰ ὄψα πιπράσκοντες . . . μαγείρουσι.

⁶ *Greg. Nyss. Or. Cat.* chs. xxi-xxvi (ed. J. H. Srawley); cf. *Apocr.* iii 9.

that the wording of the passage as a whole is more striking in Macarius. And the complete difference in what follows is remarkable. Gregory, in a truly Origenistic passage, adds that the deception was a worthy one, for even Satan himself shall be purged by the refiner's fire, but Macarius proceeds to denounce Satan as the πνευματικός ὄφis. As he elsewhere declares his belief in universalism, would he be likely to so markedly avoid it here, if he were copying an author who suggested it?

But a simpler answer to the charge of copying suggests itself. The theory of a deception of the devil in the Atonement certainly did not originate in post-Nicene days. It may indeed be referred back past Irenaeus to Ignatius,¹ but it was afterwards developed by Origen. And if it was from him that Gregory obtained it, may not the same be the case with Macarius? How then is the identity of simile to be explained? It has been claimed as an original idea of Gregory, but, as a matter of fact, this language of fish and hook and bait was common property by the end of the fourth century. Rufinus² shews a closer parallel with the *Apocritica* than Gregory, for he proceeds to illustrate his words by the quotation of Job xli 1. Here it is to be noticed that he gives a fuller quotation than Macarius, in the form *Adduces draconem in hamo, et ponens capistrum circa nares eius*. And he adds the new idea of Satan being drawn from the depths in order to become food for others (*ut esca caeteris fiat*), like the fish. It therefore seems unlikely that our author copied from him. And the same simile is found in other writers from that time onwards.³ But the closest resemblance of all is found in an author with whom no one has compared Macarius, namely Amphilocheus of Iconium. In the long fragment contained in Holl's *Amphilochius*⁴ a similar explanation is given in a comment on the very passage παρελθάτω ἀπ' ἐμοῦ τὸ ποτήριον τοῦτο. And reference is made in language akin to the *Apocritica*, though not identical with it, to the words ἐγὼ γὰρ εἰμὶ σκώληξ καὶ οὐκ ἄνθρωπος, as typifying Christ's humanity as the bait on the hook. There is no special reason for thinking that such language originated with Amphilocheus. We cannot tell whence the idea came, but some of the language, and especially the simile of the fish, may possibly have come from Macarius himself, for it is exactly in keeping with the other vigorous similes of the *Apocritica*. The following suggestion is offered for what it is worth.

Amphilochius, in writing a lengthy explanation of the Agony, would

¹ See Lightfoot on *Eph.* § 19, also Oxenham *The Cath. Doctrine of the Atonement* pp. 35, 36, 44.

² Rufinus *Comment. in Symb. Apost.* § 14.

³ See Srawley *op. cit.* p. 93 n., also Mason *Five Theol. Orations of Greg. Naz.* p. 117.

⁴ Holl *Amphil.* p. 91 et seq.

have been likely to glean comments from all sources, and elaborate them. He would find help in the *Μονογενής ἡ Ἀποκριτικός* of Macarius, and would read in it how ὁ *Μονογενής* . . . *προσποιεῖται δειλιᾶν, ἕνα δελεάσῃ τοῦτον ἀθῆς εἰς μάχην*. Can this possibly account for his using at the beginning of his own comment the very word that occurs so frequently in the *Apocritica*, saying *διδάξωμεν αὐτοὺς (αἰρετικούς) ὡς μεγάλα σφάλλονται, φόβον καὶ δειλιᾶν τῇ ἐπὶ τοῦ Μονογενοῦς προσάπτοντες φύσει?*¹ At all events Macarius does not seem to have borrowed the idea of the deception of the devil from any commentator on this single passage concerning the agony, for he says elsewhere, in referring to the death of St Paul, that *ἐδελέασεν τὸν ὄφιν*.²

The second suggestion of the indebtedness of our author to Gregory of Nyssa is not so serious a matter. His statement concerning the Eucharist is free from such technical terms as *μεταποιέω* and *μεταστοιχείω*, and the revealing of the Sacraments as an extension of the Incarnation, which are features of Gregory's exposition.³ There are a few words of Macarius in which interest has centred, where he says of the Bread and Wine *οὐ γὰρ τύπος σώματος οὐδὲ τύπος αἵματος . . . ἀλλὰ κατὰ ἀλήθειαν σῶμα καὶ αἷμα Χριστοῦ*.⁴ And it is these words which have led critics to connect him with the language of later writers, whose expression of Eucharistic doctrine is really far more developed. Thus Möller has connected him with Gregory, Batiffol⁵ with Theodore of Mopsuestia, Le Quien with John of Damascus.⁶ But after all the argument of Macarius seems only to be as follows: Bread is from the earth, which Christ made, and therefore it is His: and Christ's Body is from the earth; therefore He could say, as no one else could, except He who made the earth, that the bread at the last supper was actually His Body. Dr Salmon recognized the real trend of such language, when he expressed surprise that a Jesuit like De la Torre ventured to quote an authority, who really favoured his opponents as much as himself.⁷ It is true that in another passage Macarius shews much more plainly his grasp of Eucharistic doctrine. For he says that after all there is no promise of eternal life in ordinary bread, but only in that which is *ἐν τῇ μακαρίᾳ γῆ τῷ Χριστοῦ γεωργοῦμενος, δυνάμει Πνεύματος ἠνωμένος Ἁγίου . . . τὴν κλήσιν τοῦ Σωτῆρος ὁ μυστικός ἄρτος*

¹ *Apocr.* p. 71 l. 19, and Holl *Amphil.* p. 92 l. 6.

² *Apocr.* p. 182 l. 12, where the tradition of the milk mingled with the apostle's blood is alluded to.

³ See Greg. *op. cit.* § 37.

⁴ *Apocr.* iii 23, p. 106 l. 2.

⁵ Batiffol *Études d'histoire et de théologie positive* 2^e série *L'Eucharistie* p. 267. See Theodore P. G. lxvi p. 713.

⁶ Le Quien *Ioann. Dam.* Paris 1712, tom. i, lib. iv, *De Fide Orthodoxa* p. 271.

⁷ D. C. B. s.v. *Macarius*: 'We are obliged to give him largely the benefit of the *disciplina arcani* in order to save his line of defence from Zuinglianism.'

κεκλημένος . . . ἐνοῖ τὸν ἐσθίοντα τῷ σώματι τοῦ Χριστοῦ. But there is nothing in Gregory which corresponds to this.

6. One difficulty remains, to which both Möller and Zahn call attention. They declare his doctrine of the Trinity to be post-Nicene, and to be stamped as such by the reference to *τρῆς ὑποστάσεις ἐν οὐσίᾳ μιᾷ*. We must concede at once that here we have a real difficulty. Let us begin by marking out its limits. It is only in one short isolated passage that there occurs this apparently Cappadocian expression of Trinitarian doctrine. It is all comprised in twenty-three consecutive lines near the end of Book iv chap 25.¹ It would be possible therefore to suggest that this passage is a later interpolation. The answer to the objection to the washing of Baptism would be complete without it, and yet it was so tempting to explain adequately what Baptism 'in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost' really meant, that some post-Nicene student of the book may well have inserted these few lines within it. And certainly the style of the passage is quite different from the rest of the book. The long periods are replaced by short disjointed theological statements, with the frequent repetitions of the same word which are familiar in later theologians and formularies.

And when we see that the very next answer is concerned with the *Monarchia* of God, it suggests that it would have been clumsy indeed for Macarius himself to confuse the issue and cripple his own argument about the heathen gods by suddenly lifting the veil for a moment and revealing three Persons within the *Christian's* Deity to a blaspheming pagan opponent. He is certainly much more restrained in the rest of his answers. The only other place where he deals with inner difficulties and defends the Catholic faith in doctrinal language, is where the ubiquity of Christ has been called in question by the production of the text 'Me ye have not always'.² There he feels that he must clear the faith from those heretical vapourings, τὰ πολμῶντα περιγράφειν τὸν Χριστὸν ἐν τῷ πάθει, which seemed to give countenance to his adversary's view.

