

**THE ORACLES**  
**IN THE NEW TESTAMENT**

Edward Carus Selwyn, 1911

*excerpts from the prologue and from chapter I  
chapter XIII follows in its entirety (pp. 396-427)*

The oracle says that God will not hide  
from the man dear to Him  
a mystery that is hidden and secret to many,  
but will reveal it to him.

*(Demonstratio Evangelico, Book II, chap. 1a, Eusebius of Caesarea)*

Nor is it at all incredible, that a book,  
which has been so long in the possession of mankind,  
should contain many truths as yet undiscovered.

*(Analogy II, iii, Butler)*

## EXCERPTS FROM THE PREFACE AND CHAPTER I

The present work is an attempt to discover the use of the Old Testament by the writers of the New. The oracles are precious words, and the words in the New Testament which were precious to the writers are words of the Old Testament. They were precious because they proved the great fact that Jesus was the Christ. The proof is known generally as the Argument from Prophecy.

To pronounce the words Jesus Christ is to assert a coincidence which is by no means accidental but providential, in accordance with the purpose of God, and inseparable from the belief in that purpose. The expectation of the Christ was held by a considerable body of opinion in the first century B. C., and may be described as a faith or trust or belief: when Jesus came He was pronounced to fulfil many terms of that expectation. A coincidence was discovered between the facts of His life and the ideas of the previous faith. Jesus was identified with the Christ, the Man was found to correspond with the Opinion, the Life to fulfil the Faith. It is therefore vain to say that in these modern days we, whether Christians or not, have no interest in the question whether Jesus was the Christ. Neither the person Jesus nor the title Christ can be ignored. Nor can it be argued that coincidences can be put aside as a secondary matter. Historically, the great coincidence, the great providence, lies at the very basis of the Faith, and the Faith can never cease to be a matter of history.

Nor can the coincidence which supported the faith cease to be the subject of study. For it is not yet known how the popular belief that Jesus was the Christ was formed between the years A. D. and 70, and between 70 and 120. But it is quite clear that the apostolic writers held that it was largely formed upon coincidences between what happened and what had been written centuries before. The four Gospels contain a hundred passages of Old Testament which are treated as fulfilled in the events that they relate. Fifty of these are introduced by expressions which show that the evangelists considered them to be fulfilments. They write, "then was fulfilled what

was written,” “as it is written,” or something similar. Fulfilment cannot fail to imply the recognition of a coincidence, whatever else and whatever more it means. About eighteen more fulfilments are claimed in the Acts, where it is evident that St. Peter, St. Paul, and other apostolic men are building the Church by fulfilments of passages from the Old Testament. The Epistles contain a hundred passages which are introduced by a similar formula, which would appeal to Jews and any others who knew the Bible, with a necessary, crowning, and conclusive force. There was – and this is always to be remembered – the force of a life and a love behind the words quoted and greater than all, but this cannot now be estimated and is to be put on one side for that very reason. What we are now concerned with is merely the rational machinery employed toward the formation of the faith. This with all the coincidences involved is a proper matter for scientific treatment.

## CHAPTER XIII

### WHAT THEN DID PAPIAS WRITE?

In the course of the great controversy thirty-five years ago between Dr. Lightfoot and the author of *Supernatural Religion*, the work of Papias of Hierapolis in five books, entitled, *Expositions of Oracles of the Lord* (λογίων κυριακῶν ἐξηγήσεις) was a subject of discussion, partly as to the nature of its contents, of which only a few meagre fragments survive, but chiefly as to the value of its evidence for the existence of evangelical narratives. We have now to examine into the exact meaning of the title of this work in the light of the contemporary apostolic fathers, as well as the fragments themselves.

#### *Title of the Work of Papias.*

It was taken for granted by the two controversial champions that Papias's title was fairly translated by *Expositions of Oracles of the Lord, Explanations of Dominical Oracles, Explanations of Sayings of Jesus that were oracular*, whether to include act along with sayings, as Lightfoot contended or not. Obviously the principal question in connection with the title is the meaning of λόγια, and the next to it is the meaning of κυριαχά. The object of this chapter is to show that another meaning is alone able to satisfy the conditions.

To deal first with κυριαχά. The meaning is not clear if we translate it *of the Lord, dominica*, for it might then mean *of God*, and there are several passages which this translation would never suit. Rev 1<sup>10</sup>, "I was in spirit on God's day" would not serve, whether the meaning were the seventh or the first day of the week: it is neither. The meaning is, "I was (*i.e.* had become) in spirit (*i.e.* prophetically by means of the ecstatic state) on the Messianic Day," the Judgment Day. The only possible meaning of the adjective is that of κύριος Χριστός as about to judge the world in righteousness: it is eschatological or nothing. Again, I Cor. II<sup>20</sup>, "This is not to eat the Lord's supper." Certainly here we could not substitute "God's supper." But neither could we adequately translate "Christ's supper": it is the Messianic supper in the same sense of the word as Rev. I<sup>10</sup>; as St. Paul proceeds to say, "As often as ye eat this bread and drink this cup, ye proclaim the death of the Lord *until he come*." This adjective κυριαχὸς is not used except in the sense of the first or second coming of Christ, until we pass

beyond the New Testament scriptures, and even then, when it begins to be applied to the first day of the week, it is at first applied in connection with the same view *κατὰ χυριαχὴν ξῶντες ἐν ἧ καὶ ἡ ζωὴ ἡμῶν ἀνέτειλεν*, “The Lord’s day on which dawned the Dayspring of our life” (Ign. Mag. 9). Afterwards this view naturally wore off. But as late as Clem. Al. (*Strom.* VIII. I, I) the scriptures of the Lord (*αἱ χυρ. γραφαὶ*) = *testimonies of the Lord* (*τὰ μαρτύρια χύριου*).

This Messianic meaning of *χυριαχά*, therefore, is so far clear that when the word is applied to Logia we expect to be guided towards something of a Messianic meaning for it, towards the Messianic side of its meaning. After a prolonged observation of the use of the Old Testament in the New, one comes to the persuasion that the Old Testament texts quoted are used without any regard to the context from which they are intended to serve, that of proving that Jesus is the Christ, and the necessary inferences from that conclusion. It would not be too much to say that the final cause of the Old Testament was to be Messianic, to provide Christian proofs, to be an armoury of Christian weapons. But now all these weapons, these proof-texts, are words of a certain kind and purpose, sought out for it and discovered, and stored up for future use. That is to say they are just Logia, *precious word*, oracles, utterances, extracted from the treasury of God.

In the Greek Bible the word *λόγιον* is a favourite with the translator of the 119<sup>th</sup> Psalm. He uses it eighteen times for the *precious word* of God (five of the eighteen times it is in the plural). In the remaining places it bears just the same meaning, even when the “precious word of the Lord is full of wrath” (Isa. 30<sup>27</sup>). (See above, p. 244.) But for a translation we must have one word for one word, and “oracle” is the best that we can use, understanding it to be the spoken oracle, not the oracular authority which speaks it.