But if the words are not a later interpolation, can they possibly belong to the ante-Nicene age? He is speaking of the washing of Baptism, and he expounds the words 'in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ and in the Spirit of our God' (1 Cor. vi 11) as referring to the θεὸς εἰς ἐν τρισὶν ὑποστάσεσιν. The 'washing' is attributed to the Son, the 'sanctifying' to the Spirit, and the 'justifying' to the Father. Not that the other Persons cannot fulfil these processes, but that it befits the Son, *quia* Son, to receive sons, and the Others in like manner, ἵνα τριῶν ὑποστάσεων ἐν οὐσίᾳ μιᾷ γνωρισθῆ τὸ ὄνομα.

¹ *Apocr.* p. 209 l. 15, to p. 210 l. 3.

² *Ib.* iii 7 and 14.

In the first place it is to be noted that this last phrase is not identical with the later stereotyped expression *μία οὐσία ἐν τρισὶν ὑποστάσειν*.¹ And it is considerably limited by the word *ὄνομα* to which it is applied.

Again, there are many parallels for the earlier anticipation of language which only became universally recognized at the end of the fourth century. Not to mention the use of *una substantia* and *tres personae* in Tertullian,² we find the words in exactly the sense of the *Apocritica* in Origen,³ of whom Macarius was so plainly a disciple. He had spoken of Christ as *θεὸς κατ' οὐσίαν οὐ κατὰ μετουσίαν*, and therefore of the same *οὐσία* with the Father, and it was against the Monarchians (who seem also to have troubled Macarius) that he asserted that there were *τρεις ὑποστάσεις*. And a similar usage of *οὐσία* and *ὑπόστασις* is to be found in Dionysius of Alexandria, though his controversy with his namesake of Rome shews the unfortunate confusion and ambiguity of the terms in those days.⁴

But a yet more striking instance is found in Athanasius. It is true that he regularly uses *οὐσία* and *ὑπόστασις* as equivalent terms, as they were used in the anathemas to the Creed of Nicaea. But once at least he discriminates between them in the manner of the later orthodoxy. In his short treatise *In illud Omnia mihi tradita sunt* (written not later than 342 A. D., and conjecturally placed in 335 A. D.)⁵ he says that the Trisagion *τὰς τρεῖς ὑποστάσεις τελείας δεικνύντα ἐστί, ὡς καὶ ἐν τῷ λέγειν τὸ Κύριος, τὴν μίαν οὐσίαν δηλοῦσιν*.⁶

There are therefore early parallels for the use of the words in the sense which Macarius here gives them. And if it can be said even of Tertullian that he anticipated the results of the Cappadocians of almost two centuries later, and 'most plainly paved the way for the later orthodox phraseology',⁷ a similar possibility for Macarius nearly a hundred years later may be allowed. It must be granted that such a differentiation of the terms *ὑπόστασις* and *οὐσία* was only *occasional*. But a close study of the passages in which the words occur throughout the *Apocritica* reveals the fact that Macarius too only occasionally differentiates them. Of the eight passages where the word *ὑπόστασις* occurs (in six of which the word *οὐσία* is also found) there is only one besides the Trinitarian passage where it approaches the meaning of

¹ Bethune-Baker *Introd. to Early Hist. of Chr. Doctrine* p. 238.

² e. g. *Adv. Prax.* ch. 12, 13, 19, 22, 25.

³ Orig. *Selecta in Psalm.* ed. Lommatzsch xiii p. 134, and *In Iohann.*, ed. Brooke. tom. ii p. 71.

⁴ Dion. of Alex., ed. Feltoe, pp. 177, 138.

⁵ Robertson *Athanasius* 'Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers' p. 86.

⁶ Migne *P. G.* tom. xxv p. 220 § 6.

⁷ Harnack *Hist. of Dogma*, Eng. Transl. vol. iii p. 121.

'person'. In the others it is more or less synonymous with οὐσία. It is worth while to consider separately these eight passages.

1. The identity of ὑπόστασις with οὐσία is quite clear in the words¹ δηλῶν τὴν ὑπόστασιν τῆς οἰκείας θεότητός φησιν. Ἐγὼ καὶ ὁ πατὴρ ἐν ἔσμεν ὡς θεὸν ἀναντιρρήτως εἶναι τὸν ταῦτα λέγοντα.

2. The same is true of the passage² where it is said that as a man only keeps his tent in the vineyard while the fruit remains unpicked, so τὴν ἀνθρωπεῖαν φύσιν καὶ ὑπόστασιν remains in the world till the fruit of righteousness is plucked, and then heaven and earth come to an end, τῆς λογικῆς τῶν ἀνθρώπων οὐσίας ἀπελθούσης.

3. A little further on³ ὑπόστασις is again combined with φύσις, and its application to birds and beasts forbids the sense of 'person'. δεῖ γὰρ πᾶσαν τῶν γενητῶν φύσιν καὶ ὑπόστασιν δίχα τῶν ἀσωμάτων δευτέραν ἀναλαβεῖν καὶ βελτίω γένεσιν.

4. In another passage⁴ it is to be noticed that first οὐσία is coupled with φύσις, and then ὑπόστασις is substituted for the two. δύο λογικὰς οὐσίας καὶ φύσεις ἀνεδίδαξε καὶ τὴν μὲν προσδεομένην, τὴν δὲ ἀπροσδεή τυγχάνουσαν, τὴν ἀγγελικὴν καὶ τὴν ἀνθρωπεῖαν μηνῶν ὑπόστασιν.

5. The passage which is perhaps most significant because it occurs within forty-five lines of the Trinitarian difficulty,⁵ is dealing with God's rule over the other gods. οἱ μὲν γὰρ ἐξ αὐτοῦ τὴν οὐσίαν ἔλαβον, ὁ δὲ οὐ παρ' αὐτῶν τὰ πρεσβεῖα τῆς τιμῆς ἐπορίσατο· καὶ τῶν μὲν τὰς οὐσίας αὐτὸς ἐδημιούργησεν, οἱ δ' ὑποστάσεως ἀρχὴν οὐ κατέλαβον ἐν αὐτῷ.

6. Again, the meaning of ὑπόστασις does not seem to be different in the following.⁶ Ἐξ οὐρανοῦ καὶ γῆς λαχὼν τὴν ὑπόστασιν λογικὸς καὶ ἄλογος γέγονεν ἄνθρωπος, ψυχὴν ἀπ' οὐρανοῦ καὶ σῶμα λαχὼν ἀπὸ γῆς. It is added that he is allowed to pass away ὡς δευτέραν ἐν δευτέρα ζωῇ λαβεῖν τὴν διαγωγὴν.

7. Nor does there seem much difference in the passage where our Lord's saying is being explained that those who do His will are His mother and brethren.⁷ συντίκτεται μετ' ἐμοῦ οὐκ ἐν ὑποστάσεως οὐσία γερόμενος, ἀλλ' ἐν θελήματος ἐνούμενος χάριτι, . . . διὰ πίστεως ἐμὲ οὐ δι' οὐσίας τρόπον τινα γενεᾶ με.

8. The one other place where the word ὑπόστασις occurs, is the solitary support that the rest of the *Apocritica* gives to the Cappadocian sense in which it is used of the Three Persons of the Trinity.⁸ The discrepancy of St Matthew and St Mark with regard to the number of the Gadarene demoniacs is thus explained. Τάχα ὁ μὲν τῆς ὑποστάσεως εἰσάγει τὸν ἀριθμὸν ἀνθρώπων λέγων δύο, ὁ δὲ Μάρκος τῆς οὐσίας πεπο-

¹ *Apoc.* ii 9, p. 12 l. 16.

² *Ib.* iv 16, p. 186 l. 32.

³ *Ib.* p. 188 l. 1.

⁴ *Ib.* iv 18, p. 194 l. 6.

⁵ *Ib.* iv 26, p. 211 l. 21.

⁶ *Ib.* iv 16, p. 189 ll. 29 and 190 l. 12.

⁷ *Ib.* ii 8, p. 11 l. 3.

⁸ *Ib.* iii 11, p. 76 ll. 10 and 20.

θούσης (*sic*) κατηγορεῖ μὴ φροντίσας τοῦ ἀριθμοῦ. And the explanation is repeated further on, ὁ μὲν γάρ, ὡς ἔφην, τὴν οὐσίαν ἐμήνυσε, ὡς ἀνθρωπεία φύσις ἦν ἢ τυραννομένη· ὁ δὲ τὴν ὑπόστασιν, ὡς οὐχ εἷς, ἀλλὰ δύο τὸν ἀριθμὸν ἐτύγχανον. But first examples of the use of a singular noun in a collective sense are given as an illustration of the singular in St Mark, and explained as being because *μίαν τῆς φύσεως τὴν οὐσίαν κέκτηται*. The two terms seem therefore to mean individual existence and general existence respectively, a sense which they will also bear in the final passage about the Trinity, which has already been quoted.¹

A consideration of the use of *ὑπόστασις* by Macarius therefore leads to the conclusion that, when he speaks of *τρεις ὑποστάσεις*, he is giving the word a sense other than is his wont, and that in so doing he is only shewing himself to be as close a follower of Origen's language as he was of his method. So it seems that an ante-Nicene date may still be claimed for the *Apocritica*, even though the Trinitarian passage be a genuine part of it.

In bringing forward these objections, I have consciously omitted nothing which militates against the early date I have assigned to the book. And I venture to think that they are more than counterbalanced by the arguments in its favour, which were adduced in my former article.

The Fragments of Books I and V.

It remains to discuss certain subsidiary interests connected with the *Apocritica*. The fragments of Books I and V deserve a reference, as so little has been said about them. The bearing of the work on the text and canon of the New Testament should also be of interest; and I may conclude this brief survey with some illustrations from the book itself which indicate its theological and apologetic value.

The fragment of the first book, though not in the Athens MS, has been known since the ninth century, when Nicephorus, in answering the Iconoclasts, quoted it as from the sixth chapter.² It simply states that the woman with the issue of blood was Berenice (or Veronica), that she was once head of the city of Edessa, and was famous to Macarius's own day in Mesopotamia and elsewhere for the bronze representation of her healing which she made and gave to her son.³ The woman's name will be remembered from the *Acta Pilati*,⁴ while the bronze

¹ Bethune-Baker *Texts and Studies* vii 1: *The Meaning of Homoousios* quotes Basil as saying that man is *οὐσία*, while a particular man, e.g. Paul, is *ὑπόστασις*. So God is *οὐσία*, but closer definition of His existence as Father, &c., is *ὑπόστασις* (p. 81). The same illustration also occurs in Gregory of Nyssa (p. 53).

² *Nicephori Antirrhetica*, in *Spicil. Solesm.* i p. 332.

³ *vi*φ is Duchesne's convincing emendation of βίφ.

⁴ *Acta Pilati* 2nd Gk. form, ch. vii in Tischendorf *Evang. Apocryph.* p. 277.

statue she set up is minutely described by Eusebius¹ and is likewise mentioned by Sozomen,² Philostorgius,³ and Joannes Malalas.⁴ But all these agree in placing it at Paneas; nor indeed is this contradicted by Macarius, who simply says she was *δέσποινα καὶ ἄρχουσα* of Edessa. It is amusing to note the zeal with which Nicephorus hails our author as the Balaam of image-worship, called in to curse it by his opponents, and now blessing it by this reference to a Christian statue. If Magnus Crusius had been right in saying that the statue was destroyed by Maximin,⁵ this would have furnished an additional argument for the early date of the *Apocritica*, and we might indeed have been led to surmise that this very answer to Hierocles may have turned the attention of his fellow persecutor to the statue. But there seems much uncertainty about its destruction; Sozomen says that Julian took it down and put up his own instead, while the *Chronicle* of Malalas declares it to be still in existence about 600 A.D., having been moved into a church at Paneas. The only other writer who mentions it without reference to its destruction is Eusebius, so that there is at least the suggestion that Macarius represents the tradition as it stood in the age of Eusebius, rather than in that of Sozomen or Philostorgius.⁶ Although the fragment is only a few lines long, it is linked to the rest of the work by the favourite Macarian word *κατόρθωμα*.

But there is another interest in the fragment. Nicephorus evidently means that the chapter from which he quotes contained references to other miracles performed by our Lord. For he speaks of the sixth chapter, *ἐν ᾧ καὶ περὶ τῶν παρὰ Χριστοῦ τελουμένων θαυμάτων διέξουσιν τοιαῦδε*. From this solitary indication of the contents of Book I, we therefore gather that before our Lord's sayings were attacked in Book II, the first onslaught was on His *doings* in Book I. The miracles would naturally in all ages form a basis for attack. The Neoplatonists' way of discrediting them was not so much to deny them, as to point to greater miracles done by their own heroes, such as Apollonius of Tyana, in whose case they were not made the basis of a claim to divinity. This is exactly how Lactantius describes the attitude of Hierocles.⁷ That author also credits him with the statement

¹ Euseb. *H. E.* vii 18.

² Soz. *H. E.* v 21.

³ Philost. ap. Phot. Migne *P. G.* saec. v vol. i p. 559.

⁴ Ioann. Malalas *Chronogr.* ed. Dindorf p. 329.

⁵ See Pitra *Spicil. Solesm.* i p. 546 § 10 'A Maximino . . . sublatam fuisse testantur multi recentiores.' Asterius is the special authority quoted (see Migne *P. G.* x p. 1358).

⁶ For the possible foundation of the tradition see Gieseler *Eccles. Hist.*, Harper's ed. i p. 70, quoted in Wace and Schaff's *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, vol. i p. 304.

⁷ Lact. *Inst.* v 2 'Quum facta eius mirabilia destrueret, nec tamen negaret'.

that Christ was a leader of robbers.¹ Duchesne suggested that this might be in the lost first Book. We may add that this is the more likely, since His actions are alluded to in the fragment. The other fragment is from Book V. This is of more importance, for, so far from being printed in Blondel's edition, it has passed entirely into oblivion. Foucart, in his preface to that edition, only says that Book I is lost, and that a small part of the last chapter of Book IV is also missing. Duchesne² actually says that when Turrianus in the sixteenth century quoted from Book V, he really meant Book IV, and that all his quotations are accordingly to be found in the Athens MS. Here he is wrong, for Turrianus gives some long and interesting quotations from a chapter 'quinto libro eodemque extremo', which is on a totally different subject from anything in the extant *Apocritica*. As it does not appear in the only edition, I quote it *in extenso*. It is on the subject of faith and works, and Turrianus says that Magnetes writes as follows concerning the faith of Abraham³ :—