*“The Oracles” in the New Testament.*

When we come to the New Testament we find the same consistent usage in the four places — only four — where it occurs. St. Stephen (Acts 7<sup>38</sup>) says, “Moses received living *oracles* to give unto you,” and surely the Decalogue, to be the foundation of the sermon on the Mount, was a thing of precious words. And these were the oracles above all others that St. Paul meant when he said (Rom 3<sup>2</sup>) that the first advantage of the Jews over the Gentiles was “that they were entrusted with *the oracles* of God” — first in time, and first in importance. He also is distinctly thinking of Sinai, for he immediately proceeds, “What if some did disbelieve?” We then come to Heb.

5<sup>12</sup>, where the Hebrews “have need for one to teach them what are the elements of the beginning of *the oracles* of God.” Here we begin to have the real New Testament sense of the word, for in the two last passages St. Stephen and St. Paul are both speaking of early Old Testament times when the oracles were only in the hands of the Children of Israel. But here they are to be in Christian hands, and what for? In order to be used in the manner stated above, for the more confirmation of the faith, by investigation of select passages bearing on the Christ that was to come and had now come. The Hebrews were mere infants, in need of milk instead of solid food. He urges them to pass on to full growth, ye without anticipating the course of nature. The passage is one of great importance, and brings out the exact meaning of *Logia* very clearly.

For immediately afterward we have a repetition in other words of the same idea. He says, (6<sup>1</sup>) “Leaving the argument of the origin of the Messiah, let us move on unto full growth.” “The beginning of the Messiah” can be no other than “the elements (or rudiments) of the beginning of *the oracles* of God,” or, the alphabet of the oracles of God. Now, although even the alphabet has a beginning, the usual meaning of *alphabet* is *beginning*, and therefore we are to equate the origin (of the Messiah) with the alphabet (of the oracles of God). It follows that the oracles of God are oracles of the Messiah — that is to say, they are oracles delivered by God concerning the Messiah, discovered by man rightly in the scriptures of the Old Testament. What he says, then, amounts to this: “I have now sketched for you the outline of Messianic teaching in the Old Testament on the person of the Son in relation to angels, of Jesus in relation to Moses, and have begun to deal with His priesthood in relation to Melchizedek. But on this I have much to say and what is hard to *interpret*. I have been dealing with *Logia* throughout, but I am conscious of taxing your dulness; you have in truth never been drilled in the alphabet of *Logia*, in the simplest rules for taking and finding passages on the Old Testament which bear upon Jesus as the Christ. However, I must take you on with me. I must leave the rudimentary *Logia*, assuming your knowledge of them, as I assume your knowledge of the four duties of repentance from dead works and faith in God and baptisms (compared with baptism) and confirmation, and of the two great doctrines of resurrection and judgment. (Διδαχῆς has got shifted from its proper line, where it should be after νεχρωσν.) And I must take you to some more advanced *Logia*.” He has given them some thirteen *Logia* and is going to give as many more. The present passage forms a break in the argument which serves at once as a space for rest and for solemn exhortation. The apology for *his* abstruseness takes the quaint form of an apology for *their* childish dulness.

The last New Testament passage is I Peter 4<sup>11</sup>: “If any man speak, let him speak as speaking oracles of God.” For “man” we are justified here in saying “prophet,” for he has just before said, “Each as he received a gift”; but the gift may be of substance, in which case they are to minister it to one another as good stewards of the manifold grace of God - and equally so if it be of spirit, and then if the gift is of spirit, a prophet is to speak as conscious that he speaks *oracles* of God. Why does the Revised Version make this verse cloudy and difficult? Why does it drag in “speaking as it were oracles of God? This is very unnecessary and harmful. The prophet did speak oracles of God. That was his duty and privilege. To say *as it were* implies that he did not speak oracles of God, but something else requiring no less solemnity and earnestness.

The prophet spoke according to the rules clearly set forth by St. Paul in I Cor. 14<sup>23-33</sup>. He spoke *Logia* in combination with other *Logia* or with recent events, His “revelations” were similar in kind, in *genus* but not in *species*, to the Revelation of St. John the Divine. Here it need only be said that in a passage of any length in the New Testament dealing with the work of the Christian prophets we are likely to find something said concerning *interpretation* or *discrimination*, and accordingly in I Cor. 14<sup>27f</sup> we have the order “let one (only) be interpreter (*διερμηνεύτω* means as *between the two* speakers with tongues, or at the most three who speak in turn), and if there be no interpreter, the person is to be silent in church, speaking only to himself and to God. And as to prophets, let two or three (only) be speaking (in turn), and let the other (prophets) *discriminate*.” The *Logia* required this discrimination, a disentangling of various trains of thought being very necessary when all contexts were apt to be disregarded and prophecies from different authors combined together. \*

\*(It may be worth while to mention here that the absurd term *κυβερνήσεις* (I Cor. 12<sup>28</sup>) translated “governments” — which has no sort of support in the context or anywhere else — is probably nothing more than a miswriting of *ἐρμηνεύσεις*. But some copyists thought he would explain it, and so put in *ἀντιλήψεις κυβερνήσεις*, and read *ἐρμηνεύσεις*, and then verse 28 is simply read over again interrogatively in 29 and 30. The case is then one that proves itself. Then the *χαρίσματα* are altogether set in sharpest contrast with the *ὁδοὶ* of 13<sup>1</sup>; *the Gifts* are all inferior to *the Method* of love.)

That we have no definite declaration by authority of what a *Logion* was is not surprising, considering that it was taken for granted in apostolic times that every reader

knew: and it so happens that only four times is the word mentioned in the New Testament. But the case of Heb. 5<sup>12</sup> makes it abundantly clear. Any Messianic passage of the Old Testament was a *Logion*, and, further, any passage might become a Messianic passage if duly submitted by a prophet speaking in ecstasy according to rule and submitting his revelation to the verdict of the umpires who were also prophets, and receiving their sanction. Gradually this rule was relaxed. It is not hazardous to say that the texts of the Old Testament in St. Peter's speeches, Acts 1-4, were among the earliest *Logia*; likewise Mark 1<sup>2</sup>, 11<sup>9</sup> and 12<sup>10</sup>. There would be the rudiments, the alphabet of *Logia*. But they were the alphabet of a copious language. For it has been demonstrated above, for instance, that not merely several expressions, but substantially every word except “Mary” and except the dreams in the story of the Magi, is from the Old Testament in Greek. But this story would certainly be an example of most advanced study of oracles and it could not have been composed till after the disparagement of dreams had ceased, and after the time when every oracle had to be submitted by a prophet in ecstasy to the discrimination of the other prophets.

*“The Oracles” in Apostolic Fathers and in Philo.*

We now pass to the passages where the term is used in the Apostolic fathers, and for this purpose Lightfoot's *Essays on Supernatural Religion*, Ch. V. should be consulted. Let us take Clem. R. 53. He says, “Ye know and know well the holy scriptures, beloved, and ye have dived into (ἐγγεχύφατε, stooped to look in) the oracles of God; we write these things, therefore, to put you in remembrance.” Lightfoot is urging that *Logia* is a synonym for the scriptures, and says that Clement proceeds to quote Deut. 9<sup>21</sup> and Exod. 32<sup>7</sup>, “of which the point is not any divine precept or prediction, but *the example of Moses*.” Lightfoot is traversing the statement in *Supernatural Religion*, that “*the oracles* was not then at all applied to doing as well as sayings,” and he proves on the contrary that “the oracles” can be found in historical as well as prophetic passages of the Old Testament. But that is not the precise meaning of “the oracles.” The scriptures are not oracles until they are consulted and quoted as need arises. The scriptures are holy, but are not all equally “precious” until the need arises: then, and just so far, they are “oracles.” “Oracles” is a relative term in regard to the person consulting the oracles and receiving what he finds them to give. Oracles need interpretation, as we saw in Heb. 5<sup>11</sup>. We may be permitted to say the “oracles” is subjective, and “scriptures” objective — with the due apology for those much-abused expressions.

Further consideration of all the passages where “oracles” are mentioned will show how entirely this distinction is borne out. In the above passage Clement means, “Let me underline for your guidance the example of Moses.” The writer of Hebrews has said the same: he has underlined thirteen texts. Even the marker of a genealogy of Christ had underlined names of obscure persons in Ruth and Chronicles. The scriptures become oracles when they are found to exhibit traces of the great purpose of God to those who seek it. In quoting Philo perhaps Lightfoot has not done full justice to this subjectivity. Philo is talking of the supreme grandeur of Moses, and he says that from his ancestor Levi’s birth he was “joined to the Lord” alone: in return for which consistent worship God gives Himself as his inheritance. “My argument,” says Philo, “is confirmed by an *oracle* in which it is said —

Deut. 10<sup>9</sup> The Lord himself is his inheritance according as the Lord thy God has promised him.”

This is an instance of the first of Philo’s three classes of oracles, those which proceed “from the very face of God through the divine prophet as interpreter; the second class being of answers after inquiry; the third class proceeding from the face of Moses possessed by inspiration. The unsought promise of God making for the good of men, as Philo says, is surely a very precious passage of scripture, especially for those who benefit directly by it. The other text concerning the mark on Cain is thus introduced: “The death of the fratricide is nowhere found in the law; indeed, there is an *oracle* uttered upon his thus —

The Lord set a mark upon Cain, lest any one finding him should kill him.

Why? I suppose because the impiety is a thing without end.” He then quotes the *Odyssey* and the *Theætetus* in further illustration of the purpose of God. Here the *oracles* on Cain is the correlative to the mark on Cain.

A few more occurrences of the term *oracles* require to be noticed in the Apostolic fathers and Irenæus.

Clement (Cor. 19), after quoting Ps. 51 to show how David obtained a good report, says that his and others’ humility “has through obedience made better not only us ut also the generations before us, even them that *received His oracles in fear and truth.*” This emphasizes the attitude of mind, the conscious effort on the part of the recipients who resolved to accept wholly (χαταδεξαμένους) the fulfilments of

prophecy on which the structure of the Church was raised. No such conscious effort could be required to accept scriptures of the law and the prophets on which their minds had been nurtured.

Polycarp, writing to the Philippians (7) says, “And whosoever confesseth not the testimony of the cross is of the devil: and whosoever perverteth *the oracles of the Lord* to his own lusts, and says that there is nether resurrection nor judgment, he is the firstborn of Satan.” On this Lightfoot strangely observes (p. 174), “How much he included under this expression we cannot say, but it must be observed that he does not write τὰ κυριαχὰ λόγια, *the dominical oracles*, or τὰ λόγια, *the oracles* simply — the two expressions which occur in Papias — but τὰ λόγια τοῦ Κυρίου, *the oracles of the Lord*, which form of words would more directly suggest the Lord as the speaker.” This is going too far, for it maintains that *the oracles of the Lord* is more likely to be a subjective genitive, meaning “oracles spoken by the Lord,” than an objective genitive, “the oracles spoken concerning the Lord.” This cannot be maintained. It seems as if Lightfoot had not considered this point of view — that possibly Logia did not mean *words of Christ* (with or without *dealings*) or anything like it, but scripture passages referring to the Christ and discovered in the Old Testament. He does indeed once say *oracles of* (or, *relating to*) *the Lord*: but there he leaves the latter alternative meaning, which alone is right. And yet all along Lightfoot has been showing (p.173) that the oracles were *the scriptures of the Old Testament* and nothing less or more. Why, then, just when he comes to Polycarp, A.D. 150, does he forget this and think only of the *scriptures of the New Testament*? What if Polycarp was still, as a disciple of John, sufficiently in full touch with them? What if he meant Jesus by the Lord, and when he said *the oracles of the Lord* meant the Old Testament passages concerning the Lord Messiah? If he did so, then all would be perfectly clear. There were always some, like the mockers of 2 Pet. 3<sup>3</sup>, whether Gnostics or not, who perverted the oracles. For instance, here is a passage taken at random to exemplify *the perversion of the oracles of the Lord*. Isa. 41<sup>8</sup>, 43<sup>11</sup> are acknowledged to be Messianic passages; they must belong to the oracles of the Lord. But this is the kind of stuff that the Naassene heresy (of Jewish origin, otherwise called Ophite, worshipping the serpent) makes out of them, according to Hippolytus (Hær. 5<sup>3</sup>), “*When thou passest through rivers* means the impulsive principle; *thou art mine, fear not.*” Again in Ps. 24, “*Who is this king of glory? A worm, and not a man, an outcast of the people: himself is the king of glory and powerful in war. And by war he means the war that is in the body, because its frame has been make out of hostile elements, Remembering (Job 40<sup>27</sup>) the war that is in thy body.*”

“Such, then, is their system” — says Irenæus of another school, the Valentinians — “one that neither prophets announced, nor the Lord taught, nor apostles delivered, but of which they boast they have a complete knowledge beyond all others.” Exactly the same is his meaning in regard to perversion (I. 8<sup>1</sup>): “They (the Gnostics) transpose and transform, and by making one thing out of another they lead many astray by their ill-constructed fancy of *the oracles of the Lord* as they are made to suit the case.” . . . “They want to make *the oracles of God* suit their own fables.” On the other hand, if the oracles were the saying (and doings) of Jesus it is not easy to see how the perversion of them, so repeatedly mentioned, would ever have taken place. The complaint of Polycarp is that the oracles were *perverted to their own lusts*, as few sayings (or doings) of Jesus could possibly be *perverted*. The denial, which Polycarp proceeds forthwith to mention, is a different matter from perversion, and while denial of the resurrection and the judgment could be denial of some of those sayings (and doings), it could equally well, and indeed far more consistently, mean the oracles concerning the Lord which were found in the Old Testament.