Πιστεύσας γὰρ δι' ἔργων ἀγαθῶν εὐαρέστησε τῷ θεῷ, κἀντεύθεν ἠξιώθη τῆς φιλίας τοῦ κρείττονος, ἐκεῖνα πράττων τὴν πίστιν ἐποίησε λάμπειν ὑπὲρ τὸν ἥλιον. καὶ σὺν πίστει καλῶς πραγματεύεται. δι' ὃ φιληθεῖς ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ σεμνίνεται, θεμέλιον γὰρ τὴν πίστιν εἰδὼς τοῦ κατορθώματος, ῥίζοι ταύτην εἰς βάθος οἰκοδομῶν ἐπ' αὐτῆς τὸ πλῆθος τῶν οἰκτιρμῶν, συνάψας γὰρ ἑκάτερον δέσει συγγενικῇ,⁴ ὑψηλὸν ἐν ἑκατέρω ἀνίστησι πύργωμα οὐκ ἀναμάρτυρον ἔργων τὴν πίστιν κτησάμενος, οὐδ' αὖ πάλιν τὰ ἔργα δίχα τῆς πίστεως γυμνητεύειν ἔασας, σπέρμα δ' εἶναι γνοὺς τὴν πίστιν πολυφόρον, τὰ συμβαλλόμενα ἅπαντα συνάγει τῷ σπέρματι, γῆν, ἀροτήρας, πήραν, ζυγόν, ἄροτρον, καὶ ὅσα γεωργῶν ἐπιστήμη κατέδοξεν. ὡς γὰρ δίχα τούτων ὁ σπόρος οὐ βάλλεται, καὶ δίχα τῶν σπερμάτων οὐδὲν τῶν μνημονευθέντων ὁ λόγος ἐπιτελεῖ, οὕτως ἡ πίστις, τρόπον τινὰ σπέρμα τυγχάνουσα μυστικόν, εἰ μὴ δι' ἔργων βλαστήσειεν ἀγαθῶν, ἄκαρπος ἐστὶ μόνη διαμένουσα, ὡσαύτως τῶν ἀγαθῶν πράξεων ἡ σύνοδος ἐὰν μὴ τὴν πίστιν συμπελεγμένην ἔχη ἑαυτῇ, ἄργον ὑπάρχει πρᾶγμα, καὶ πάμπαν ἀτέλεστον, δι' ὃ τὸν Ἀβραάμ ἵνα πίστεως δείξῃ τῶν ἔργων τὴν χάριν ἐκλάμποντα, φησὶν ἡ θεία γραφή, ἐπίστευσεν Ἀβραάμ τῷ θεῷ, καὶ ἐλογίσθη αὐτῷ εἰς δικαιοσύνην.

ὁρᾶς πῶς τὸ προλαβὸν κατόρθωμά⁵ τῆς ἀρετῆς εἰς δικαιοσύνην ἡ πίστις λογισθῆναι πεποίηκεν, ὡς ὁ σπόρος τὴν χώραν καρποφορήσαι ποιεῖ.

ὡς γὰρ λαμπὰς ποιεῖ τοῦ ἐλαίου λάμψαι τὴν ποιότητα ἐμβαλλομένην λύχνῳ,

¹ *Ib.* 'Ipsium autem Christum adfirmavit a Iudaeis fugatum collecta noningentorum hominum manu latrocinia fecisse.'

² *Op. cit.* p. 5.

³ F. Turr. *Dogmaticus de Iustificazione, ad Germanos adversus Luteranos*. Romae 1557.

⁴ In the Latin translation that follows it is rendered, 'Vinculo quodam necessitudinis et cognationis.'

⁵ Latin—'superiora opera bona.'

οὕτω πίστις καθάπερ ἐν λύχνῳ βληθεῖσα τῷ Ἀβραάμ ἀστράφαι πεποίηκε τῶν ἔργων τὴν ἀρετὴν. φυσικῶς ὁ Ἀβραάμ τὸ μὲν ἴσον τῆς πολιτείας παιδευθεὶς ἤσπαζεν,¹ καὶ πλησίους χρήσιμος ὑπῆρχε, καὶ ἄδολος, ἐν δόσει καὶ λήψει φιλῶν τὸ ἀκακούργητον, ἀφθονον τοῖς δεομένοις παραμυθίαν διδούς, ἀπλῶς ἐπιτηδευμάτων φάβλων² ἀπεχόμενος, ταῦτα εἰ καὶ κατὰ τῷ φαίνεσθαι, καὶ σεμνά, οὐδεὶς ἐλόγιζεν, οὐδεὶς ἀρετὴν κατὰ λόγον ἔταπτεν, ἐπεὶ μὴδ' οἷός τις ἦν, εἰ μὴ μόνος θεός, ἀλλ' οὕτω ἐπίστευσε. ὀπρῆνικα δ' ὁ Ἀβραάμ ἐπίστευσε τῷ θεῷ, ταῦτα καὶ τὰ τοιαῦτα τῶν καλῶν κατορθωμάτων εἰς δικαιοσύνην ἐλογίσθη τῷ Ἀβραάμ.

It is possible that Turrianus has still Macarius before him in the words that follow, for though the quotation ends with 'hactenus Magnetes', he may still be borrowing ideas from him.

After referring to the above three parables of the building, the seed, and the lamp, he adds³ 'Est alia quarta parabola, aptissima illa quidem, ut mihi videtur, *massae et fermenti*, ut sit instar massae fides, fermenti vero opera bona et spiritualia, ut enim sine fermento panis est insuavis, et ad digestionem ac nutritionem difficilis, rursus fermentum solum sine massa prorsus inutile, massae vero additum panem efficit suavem et firmum, salubrem et facilem ad digestionem, sic dilectio, quae est, cum secundum mandata Dei ambulamus, instar fermenti totam massam fidei ἐνώσασα καὶ καταζυμώσασα, id est firmans ac fermentans reddit eam utilem et salutarem, ita ut massa fidei sine fermento dilectionis et bonorum operum neque utilis sit, neque salubris animae cibus, neque Deo gratus, neque rursus dilectio communis sine massa fidei commoda sit, utriusque vero temperatio, et admistio salutaris est. Haec est nova conspersio fidei, et bonorum operum Deo placens, sine vetere fermento, id est, sine eius, quae in mundo est, concupiscentiae corruptione.' Turrianus adds a fifth parable, but explicitly derives it from the Epistle of Ignatius to the Ephesians.

The above Latin addition cannot be proved to be derived from Macarius, but the following considerations make it not improbable that it was.

1. Though Turrianus makes frequent reference to the *Apocritica* in his books, he nowhere else gives so long a quotation from the Greek, but either translates, or more frequently gives, a brief paraphrase, with an occasional word or two of the original. An example of this is seen immediately before the long Greek quotation above, for he first introduces 'Magnetes' by saying, 'Docuit itaque Apostolus istis tam multis tam variis exemplis fidem esse πολυφόρον σπέρμα (ut Magnetes, vetustissimus auctor dixit) id est, foecundum semen,' &c.

¹ Latin—'servabat.'

² Latin—'deinde a pravis studiis se abstinens': φάβλων evidently for φαύλων.

³ p. 38.

The insertion of ἐνώσασα καὶ καταζυμώσασα may similarly be quoted in the fourth parable of the leaven as being Macarius's actual words.

2. It is not the habit of Turrianus to introduce Greek words or expressions in this way, unless he is quoting some author whom he has in mind.

3. This same passage from the fifth Book of the *Apocritica* is given in its Latin form¹ word for word elsewhere, on p. 443 of Turrianus's work *Adversus Magdaburgenses* lib. iv chap. 7. It ends with a similar reference to the three parables, and then, without mentioning the fourth concerning the leaven, he proceeds 'ad has autem parabolas . . . addidi ego aliam parabolam, ex epistola beati Ignatii ad Ephesios sumptam'. 'Addidi ego,' as referring only to what is in the *Dogmaticus* 'postremo alia quinta parabola', seems to imply that he was not personally the author of the *fourth*.

The value of this fragment from Book V consists in more than its recovery when scholars were ignorant of its existence. A remarkable feature of the whole work is its advance from the discussion of mere details, such as isolated texts, to the essentials of the faith, such as Baptism, the Virgin-birth, and the Resurrection of the Body. It is chiefly in the later part that interest and controversy have centred. But to have something from the end of the last book is to gain a clue to the extent and completion of the dialogue. And the question arises, what kind of objection is Macarius answering in the fragment before us? Turrianus only tells us that he is speaking about the faith of Abraham. The difficulty to be faced is evidently the problem of the relation of faith to works in the process of justification. In what form has Hierocles raised it?