*The Apostolic Fathers in their regard for the Old Testament.*

Before, however, we go to Papias himself let us briefly notice the use of scripture by Clement and Barnabas. Clement’s Epistle to the Corinthians consists of about 1,160 lines, of which no less than 346 are quotations with or without notes of quotation (λέγει γὰρ or the like) introducing them: not far short of one-third of the whole is quotation. This enumeration does not take account of many isolated expressions which would reduce the proportion very nearly to half-and-half. But, what is even more remarkable, of the passages quoted the proportion of the New Testament verses to those of the Old Testament and Apocrypha is as seventeen to two hundred and forty-five. Now the number of pages of the Old Testament to the New Testament is three and a half to one, while these quotations show a proportion of the Old Testament to the New Testament of nearly fourteen to one. In the case of the Epistles of Barnabas the disproportion is no less remarkable: one-fourth of the whole contents is quoted matter. But of the quoted matter no less than one hundred and fifty-seven verses are from the Old Testament against eleven from the New Testament, apart from unverified quotations: as fourteen to one.

There is only one explanation of this disproportion as we think it, true proportion as they thought it: the Old Testament was more important to them than the New, which appeared to them in the light of a commentary on the Old, a fulfilment of it,

but in such a way that what was fulfilled was *at that time* more important than what fulfilled it, in point of literature or scriptural value at least. Justin Martyr would not have been content to speak of the Gospels as “memoirs” if he had attributed to them the relative importance which they commanded two centuries later, and fourteen centuries later.

The importance of this fact is enormous when we come to consider the meaning of Papias’s title which we may assume to correspond fairly with the contents of his work. The two works of which we have analyzed the quotations belong to the same date as Papias, and both are epistles, where we expect or are entitled to expect more instruction and exhortation than quotation. But if epistles are crowded with quotation from the Old Testament, what is *an explanation of scriptures* (not so say *oracles*) to be expected to contain? Lightfoot says, “if Papias entitled his work” thus, “there is nothing to show that he did not include narrative portions of the Gospels, as well as discourses; though from the nature of the case the latter would occupy the chief place.” This statement involves two great assumptions, first, that *oracles* in Papias’s title of contents is used in the more comprehensive till it meant nothing more or less than scriptures; secondly, that it must mean words spoken *by* the Lord Jesus (and probably deeds done by Him) instead of meaning words written by the prophets of the Old Testament *concerning* the Lord Christ which were duly fulfilled by the Lord Jesus, so that the whole work in five books amounted to a proof from the prophetic side that Jesus was the Christ, intended to serve as a *vade-mecum* for devotional or meditative or controversial purposes. It would seem that Lightfoot had never thought of this point of view at all. And yet, considering how much of the Gospels and Acts is directed to the Argument from Prophecy, it is antecedently probable that some such work would at the time be in existence.

#### *The Extant Contents of Papias.*

Let us therefore interrogate Papias if we can, and let us assume Lightfoot’s dates for him: born A.D. 60-70. We are not at all concerned to show that the work did not contain acts of Jesus. Upon the theory now propounded it did. In fact, in proportion to the originality of Jesus, if the term may be allowed, “the authority with which He taught,” the saying of Jesus were drawn less from the Old Testament than any man’s sayings. They were His own. The other prophets, whether of the Old Testament or the New Testament, were borrowers of Isaiah, verbally speaking, far more than He was. The theory now propounded is that Papias dealt with fulfilments, and from the

nature of the case these were to be found far more in His acts and sufferings than in His sayings. But in fact, since Lightfoot has said so much concerning His sayings, as if that were the meaning of *oracles*, our path henceforward is rather divergent from his, and it essays a positive result which, should it be established, would throw new light upon the earliest form of the Christian faith. We may take fragments of Papias in the order in which they are given in Lightfoot’s volume, *The Apostolic Fathers*, and make observations on each in succession.

(I, II) Papias was said by Eusebius to be known to be a hearer of John the Divine and Apostle. Eusebius “charges Irenæus with confusion” on this point (Eus., *H.E.* iii. 39; Iren. v. 33, 4) [Lightfoot, *Ign.* i. 426]. This is the author of the Apocalypse. Like master, like pupil. There is no writer of the New Testament who is half so full of the spirit and letter of the Old Testament as he is. The Apocalypse contains five hundred and eighteen quotations from the Old Testament in twenty-two chapters, on a moderate estimate by Westcott and Hort’s list! The “hearing,” if it means discipleship, of such an author was no sort of preparation for a collection of the saying and doings of Jesus, which are hardly referred to or recognized in Revelation. The whole bent of his mind was towards the imagery and phraseology of the Old Testament.

(III, 1, 2) The term ἀρχαῖος ἀνὴρ, applied to Papias, means “an old-fashioned man,” just as Mnason was “an old-fashioned disciple” in the opinion of Luke (Acts 21<sup>16</sup>). Here we have the opinion of Irenæus. As Luke looked back from after A.D. 70 upon the ultra-Jewish Christianity of fifteen years before, when a Christian was at the same time a sincere Jew, and maintained the position described in Acts 2<sup>41-47</sup>, etc., so Irenæus looked back upon Papias who found his great interest in the Old Testament scriptures fulfilled in Christ and only a lesser interest in details of His life apart from such fulfilments. And this accounts too for the *expositions* or *explanations* in the title (unless we suppose, what is far the simplest meaning, that *expositions* are the texts as set forth). There are numerous quotations of the Old Testament that, as applied to Jesus, require explanations, and many such explanations occur in Acts (2<sup>29,34</sup>, 4<sup>25</sup>, 7<sup>37,49</sup>, 8<sup>31 f</sup>). But what is most remarkable about our Gospels is generally the absence of explanations, so that we are surprised to find, e.g., the parable of the Sower followed by an explanation. Irenæus (A.D. 177) wrote a long generation after Papias, very likely two generations, and by that time the canon of the New Testament had become far more settled, and the disproportionate value of the Old Testament (as we think it) was reduced. Irenæus saw the New Testament large while Papias had seen it small, in proportion to the Old Testament.

The next point to notice is that the work, according to Papias’s own statement, consisted of at least two parts: “the interpretations” (ἑρμηνείαις), and “all that he had learnt carefully and remembered carefully in time past from the elders,” which he arranged alongside of the former (σογχατατάξαι). It must be allowed that when Lightfoot translates the last word “to give a place” for you, he hardly does justice to the word. There is *arrangement* in τᾶξαι, there is *orderly* arrangement in χατατάξαι, and there is this *alongside* of something else in σογχατατάξαι. How can justice be done to the expression with less? It seems to imply nothing less than an arrangement in columns, probably three columns: the texts, the interpretations, the comments of the elders (if any). If the first column consisted of our Gospels, as Lightfoot supposes, this would make a somewhat formidable volume, not so much because of the third column as because of the second. For the idea of the saying and acts of Jesus being accompanied by *interpretations* is even more serious than that of *explanations*. However, the two terms, unless we have already disposed of *explanations*, must surely be synonymous, or else — worse still — we should have a Tetrapla, a work in four columns! And five books of it! And all written by a narrow-minded man (says Eusebius), though bishop of the important city of Hierapolis in Phygia. If, however, the text was that of the prophecies fulfilled, it would most natural that it should be attended by *interpretations* (see pp. 83, 102, 293, etc. above) in the second column, and by comments of the elders in a third.

When Papias said concerning Matthew that “he composed the oracles in the Hebrew language, and each (reader) *interpreted* them as he was able,” his meaning was the same that is here given. Besides the translation of the oracles into Greek which many Greek readers would require, the interpretation would be necessary to all readers, that is to say, the application of the Old Testament passage to its environment or event in the life of Christ. It is plain that Papias’s work was an improved edition of “Matthew’s” adapted in an *exposition* (the texts) for Greek scholars by a very scholarly Greek writer, as Jerome has remarked, and accompanied by *interpretations* which were more or less authoritative in consequence of Papias’s diligent inquiries of all who came to him from the headquarters of “the Truth,” and also by “*illustrative traditions*.”

(III, 3, 4) Papias says that he did not care for “those who related *the foreign commandments*.” This is a strange expression, but it derives some light from its correlative expression, “but those which have been given from the Lord to *the faith*.” Now it so happens that we have this very combination, of “*commandments of God* and

*the faith* of Jesus,” in Rev. 14<sup>12</sup>, to “guard which is the endurance of the saints.” Does not this point to the idea that St. John the Divine held the two to be on the same level, and to be inseparable? And so they were then. The (τὰς) “foreign commandments” may be Jewish ordinances of circumcision and lustration; and the contrary includes those authoritative interpretations of the Old Testament passages which set all these aside as the Lord did in Mark 7<sup>19</sup>, “making all things clean.” When Papias was born the Jewish law was not a foreign commandment, but when he wrote it had become so, and this was very largely due to the interpretation of prophecy in accordance with the teaching of Jesus and the belief in Him.

The expression is translated by the author of *The Oracles of Papias* as “the commandments of another man,” but it does not appear to be explained further, and who is supposed to be meant is not stated. If Moses is meant, the sense will be as in the text above. If “any other man than Jesus” is meant, we should expect not ἀλλοτρίας but τῶν ἄλλων. Lightfoot translates “foreign commandments,” omitting “the,” and gives no explanation, so far as I can find. Valois’s (in Routh) “nova quædam et inusitata præcepta” seems quite wrong. The expression seems rather to have escaped notice.

It was quite fatal to the Church to allow the Jewish scriptures to occupy the preponderating place which they occupied for the readers of Clement and Barnabas, unless at the same time the Christian readers were supplied with weapons to convert the Jews, who defended their law in and by those very scriptures. To suppose that the Christian life and experience in the year A.D. 100 with the Greek Bible in its hand was strong enough to convert the synagogue into the Church without careful and considered interpretation would be to take a sanguine view of the difficulties. To suppose that it could do so with the Hebrew Bible instead of the Greek is to assume an utter impossibility. But given, first of all, the Greek Bible, and given, next, those lines of interpretation with which the modern mind is partly familiar, the task, so far as theory went, was capable of achievement and, as we know, was abundantly achieved. I say partly, because a careful search will disclose beneath every page of Acts the Old Testament passages — the oracles — which were actuating the minds of the characters and of the writer to act and to say and to write as we see them doing. For instance, we find that Philip, meditating on the conversion of Egypt, received in ecstasy the angel’s message to go to “the desert.” In either case the trance was accompanied by a train of reasoning which some patience will be required to discover

underlying the materials of the narrative. It will be found that the reasoning follows a line of oracles in every case, for there was nothing else to follow (see pp. 202, 232 n.)

*Translation of some of Papias's Expressions.*

One rubs his eyes at reading in Lightfoot's Translation of Papias (*The Apostolic Fathers, and Essays*, p. 143) the following: "I did not take pleasure in those who have so very much to say, but in those who teach the truth, nor in those who relate foreign commandments, but in those [who record] such as were given from the Lord to the Faith, and are derived from the Truth itself." (Οὐ γὰρ τοῖς τὰς τὰ πολλὰ λέγουσιν ἔχαιρον ὥσπερ οἱ πογγί, ἀγγὰ τοῖς τὰ ληθῆ διδάσχουσιν, οὐδὲ τοῖς τὰς παρὰ τοῦ Κυρίου τῆ πίστει δεδομένας χαὶ ἀπ' αὐτῆς παραγινομένας [-νοῖς] τῆς ἀληθείας.) The last six words are ambiguous. Any English reader who did not refer to the Greek would suppose that Lightfoot meant that the commandment given from the Lord were derived from the Truth. But what Papias says is quite different. He says *those who relate them are derived* — to use Lightfoot's expressions — from the truth itself. But then, again, to say that *persons are derived* from any but their own ancestors is an awkward expression. But again — most important — that is not the meaning of παραγίνεσθαι, which invariably means *arrive*, *come to the side of*, and never once in the New Testament, where it occurs thirty-seven times, does it mean *come from the side of*, or *be derived from*. It is to be feared that the English reader is not the only person who has gone astray here. Translate, "and who came to me straight from the Truth itself," — reading with Gebhardt, Harnack and Zahn παραγινομένοις. If, however, we retain παραγινομένας, we translate "and come to me from the Truth itself." Either the reporters or the reports "come to me," says Papias, or 'used to come.'

And this following of the parallels of the oracles (παραχολουθεῖν, Luke I<sup>3</sup>: see p. 82 above) is exactly in accordance with what Papias says: "For I did not think that I could profit so much from *the (texts) out of the books* (τὰ ἐκ τῶν βιβλίων) as from the (comments upon them) by a living and abiding voice." Once more, a respectful protest must be raised against the omission of *the* by Lightfoot before *books*. To make Papias disparage books generally is hardly fair. Such a generalization is only a translator's confession of ignorance in a case where a slight effort of imagination would have pointed him the way to knowledge. It is only fair to allow Papias, who is throughout maintaining his carefulness in sifting and comparing the statements of eyewitnesses and earwitnesses, to have some consciousness of responsibility; but

then in the same breath to make him disparage “the contents of books” is nothing less than a contradiction. In one place, however, Lightfoot does partly explain himself by a paraphrase, “the capricious interpretations which Papias found in current books” (p. 160). This comes to nothing definite. What Papias means is that *the texts from the books of the Old Testament* by themselves are valuable, but that the descriptions by the Lord’s then surviving disciples of the occasions on which they were fulfilled are still more valuable, including, as they must by hypothesis include, the aforesaid texts. Further, these comments embodying those of Jesus upon selected texts have come to constitute *a body of tradition* (παράδοσις, represented by Papias’s expression δεδομένας παρὰ τοῦ Κυρίου τῇ πίστει) now *attached to the faith* and requiring to be guarded as “the very commandments of God,” in contrast to the old law, which is now become *foreign*. There now appears to be no difficulty whatever in understanding Papias’s position.