Has he simply quoted Genesis, and shewn its disagreement with Christian teaching about good works? But if this were so, Macarius is quite broad enough to have pointed out that Abraham was not a Christian. Or has he gone on to shew the discrepancies between the writers of the Epistles, in the same way as, in the early part of the dialogue, he treated those between the writers of the Gospels? In a word, does the argument centre in the difference between the teaching of St Paul and St James on faith and works, as shown by individual passages in their writings? Quite possibly; but this would be such a return to his earlier objections to details, that a more general objection seems more likely.

It would almost seem then as if he had gone on to attack the more esoteric teachings of Christianity, and to object, not merely to discrepancies of individual authors, but to difficulties within the Catholic

¹ He refers to his earlier *Dogmaticus*, saying, 'non pigebit repetere hic. Si quis Graeca conferre voluerit, inde petat.'

faith such as the reconciliation of justification by faith with the stress laid upon good works. If this conclusion be correct, it is obvious that the scope of the *Apocritica* as a whole is wider than has been supposed, and we must hesitate before we speak of it as merely a book of answers regarding certain passages in the Gospels and the New Testament generally. The doctrinal range of the dialogue seems wider and deeper than this, and Macarius is revealed as a theologian with a broader horizon than has been attributed to him. Moreover, the exposition which the fragment contains of the relation of faith and good works, is in itself an excellent one. Internal evidence supports the genuineness of the fragment. The allegorical and Origenistic style of explanation is quite Macarian, and so is the language. His favourite word *κατόρθωμα* occurs no less than three times.

A word may be added here about the other fragments of Macarius that remain, namely, the ten fragments of his lost work 'Homiliae in Genesim'. The only place where they are all to be found together is an appendix to the treatise of Duchesne.¹ The heading of the first as *δημιουργία Ἀδάμ* suggests at once *δημιουργός*, the title of God the Son which occurs more than once in the *Apocritica*,² and, in the course of the fragment, He is also termed *μονογενής*. The interpretation of the coats of skins in fragment 8 shews an indebtedness to Origen, and the allegorical method recalls the *Apocritica* throughout. The explanation of Exod. xxiii 19 (or Deut. xiv 21), given in the ninth fragment, namely, that the kid not being seethed in its mother's milk is to be connected with the infant Christ not being killed by Herod at Bethlehem, seems to suggest the question whether Macarius wrote a commentary on Exodus (or Deuteronomy) as well. Duchesne does not allude to the title of this previously unedited fragment.³

The Bearing of the Apocritica on the History of the Text and Canon of the N. T.

The testimony of Macarius to the Text of the New Testament is disappointingly small. The result of collecting the variant readings only leads to the conclusion (already expressed in my former article) that the quotations were made from memory. So many are little more than paraphrases, that it is unsafe to dogmatize about the rest. There are, however, three quotations which stand out from the others. The opponent, when noting discrepancies in the accounts of the Passion, quotes St Mark xv 34 as *ὁ θεός, θεός μου, εἰς τί ἠνείδυσάς με*;⁴ this he notes as differing from *τί με ἐγκατέλιπες*; in St Matthew. This unusual reading will be recognized as agreeing with Codex Bezae. Macarius

¹ *Op. cit.* pp. 39 and 12.

² e. g. *Apocr.* pp. 187, 68, 216, &c.

³ Duchesne *op. cit.* pp. 42 and 39, ex cod. Vat. Pii II, 22.

⁴ *Apocr.* ii 12.

makes no contradiction in his answer,¹ but we cannot therefore argue that he also had the same reading. For it is only one alleged discrepancy out of many that are adduced, and it is not Macarius's habit to leave the main argument by raising a side issue. The matter therefore seems to admit of the same explanation as I have suggested in the case of the '300 years' of Christianity. But it is of sufficient importance that the reading of D should be unhesitatingly quoted by this Neoplatonist, presumably suggesting that it was current in Syria at the end of the third century.

The opponent again gives the reading of D in quoting St John xii 31, from which he omits *τούτου* the first time after *τοῦ κόσμου*, and gives *βληθήσεται ἔξω* for *ἐκβληθήσεται ἔξω*.² Macarius also omits the *τούτου* and the *ἐκ*, but adds that there is another reading *βληθήσεται κάτω*.³ He thus supports a reading already known to us in the Old Syriac and some of the Latin versions.⁴ This interesting textual reference is the only one in the book, and it is noteworthy that in his answer, though he gives the quotation as *βληθήσεται κάτω*, the idea of the other reading *ἔξω* also enters in.

The other textual point worthy of mention lies in the fact that Macarius quotes from the last twelve verses of St Mark's Gospel. An objection is based on St Mark xvi 18, and the answer accepts it as Scripture.⁵

Concerning the bearing of the *Apocritica* on the *Canon* of the Scriptures more might be said. In the Questions, the Gospels and the Acts are, of course, quoted over and over again, and, together with a few passages from the Pauline Epistles, form the text upon which most of the objections are based. But casual quotations from Scripture are exceedingly few, as indeed we might expect in the circumstances. As regards the whole Bible, quotations occur from Exodus, Deuteronomy, Joshua, the Psalms, and Isaiah, and also from the four Gospels, Acts, Romans, 1 and 2 Corinthians, Galatians, 1 Thessalonians, 1 Timothy, and the Apocalypse of Peter. The answers quote, independently of the questions, from Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy, Joshua, 1 and 2 Kings, Job, the Psalms, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Daniel, and Habakkuk, and also from the four Gospels, Acts, Romans, 1 and 2 Corinthians, Ephesians, 1 Thessalonians, and 1 Timothy. This list includes nine Old Testament books which are not referred to in the questions, but only one from the New Testament.⁶ Even when Macarius

¹ *Apocr.* ii 17.

² *Ib.* ii 15.

³ *Ib.* ii 20.

⁴ Burkitt *Evangelion da-Mepharreshe* vol. i p. 499, 'Now is the judgement of the world; now the sovereign of this world is thrown down.' Cod. Veron. 'Nunc iudicium est mundi, nunc princeps mundi hujus mittetur deorum.' Cf. Cod. Corbei.

⁵ *Apocr.* iii 16 and 24.

⁶ *Hebrews* is a doubtful exception, as the ultimate source of Heb. i 9, as quoted in *Apocr.* p. 75, is really Ps. xlv 8. But there are many reminiscences of N. T. language.

does quote from the latter, it is often vaguely, as when he introduces St Paul's words to the Galatians about being crucified to the world by *ὡςπερ ὅταν λέγη τις φιλοσοφῶν ἐν βίῳ*.¹ But we must not expect him to add much to the quotations contained in the objections. For as it was the Christian Scriptures themselves that were being held up to ridicule, it was some external support that they chiefly needed from their defender. And it is interesting to find that, although we cannot find any certain trace in the *Apocritica* of the *Epistle to the Hebrews*, we have only to turn to the first fragment of his *Homilies on Genesis*,² to find an express quotation from Heb. i 3. And he shews by adding *κατὰ τὸν Ἀπόστολον*, that he was among those who accepted the book as Pauline. No acknowledged quotation is made either from the Catholic Epistles or from the *Apocalypse*, but an argument cannot be built on this silence. It is true that when he substitutes a canonical reference to the destruction of heaven and earth for the quotation his opponent had made from the *Apocalypse* of Peter,³ he strangely passes by the obvious parallel from 2 Peter iii 12, and chooses that from Isaiah xxxiv 4. But on the other hand his connexion elsewhere of *χίλια ἔτη* with *μία ἡμέρα*,⁴ suggests a knowledge of 2 Peter iii 8, though it is just possible he is only following the Psalm where the phrase is first to be found,⁵ though in a form influenced by the passage in 2 Peter. But it at least seems as though he avoided basing his argument on a book which could be put down in his day as *ἀντιλεγόμενον*.