(5-7) Eusebius professes to be not quite clear as to the problem of two Johns at Ephesus which he commends to the attention of readers, but he could hardly give more clearly his own opinion that the teacher of Papias was the author of Revelation, and that Papias claims to have heard him with his own ears and to have included his traditions in the five books.

(8-10) The other passages of Papias, in which he records some other wonderful events likewise, as having come down to him by tradition, do not now concern us. Philip’s daughters living at Hierapolis were the medium of two to these, the raising of a corpse and the drinking of poison by Justus Barabbas unharmed.

(11-12). Then it seems that Papias put in his second or third column (παρατέθειται) “some strange parables of the Saviour and teachings of his and some other statements of a rather mythical character,” including a period of some thousand years after the resurrection and a material form of Christ’s kingdom on the earth. After the clear statement by his master in Rev. 20<sup>4f</sup> Papias is not to be blamed for this. Whether the term of a thousand years is predicable of any but a “material” reign is purely a metaphysical question.

(13-14) Then Eusebius judges him a man of very mean capacity, or narrow-minded; but adds that he influenced Irenæus and others because of his old-fashioned character. It was easier for Eusebius in A.D. 300 than for Irenæus and his contemporaries in 180 to discern and characterize the historical phases through which the Christian faith passed in the two first bewildering centuries of its life.

“*Peter’s Instructions.*”

(15) “Peter adapted his instructions to the needs (of his hearers) but had no intention of giving a connected arrangement of the Lord’s oracles” — says Papias. Once more let us translate τῶν κυριαχῶν λογίων, *the oracles about the Lord*. Now this clearly implies that Peter’s *instructions* (διδασκαλίας) had something to do with the *oracles* that he used. We know that he used them freely in Acts. He has employed no less than a dozen prophecies of the Christ, most of which are cardinal supports of our Christian theology to-day. But has it ever been supposed that Peter had designed to write a biography of Christ that would be called a Gospel? There is, indeed in 2Pet. 1<sup>15</sup> (“but I will give diligence that ye may be able at every time also after my decease to call these things to your remembrance”), an intimation that Peter planned the production of some written work. This is the only possible meaning, as Zahn has shown (*Einl.*, ii. P. 47). Now 2 Pet. goes on to give an idea of the sort of work it would be, for he refers to the Transfiguration as an example of the fulfilment of a *prophecy* (2 Pet. 1<sup>20</sup>) namely, Ps. 2<sup>6</sup>, “his holy mountain,” where “the Lord said unto me, Thou art my Son,” etc. This is exactly an instance of *the oracles of the Lord* of which Papias’s work was an *exposition*. Peter did not design to leave behind him even an ordered collection (σύνταξιν) of the oracles, but he may have intended to see that some collection of them was made. The fact is that Mark has preserved three of the twelve oracles quoted in Acts by Peter, many others of the twelve being such as to fall naturally outside the scope of his Gospel. But it is quite possible that the idea ascribed to Peter by the anonymous elder whom Papias reports in this negative way, and claimed by 2 Pet. 1<sup>15</sup> more positively, developed into Mark or Luke and Acts. Also it is possible that the elder was mistaken. In any case it was much more his object to assert the carefulness and the accuracy of Mark than to affirm anything else about him. He assumes that Peter required an interpreter in any case, because (if for no other reason) he was an imperfect scholar in Greek composition. The present writer hopes to have shown in *St. Luke the Prophet* that Luke was the Silvanus who is said in I Pet. 5<sup>12</sup> to be the medium who wrote that Epistle.

*The Oracles of Papias still founded on the Old Testament.*

(16) The next fragment is, “Matthew then composed the oracles in the Hebrew language, and each [reader] interpreted them as he was able.” The usual translation of this statement may perhaps be right, making *interpreted* mean only translated from Aramaic into Greek. But it is a question whether it does not mean a previous or sub-

sequent *interpretation* of sense rather than language. For when “the elder” used the same term, *interpreter of Peter*, as applied to Mark (though we are not told that Matthew’s composition is reported by Papias from the *same* elder), it is quite possible that it meant expositor as much as translator. It is a pure assumption on the part of some persons that the meaning of the statement is generally that our Matthew is a translation from the Aramaic. Our Matthew cannot be called a translation, and again and again it is found to be built up, apart from its quotations from the Old Testament, on the Greek Bible. Of the quotations, those which are peculiar to Matthew (see list in Westcott, *Intr.*<sup>5</sup>, p. 225) are taken into our Matthew from this collection of *the oracles in the Hebrew language*. Here, then, we have the exact limit of the Hebrew (Aramaic) original of our Matthew. And it must be remembered that this statement of Papias is no sort of proof of the authorship of our Matthew.

(IV) The *pericope adulteræ* (John 7<sup>53 ff</sup>) is supposed by Lightfoot to be one of those illustrative anecdotes which Papias derived from the report of the elders, and which he did not scruple to arrange alongside of the interpretations of the oracles, and this is not probable. We need not discuss it further than to say that it belongs to the class of passages where the Law of Moses was “fulfilled,” this time in immediate practice, by Him who “came not to destroy but to fulfil.” This, again, exactly exemplifies the *Exposition of the Oracles Concerning the Lord*. What could be better than this incident to show that “a greater than Moses is here”? Its character, therefore, does throw light upon the nature of *the oracles* as drawn from the Old Testament.

(V-X) We can pass over these references to Papias with two remarks: that Georgius Hamartolus says that Papias mentions John’s death at the hands of Jesus after *fulfilling Christ’s prophecy*. It is one that on every account deserved to be included with the *oracles* concerning the prophet of Nazareth, especially because it fulfils the words applied by Tertullian ©. *Marc.* 4<sup>39</sup>) to apostles killed by the Jews —

Ps. 116<sup>13</sup> I will *drink the cup* of salvation and call upon the name of the Lord. Precious in the sight of the Lord is *the death of his saints* —

And, secondly, that Jerome has bluntly translated Papias as saying “*Books to read* do not profit me so much,” etc., where he has utterly failed to see the point of τὰ ἐχ τῶν βιβλίων, thereby drawing after him much people. The interpolation of “to read” is gratuitous. Then he says, “he has not leisure or power to translate into Latin such important matters as neatly as they are written.” If the *Exposition of the Oracles* had been an explanation of the Gospel accounts, as Lightfoot maintains — “the main

object of the work” — would it not have been a worthy task to have done this, even at a comparative loss of neatness? If, on the other hand, the book was a *purgio fidei* or *vade mecum* of prophecies fulfilled in Christ, it might well have been worth less than Jerome’s while, about A.D. 400, to translate it. Jerome’s statement, therefore, is quite intelligible. No regret need be felt about the loss of the translation by itself, for Jerome has mistranslated Irenæus’s remark about Papias when he said that Irenæus makes Papias a hearer of *the evangelist* John. This is a good instance of the persistent tendency to put the clothes of the apocalyptist on the back of the evangelist.

(XI) The short fragment on “the angels to whom He gave the rule of the administration concerning the earth” would have much more place among *oracles concerning Christ* than among “sayings and doings of Christ.” For it would be an explanation of the original high estate of the angels when they were all *ministering spirits* and all worshipped God (Heb. I<sup>6,7</sup>), as Deut. 32<sup>43</sup> and Ps. 104<sup>4</sup> taught, with the proviso given in Heb. 2<sup>5</sup>; while their fall, which he proceeds to mention, is described in the phraseology of Rev. 12<sup>9</sup>, by Papias’s master. It is quite clear that the fragment might well be an explanation of the saying of Jesus in Luke 10<sup>18</sup>: “I beheld Satan as lightning *fallen from heaven.*” But this would not be enough for this expression itself is a fulfilment of —

Isa. 14<sup>14,17</sup> How doth he fall our of heaven, the morning-star that dawneth betimes! He is *dashed down th the earth*, he who sendeth forth [*his angels*] into all the nations . . . He who maketh *the whole world* desert.

Thus the fragment is equally suitable to either theory of the contents of the book, as Lightfoot would probably have admitted (p. 200).

(XII, XIII) Anastasius of Sinai calls Papias “the Great (ὁ πολύς)” and an expositor, and says that he took all the work of “the six days” as referring to Christ and his Church. This remark does not belong very well to the sayings and doing of Jesus. But it suits well with the idea of Clement of Alexandria (Strom. 5<sup>10</sup>, 6<sup>16</sup>), whose application of Ps. 19<sup>2ff</sup> suggests its use by Papias as an oracle of the Lord. Anastasius considers that Papias is spiritual in regard to his views of paradise, thus differing from Eusebius’s remark above, where he called him materialist.

“*The vine with ten thousand shoots,*” etc.

(XIV) We now come to the well-known passage concerning the vine with ten

thousand shoots, which again Lightfoot supposes to be an illustrative story derived from oral tradition, relating what the elders said that John said that the Lord said, and he would place it in the third column of Papias’s work. There we might leave it, as it would not conflict with our theory. But it is perhaps worth while to point out what may probably be the origin of the idea. In Isa. 7<sup>23</sup> (Greek) after the Immanuel prophecy, the impending punishment by the king of Assyria is predicted. Now we know from Justin Martyr (*Dial.* 77 and 103), that the king of Assyria was identified with Herod; and this idea has been traced back at least as far Acts 12<sup>23</sup> in the New Testament. Then follows the prophecy that “Herod” shall be shaven bare, and every one that is left on the land shall eat (nothing more than) butter and honey.

Isa 7<sup>23</sup>. And it shall be in that day that wherever there are a thousand *vines* of a thousand shekels they shall become earth and thorns.

Now we see that after the devastation of the land in consequence of Herod, who is a form of Antichrist — and this becomes clear from a study of the prophecies in the light of Justin Martyr’s idea — there must follow a Restitution of all things, an ἀποκατάστασις πάντων (Acts 3<sup>21</sup>), in the time of Christ, and so these vines must become far more fruitful than before. Isaiah proceeds in the next two verses to deal with the crops of arable land, just as the Papias fragment does with *wheat*; the harmony of the *animal creation* in the time of Christ follows in Isa. 11, and this last passage is actually transcribed by Irenæus in this connection. May we not infer from Irenæus’s words that he is here concerned to justify Papias, whom he has summoned to his support? This is what Irenæus says: “The Lord said, they shall see who shall come to those (times).” [Thus far is quoted by Lightfoot. But Irenæus proceeds:] “These times then (*ergo*) are prophesied by Isaiah, who says (*Haec ergo tempora prophetans Esaias ait*): The wolf shall feed with the lamb, etc. (as Isa. 11<sup>6-9</sup>, Greek). And again: The wolves, etc. (as Isa. 65<sup>25</sup>). I am not unaware, however, that some persons try to take these verses as eaning wild men, both of divers nations and different works, who believe, and after their belief agree with the righteous. But although this may now be the case with some human beings who come from various nations into the agreement of the faith, still in the resurrection of the righteous it will so happen with the animals, as it has ben said, For God is rich in all things., And it is right that the creation is restored” (here again is a reference to the ἀποκατάστασις πάντων just mentioned) “all the animals shall obey and be in subjection to man” (as Papias said in the passage quoted from him) “and revert to the food originally given by God — for they had been originally subjected in obedience to Adam — namely, the fruits of the earth.

But this is not just the occasion to show that the lion feeds on straw. Still, this shows the size and richness of the fruits: if the lion feeds on straw, what must the wheat be like that produces such straw?”

That Irenæus is led away from his subject, the bodily resurrection, to a digression upon the animals is caused by the last three lines of Papias’s fragment, which deal with the animals. Does it not seem far more probable that Papias himself had been quoting Isa. 11? And is not the *ergo* of Irenæus almost a proof of it? Lightfoot takes the same view (p. 198), but draws no inference from it as to “the main object of Papias’s work.” The point that Lightfoot does not show, and probably it is beyond a man’s power to show it, is how “the interpretation of the sayings and doings of Christ recorded in the written Gospel” is apt to prove “characteristically millennial” (*Essays*, S. R. P. 159). The subject and the predicate here are utterly out of harmony. In other words, Papias’s second column, so to speak, of *interpretations characteristically millennial* would, upon Lightfoot’s theory, be hopelessly incompatible with the text of his first column, the sayings (and doings) of Christ. Had it been possible for the evangelical narratives to be travestied in this characteristically millenarian fashion throughout the space of five books, and had they been so travestied at the hands of the orthodox bishop of Hierapolis, the result would have been to strangle the Christian faith. We must bear in mind that Papias himself, to do him justice, said of this report to the elders, “But these things are credible [only] to them that believe.” It would be hard to deny that Irenæus, who has probably embodied much of the substance of Papias’s work in his own, is himself just as millennial as Papias, as Lightfoot admits (p. 151). He also wrote in five books; but then he is not a professed expositor of the evangelical narratives. On the other hand, there was room for much fantastical interpretation by Papias if he took for this text the prophecies concerning Christ as he found them in the Greek Bible. For instance, Papias reports the elders as saying, “When any of the saints shall have taken hold of one of the clusters, another shall cry, I am a better cluster; takes me, *bless the Lord through me.*” Can there be any doubt that the origin of this is found in the passage just mentioned —

Isa. 65<sup>8</sup> Thus saith the Lord, As the grape shall be found in the cluster, and they shall say, Injure it not, for a blessing is in it, so will I do on account of him that is my servant, for his sake I will not destroy all?