The chief bearing of the *Apocritica* on the canon is through the two passages quoted from the *Apocalypse* of Peter. Though not contained in the new Akmim fragment, they are well known already, and have been discussed by Dr James.⁶ They are both quoted by the opponent, who bases his argument upon them. I see no proof that Macarius quotes it, as Zahn states, as a book not intrinsically of the Scriptures,⁷ nor that his attitude was very friendly to this apocryphal book. Rather he seems to quietly pass it by, using such words as *παραπέμπεσθαι* and *ἄκοντες*, and skilfully substituting passages from canonical scriptures. His treatment of it rather seems to suggest that it did not form part of his canon. It is worthy of mention, on the one hand, that Macarius and Eusebius of Caesarea⁸ are alike in adopting what seems a semi-hostile attitude towards the book; and on the other hand that Sozomen says later on that he found it read on Good Friday in certain churches of Palestine.⁹ Its recognition in Syria by the opponent of Macarius

¹ *Apocr.* p. 39.² Duchesne *op. cit.* p. 39.³ *Apocr.* iv 16, p. 185.⁴ *Ib.* iv 13, p. 180 l. 3.⁵ *Ps.* xc 4.⁶ *Two Lectures on the Newly-Discovered Fragments.* Cambridge 1892. See also Hilgenfeld *N. T. extra canonem receptum*, fasc. iv, p. 74 et seq.⁷ Zahn *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte*, Band ii 1878, p. 450 et seq. *Zu Makarius von Magnesia.*⁸ *H. E.* iii 3. 2, and iii 25. 4.⁹ *Soz. H. E.* vii 19.

accords well with this latter statement. The remark of Dr James, that 'its popularity seems to have been almost confined to the less educated class of Christians', would help to explain how one came to know and quote it who only knew Christianity from outside.¹

There are also in the *Apocritica* several indirect references to Apocryphal literature and legendary stories. The statement of Macarius² that, at the martyrdom of St Paul, milk flowed from the wound, is only to be found in Pseudo-Abdias and Pseudo-Linus.³ It is noteworthy that the latter was translated into Latin in the fourth century, which suggests that during the previous period it was recognized further East. Again, in speaking of the way in which the Gospel divides kinsfolk, Macarius gives as an instance the parting of Thecla from her mother Theoclea.⁴ Whatever may be the date of the actual *Acta Pauli et Theclae*, the story is at all events traceable as far back as Tertullian.⁵ The introduction of Alexander the Syriarch into the legend, would naturally make Macarius link it with Antioch in Syria, and his example is followed by Basil of Seleucia⁶ and Gregory of Nazianzus. Once more, Macarius refers to a legend similar to that of the *Vita Polycarpi* when he tells of the efficacy of that saint's prayers concerning the weather,⁷ &c., and the blessing that he brought upon the widow's⁸ house which he managed. The 'Life' bears the name of Pionius, who was martyred at Smyrna in 250 A. D. Concerning its relation to the *Apocritica*, the following criticism⁹ may be quoted: 'There is such a want of closeness of agreement that we cannot believe that the extant life was that read by Macarius. But there is enough of general agreement to make it credible that the extant life is a re-working of a life current in the fourth century. Whether the latter were as old as the Pionius of the third century is a matter in which we have not materials to form a judgement.' This point might be used as an additional argument for the earlier date of Macarius.

Macarius refers more than once to O. T. Apocryphal books. In iv 12, p. 174, where he tells how God Ἀββακὸν ἀπάσας . . . ἔθηκεν ἐπάνω τοῦ Βαβυλωνίου λάκκου, there is a reference to Daniel xii 34 (Bel and the Dragon). Again, in iii 3, his opponent complains that the Mosaic books were only written 1180 years after Moses' death ἐπὶ Ἐσδρα

¹ *Op. cit.* p. 47.

² *Apocr.* iv 15.

³ See references in Duchesne *op. cit.* p. 37. Also *D. C. B.* art. 'Linus', vol. iii p. 728.

⁴ *Apocr.* ii 7, p. 6.

⁵ *Tert. de Bapt.* ch. xvii.

⁶ *Bas. Sel. in Isauria de vita ac miraculis D. Theclae . . . libri duo*, Antwerp 1608, p. 68.

⁷ *Apocr.* iii 24, p. 109.

⁸ Reading χήρας for χείρας of Blondel's edit.

⁹ *D. C. B.* art. 'Polycarp.'

καὶ τῶν ἀμφ' αὐτόν. Macarius accepts the statement in iii 10, but explains that they were then accurately repeated, in the case of both Esdras and Moses τὸ αὐτὸ πνεῦμα ἐκατέρους ἐδίδαξε, καὶ ἀμφοτέροις τὰ αὐτὰ σαφῶς ἠπηγόρευσε. The basis of his words is evidently not to be found in the book of Ezra, but in 2 Esdras xiv 21-25, though this is not noted in Blondel's edition.

Before leaving this part of the subject, we may note two minor points. Macarius begins his defence in Book III¹ by speaking of the slights that were being put upon τὸν κανόνα τῆς Καινῆς Διαθήκης. And his opponent refers to St Peter's early death² in language which has led to the surmise that he thought St Peter's episcopate at Rome only lasted a few months. His words are simply these: ὅμως ἱστορεῖται μὴδ' ὀλίγους μῆνας βοσκῆσας τὰ προβάτια ὁ Πέτρος ἐσταυρώσθαι, where the word ἱστορεῖται suggests that he was in possession of a tradition.³ The answer of Macarius makes no allusion whatever to this statement.

The Theological Value of the Apocritica.

I now pass to a brief reference to the theology of Macarius. It is scarcely worth while staying to rebut the charges of heresy brought against it by Nicephorus.⁴ More interesting is his statement that Macarius is a follower τοῦ δυσσεβοῦς καὶ ἀποπλήκτου Ὀριγένους. He specifies the particular dogma derived from him as being the non-eternity of punishment, ὡς τέλος ἔξει ἢ κατὰ τὸν μέλλοντα χρόνον τοῖς ἀσεβέσιν ἀνθρώποις ἠπειλημένη καὶ ἠτοιμασμένη παρὰ θεοῦ κόλασις. These actual words are not to be found in what remains to us of the *Apocritica*, but there is a kindred sentiment, evidently overlooked by Duchesne, in iv 16, p. 187. Δεῖ γὰρ πᾶσαν τῶν γενητῶν φύσιν καὶ ὑπόστασιν δίχα τῶν ἀσωμάτων δευτέραν ἀναλαβεῖν καὶ βελτίω γένεσιν. But there are many

¹ *Apocr.* iii 10, p. 168 l. 17.

² *Ib.* ii 22, p. 102 l. 11.

³ Speaking elsewhere of the death of St Paul and St Peter, it is of the former that he says ὅσον οὐδέπω ἐν Ῥώμῃ κρατηθεὶς τῆς κεφαλῆς ἀποτέμενεται.

⁴ The only passage that might be construed as unorthodox is in iii 8, p. 68, where he speaks of ὁ δοκῶν πεπονθέναι. But this has never been attacked, and must be read alongside other passages which are entirely opposed to anything Docetic. We may here note that he contributes two new names to our catalogue of heretics. In iv 15 he includes in a list of deceivers and anti-Christ's Droserius and Dositheus the Cilician, after whom their followers were called. In iii 43 he gives further details concerning Dositheus, as an Encratite in Asia Minor, whose followers were called Apotactites and Eremites. Dositheus is only known by name otherwise (Hegesippus ap. Euseb. *H. E.* iv 19. 3), and we have already referred to him (pp. 548, 549). Of Droserius there is no mention in that passage of the *Apocritica*, and Duchesne is therefore wrong in saying that he and his followers are mentioned as Eremitae. We may refer to iv 25, p. 209, iii 14, p. 93, and iv 15, p. 184 for proof that Macarius is guiltless of the Arian, Nestorian, or Manichaean tendencies with which Nicephorus charged him.

other passages and explanations where he is obviously indebted to Origen.¹ With regard to his theology generally, I can do no more now than refer to certain passages which give a comprehensive and catholic statement of Christian theology, and receive a peculiar value from the date at which they seem to have been written. I single out twelve, as practically covering the articles of the Creeds, though not identical with them. The doctrine of the Holy Trinity has already been alluded to, as contained in *Apocr.* iv 25, and it again finds a place in iii 27, in a comment upon St Peter's confession. The creation of man is referred to the *δημιουργὸς Λόγος* in iii 13, and the object of creation is very beautifully expressed in iv 16. The fall is stated in the same chapter to have been man's failure to be what the Creator made him. God's work before the Incarnation is shewn in iv 18, His call of sinners having begun with 'Adam, where art thou?' They might have obeyed it then, the fault was in their own choice. Thus free will and predestination are put side by side. The Divinity of Christ is shewn throughout, especially in ii 9 and iii 14, and His humanity in ii 11, ii 9, and iii 14. The Old and New Testaments are closely linked in iii 8, 10, 40, and 41. The law and the prophets fade like moon and stars before the sun and this crown of apostles, and yet remain, though without power. The Virgin-birth is regarded both by Macarius and his opponent as an essential part of the faith (iv 28). The power of Christ's atoning death is set forth in iii 9 and 14, and His Resurrection and appearances are shewn in ii 19 to rest on the power, not of men, but of God. His Ascension and present ubiquity are discussed in iii 14, His Godhead and His manhood being for ever indissoluble. The last things, judgement, resurrection, and eternal life, are spoken of in iv 30, where the world is regarded only as the preparation for eternity, and its destruction as a new and better beginning. With regard to the Church and the Christian life, iv 25 and iii 23 are of the chief value. The water of Holy Baptism has the power to cleanse from the stain of evil, nor is it the fault of the Giver if this grace is abused. The Eucharist is the plainest explanation of Christ's words about eating His flesh and drinking His blood. It is far more than a mere type. The above twelve instances must suffice. But I may add a few illustrations of exegesis. There is something remarkably modern about many of his explanations of controverted passages. 1. For example, in ii 9, he answers the difficulty in 'Why callest thou Me good?' &c. in a now familiar way. For he says the explanation lies in the attitude of the young man, who, conscious as he was of his own

¹ This indebtedness has already been shewn in my former article to vitiate the theory that he is to be identified with the Macarius who accused Heraclidas of Origenism in 403 A. D.

well-doing, simply addressed Christ as if He were an ordinary man. So Christ answers, Why do you think Me a mere man and yet call me good? You are mistaken. Absolute goodness is not in men, but only in God. In *your* sense I deny that I am good, though I should not have done so had you glorified God in Me. I cannot be a party to your confusion of the absolutely and the relatively good.

2. In ii 11, he faces the difficulty that our Lord said 'If I bear witness to Myself, My witness is not true', and yet He did bear witness in such sayings as 'I am the Light of the World'. Such witness, he replies, is not true in *man's* case, but it is in *God's*. So Christ first speaks as man (which the Jews judged Him to be) when He says He does not bear witness to Himself, but seeks it from God. But He says as God that He is the Light of the World, disdaining witness from His inferiors. He therefore simply allows that if in their erroneous judgement He is merely man, His witness is not true. Thus He contradicts, not His own statement, but their opinion about Him.

3. His discussion of the blessing upon St Peter¹ is also of interest, with its sequel in his rebuke. Here, as elsewhere, he urges that the first thing to do is to study the context. He says Christ told St Peter to be 'Rock-man' as witnessing to the Rock of the Godhead and holding an impregnable belief (an explanation which definitely opposes the book to the Roman view). He adds that the devil forthwith tries both to rob St Peter of his merit and to hinder Christ's Passion by putting words in the former's mouth. Christ recognizes the real speaker and addresses *him* when He says 'Get thee behind Me, Satan', and then He turns to St Peter with the words 'Thou art an offence unto Me'.

The charge of the 'keys of heaven' is explained by the fact that St Peter's faith had reached, in his confession, to a height wherein he was led up to the very court of heaven. He now knew the King upon His throne, and had it in his power to open his knowledge to those who came to him, but to keep it closed from those who were not fit for the beatific vision. In this sense he had the power to open and shut heaven, and to lead men into it or out of it.

Nor is the grammar of the passage ignored, but the presence of articles in St Peter's confession of *the* Christ as *the* Son of *the* living God is shewn to reveal the unique nature of each, and that impregnable Rock of truth from whence the devil afterwards tried to throw the apostle.

4. As an instance of his treatment of St Paul's words, we may take the explanation (iii 40) that, when St Paul says to do one thing in the law obliges a man to do all, he is not abusing the law, but pointing to its minuteness, and to that difficulty in carrying it out which Christ has

¹ *Apocr.* iii 27.

freed us from by coming to fulfil it Himself. As to his calling the law 'holy', &c., it was holy because the Holy One fulfilled it. There is no falsehood in St Paul saying (1 Thess. iv 16) 'We shall be snatched up', although the resurrection did not take place in his day. For he is very fond of identifying his own humanity with that of the whole race (iv 12).

5. A few instances of ingenious allegory may be added.

The golden pot of manna (for which the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews was almost giving us a Christian meaning) shews the Eternal Word contained in our Lord's humanity (iii 10). 'The fourth watch of the night', when Christ appeared on the sea, is thus expounded. The sea is the brine and bitterness of existence, the night is human life, the boat is the world, those who sailed all night are the human race, the contrary wind is the devil's opposition, and the fourth watch is the Saviour's coming. There are four watches in the world's life. In the first watch the *patriarchs* helped life by their light, in the second the *law* guided the boat of the world, in the third the *prophets* contended for the world's sailors, and in the fourth Christ checked their fear and their foes, and ended the night by the light of His love for men.

Again, in the parable of the leaven, the woman is creation, and the three measures of meal are either past, present, and future, or man's body, soul, and spirit, or the three dimensions (iv 17).

Its Apologetic Value.

It remains to speak briefly of the apologetic value of the *Apocritica*. The questions have a value of their own, and some of the objections sound strangely modern. The apologist is an otherwise unknown Christian, yet able to defend the faith against promiscuous objections, without involving himself in any inconsistency. The fragment of his first book reminds us of the similar appeal to the results of Christ's miracles which was made by the earliest apologist Quadratus. And the rest of his work contains much that is not without apologetic value. For example, the opponent used a form of 'higher criticism' as a bitter means of attack. The Mosaic books were discredited as written centuries after Moses, the discrepancies of the Synoptists were used to prove the untruthfulness of their narrative, and the single tradition of St John was shewn to be too isolated to be trustworthy. A remarkable spirit of concession is found in the answer, and a readiness to adapt theories of inspiration to new difficulties. The later date of the Mosaic books is accepted without any weakening of their authenticity.¹

¹ *Apoc.* iii 10 ἐπει δ' ἔφησ τὰ Μωσείως ἐν τῇ αἰχμαλωσίᾳ πεπονημένοι γράμματα, καὶ αὐτῶν οὐκ ἀκριβῶς ὑπὸ Ἑσδρα γεγράφθαι, εὐρεθήσεται κατὰ πᾶσαν ἀκριβείαν δευτερογραφηθέντα· οὐ γὰρ ἄλλος ἐλάλει τῷ Ἑσδρα, καὶ ἕτερος τῷ Μωσεί, ἀλλὰ τὸ αὐτὸ πνεῦμα ἐκατέρους ἐδίδαξε, καὶ ἀμφοτέροις τὰ αὐτὰ σαφῶς ὑπηγόρευεν.

And there is shewn a remarkable recognition of the human element in the Scriptures, as existing side by side with the divine. The objections to synoptic discrepancies are faced by the statement¹ that the details of expression are not the criterion of the truth of a fact. Greek accuracy of expression was not to be expected of foreigners, and in such a narrative as that of the Crucifixion, the accounts can be truthful, and yet reflect the suspense of the crisis, the very strangeness of which had unnerved them all. And, apart from their being unlettered men, their object was a faithful record, not fine writing. Speaking elsewhere² of the single tradition of St John, Macarius says it is not to be rejected because the others omit it, but what one evangelist happened to remember must be thankfully received. As a second and final instance, I may take the attack and defence of our Lord's Resurrection. Why did He only appear to biased and untrustworthy witnesses? Why did He not shew His glorified Body to the high priest or to Pilate? In answering this,³ Macarius has taken two firm lines of defence. First he uses a useful form of apologetic by asking the counter-question, What if He *had* appeared to Pilate? The Jews would still have thought the latter was either deceived or bribed. And then he boldly argues that such appearances would have made the Resurrection seem to need human support. As it was, the weakness of the women and the obscurity of the disciples guaranteed that it would rest on the power not of man but of God. Thus does he frankly admit, here as elsewhere, that the final appeal of Christianity is not to a man's intellectual faculties, but to that spiritual instinct which is in his higher nature. In spite of its blemishes, I believe the *Apocritica* is fit to rank among the great apologies for the faith.

Note on the Text and MSS of the Apocritica.

This is a part of the subject with which I have not attempted to deal. A few notes are here added, for which the only *apparatus criticus* is Blondel's footnotes and pp. 5-8 and 43 of Duchesne's treatise. I have already alluded to the identification of the MS found at Athens with that lost centuries before from St Mark's, Venice. Duchesne suggests theft as the explanation, Greek officials at St Mark's being the cause of its gradual transference to Athens, by way of Corcyra and Joannina.

Is it possible that the MS was headed by a reproduction of the author's portrait which Nicephorus describes as the frontispiece? If that were the case, it would have an interest of its own, and the early part (missing in the present MS) may have been transferred to a different part of the library. In that event, only that portion would

¹ *Apocr.* i 17.

² *Ib.* ii 18.

³ *Ib.* ii 19.

leave St Mark's, and it is to Venice rather than to Athens that we must turn for the possible recovery of the lost first Book. What survives is a paper MS of the fifteenth century, described by Duchesne as 'prave scriptus, multis lacunis'. The only means of testing its accuracy is by comparing it with other authorities, such as Nicephorus and Turrianus, where fragments are quoted. Duchesne gives a list of eleven MSS containing fragments, and notes a few variants, while Blondel's edition notes the readings of Nicephorus. Sometimes the latter gives undoubtedly the right reading, as on p. 200 l. 14; here he has βρέτας τοῖς θεοῖς ποιῶντες instead of σέλας τοῖς κ.τ.λ., where there is an evident confusion with σέβας in the line above. On p. 218 l. 18 he supplies an additional sentence, when Blondel does not note a lacuna. On p. 214 l. 10 he reads δεσμῶν χωριζόμενοι instead of χαρίζόμενοι, and here it can be no mistake of the collator, for he notes 'in marg. χωριζόμενοι ἴσως sec. manus'. But there are cases where both are wrong, as where they read ὁ for ὅς . . . κυριεύει φύσεως on p. 212 l. 5. And in some readings our MS is to be preferred, as in the reading of p. 214 l. 19, where, for θηρῶν τὸ ἀθήρατον, Nicephorus has ἀθέατον. Another authority is to be found in *Codex Vaticanus Pii II*, no. 22, a tenth-century MS, which quotes part of *Apocr.* iii 13. Here again, several mistakes in the Athens MS are revealed, as on p. 89 l. 12, where, in the explanation of the inner allegorical meaning of Elijah's visions, the awkward phrase ἄκουσον . . . τῶν ὄπτασιῶν τὸν καιρὸν is greatly improved by the substitution of τὸ κύριον. And yet in l. 15, in speaking of the 'earthquake' as meaning the Mosaic law, πραγμάτων is a poor substitute for προσταγμάτων in the sentence τὴν οἰκουμένην ἀπὸ τῶν προσταγμάτων φημιζόμενος ἔσεισε.

And even when there is no authority by which to test the text of our MS, there are many indications that it is corrupt, as indeed we should expect in the case of so late a MS. Blondel has had to alter obvious blunders on nearly every page, or to note that they have been corrected by a later hand. In many cases he has left the unusual spelling of the MS, e. g. ἀποκτείνοντας on p. 69 l. 3, although he gives the same quotation from St Matt. x 28 in the question as ἀποκτείνοντας (p. 53 l. 3), with the footnote Cod. pr. l. ἀποκταίνοντες; alt. ἀποκταίνοντας. But many places remain which still need emendation. On the subject of Synoptic discrepancies concerning the Crucifixion, the opponent complains that πολλοὺς σταυρουμένους ἐμφαίνει ἢ ἓνα δυσθανατοῦντα. Here Duchesne's convincing suggestion is δις θανατοῦντα (p. 21 l. 4). Whether the fault lies with the MS or with the collation of it, cannot be decided without having it before us. The readings of Turrianus are not to be trusted, as his habit is to quote loosely, but in places where our present text seems unsatisfactory, even he may give some

help. For example, in *Apocr.* iv 2, p. 177 l. 10, where it is shewn to be partly due to St Paul's affection that he identifies himself with the dead in 1 Thess. iv, we read οὕτω γάρ τις φιλέταιρος ποιεῖ καὶ ποιεῖ τῶν ὁμοστοίχων ἀγαπῶν τὴν συγγένειαν. Turrianus (*adv. Magd.* ii 13, p. 208) quotes this as οὕτω γάρ τις φιλέτερος, καὶ τῶν ὁμοστοίχων ἀγαπῶν τὴν συγγένειαν δοκεῖ. May we not take the suggestion from δοκεῖ, and instead of the clumsy ποιεῖ καὶ ποιεῖ, emend to some such phrase as ποιεῖν δοκεῖ? I can make no attempt to discuss here the question of emendation in passages where there is no authority to suggest it.

T. W. CRAFER.

I. THE DIATESSARON IN THE SYRIAC ACTS OF JOHN.

IN the January number of the JOURNAL I attempted to shew that the Syriac *Acts of John* is no translation from Greek but an original Syriac document, and that the writer of the Acts made use of Tatian's Harmony. I venture to hope that the evidence adduced in support of these opinions will have proved convincing to Syriac scholars.

Two passages were reserved for separate consideration, as involving an arrangement of the Gospel narratives markedly different from that found in the late Arabic version of the Diatessaron which we possess. The first of these which I shall consider comes on pp. 38-39 of the Syriac text, 34-35 of Dr Wright's translation. It describes the first miracle of feeding the multitudes and that of the walking on the water. The corresponding matter in Diat. Arab. comes in xviii 22-xix 13. It will be well to exhibit our passage with reference to the account as given in the Arabic.¹

Diat. Arab.	Gosp.
xviii 22 ^a	Mk. vi 33
22 ^b -25 ^a	Jn. vi 2 ^b -5 ^a
25 ^b	Mk. vi 34 ^b
26	Lk. ix 11 ^b
27	Mt. xiv 15 ^a

Acts of John.

And when He was teaching *in the desert* (cf. Mk. vi 31 = Mt. xiv 31; *but also Lk. ix 10 in C*²), and

¹ I avail myself of the Gospel references given by Mr. Hamlyn Hill in *The Earliest Life of Christ*. I shall refer to the Curetonian and Sinaitic MSS of syr. vt. as C and S respectively. When Prof. Burkitt is quoted the reference will be to his *Evangelion da-Mepharreshe* unless otherwise indicated.

² Ciasca's Arabic Diatessaron xviii 21 is equally silent as to Bethsaida, so that we may conjecture that C here reproduces the text of Tatian¹ (Burkitt ii p. 292).