Then follows immediately a very important Messianic passage (Chap. III above, We have seen how almost any *oracle of the Lord Jehovah* was liable to be treated as an

*oracle of the Lord Christ* in the first century. The medium of the Greek Bible is just the element in the problem which Lightfoot has overlooked.

Meanwhile, we are still waiting to see whether Lightfoot has yet supplied us with any fragment of Papias to put into his second column, “the interpretations which explained the text, and which were the main object of the work” (p. 157). The *pericope* is gone (nineteen lines) into the third column. The *vines* (twenty lines) are gone, as being likewise elders’ illustrations. The *Judas fragment* (*seventeen lines*) has yet to be considered, and where will it go?

(XV-XVII) The Messianic feast which Papias mentions is a reminiscence of Rev. 3<sup>29</sup>, etc. But these again are based on older prophecies, such as —

Isa. 9<sup>3</sup> They shall rejoice before thee as they that rejoice in harvest, and like unto them that divide spoils.

Isa. 56<sup>7</sup> I will bring them into *my holy mountain* and gladden them in my house of prayer: *their whole burnt-offerings* and their sacrifices shall be acceptable upon my altar.

(XVIII) The horrible symptoms preceding the death of Judas are partly to be found in Ps. 69<sup>25</sup>, from which passage the quotation in Acts 1<sup>20</sup> is taken, and are partly exaggerations on similar lines (see Ch. VIII). The miserable traitor was to be loaded with such a list of bodily torments as not even the Old Testament vocabulary could provide. Once granted that there was to be a traitor, this heightening of his misery was inevitable. But the position of the fragment, however repulsive — and it seems to be genuine Papias, not the report of elders’ sayings — would be more appropriate or at least intelligible among oracles concerning the Christ than among the saying and doings of Jesus. It could not be claimed for any one of Lightfoot’s three classes, or columns, and he has said nothing about it in the *Essays*. The present theory would find a place for it in Papias’s second column, as an explanation of an oracle in Ps. 69.

(XIX, XX) are of no value to us here.

*Ignatius and St. John on “filtration” of the Church from Judaism.*

To conclude briefly. Lightfoot’s theory is that “Papias, like Irenæus after him, undertook, we may suppose, to stem the current of Gnosticism” (p. 166); perhaps

“he fell into the opposite error, so that his Chiliastic doctrine was tainted by a somewhat gross materialism.” But there is not a single trace of gnosticism as the adversary assailed in Papias’s work. Why go to Irenæus a long generation or two generations later? Why bring in Hippolytus, later still? Why bring in the Ophites? Why suppose or suggest that Papias wrote his work late in life? If he was born A.D. 60-70, then A.D. 120 is a fair average for the date of his writing, and this would be two good generations earlier than Irenæus. There was not much time for Basiides (fl. 117-138, Alexandria) to have become formidable in Hierapolis before that. Lightfooot suggests that because the epithet *foreign* (ἄλλότριος) is applied to the Gnostic teaching by Ignatius (?117 A.D.), it is equally applied to the same in Papias. But if we look at the Ignatian passages we shall doubt this way of putting the case.

Thus (Ign. *Rom.* Pref.) “Ignatius . . . unto them that are filled with the grace of God without wavering and are filtered clear from every *foreign* stain.” Had the Roman Christians, then, come through Gnosticism to Christ, leaving their sediment behind? Not at all, but they had come through Judaism, and a better figure could hardly be employed than *filtration*. Again, “I exhort you — yet not I, but the love of Jesus

Christ — take ye only Christian food, and abstain from *foreign* herbage which is heresy” (Ign. *Tral.* 6). Here, undoubtedly, there is a reference, as elsewhere in this Epistle, to the Docetic heresy which denied the real passion of Christ, a form of Gnosticism indeed, but very different from the wild fancies of Basilideans and Valentinians. But this heresy was quite as much a form of Judaism as of Gnosticism, and it existed long before Gnosticism, having been implicitly rebuked as an error by St. Paul when he said to Festus and to the Jew Agrippa II who believed the prophets (Acts 26<sup>23</sup>), “*how that the Christ must suffer*” — a new word “sufferable,” being coined, we may almost say, to convey this most vital idea. A large class of Jews had always refused to apply the sufferings of Isa 53 to the Christ. Once more (Ign. *Phil.* 3) the same idea occurs: “If any man walketh in a *foreign* doctrine, he hath no fellowship *with the suffering* [of Christ].” In each of these passages, then, it would be truer and clearer to say that the lingering errors of Judaism within the Christian Church were being combated, the process of filtration being still incomplete, and the predominant use of the Old Testament in the epistles of Clement and Barnabas illustrates this incompleteness.

But the use of ἄλλότριος meaning *Jewish*, had begun within the canon of the New Testament (John 10<sup>5</sup>) —

But a *stranger* will they not follow, but will flee from him, for they know not the voice of *the strangers*.

If Ignatius alone concerned the reader, the words should be translated *foreigner(s)*. They are no older than Ignatius. They can only be understood in the light of the second century. The writer of the Gospel is so conscious of this anticipation of history that he says —

This *parable* said Jesus unto them, but *they knew not* what things they were which he spake unto them.

The relation of these *strangers* or *foreigners* (ἄλλότριος) to the Church appears on further study of the *parable*. The *door* through which the shepherd entereth into the sheepyard of the ancient church is the *door of faith* (Acts 14<sup>27</sup>) which God had opened to the Gentiles in the ministry of St. Paul, by contrast with the door of circumcision. Hence, the faith-door is presently identical with the shepherd himself, since faith in Christ is actually Christ Himself: “*which is Christ in you, the hope of the glory*” (Col. 1<sup>27</sup>). This personal union with Christ is expressed by “the sheep hear his voice, and he calleth his own sheep by name and *leadeth them forth*” (ἐάγει, compare the idea of filtration) out of the sheepyard of the Jewish Church. After putting out (ἐχβάλη) all his own sheep, he goeth on the way (πορεύεται) before them, never to return to the sheepyard, but to find pasture elsewhere. Others who go up from elsewhere (ἀναβαίνων ἀλλακόθεν) are thieves and robbers. The covenant of circumcision is done with; only its deadening effect is hinted at: “the thief cometh only to steal and *kill* (θύση) and destroy.” The Fourth Gospel, as Bacon has clearly demonstrated [*the Fourth Gospel in Research and Defence*], is the Pauline Gospel developed. Our bodies are to be presented a living sacrifice (θυσία), says St. Paul (Rom. 12<sup>1</sup>, etc.): the Jewish system would make them a dead sacrifice, would *kill* them (θύση, John <sup>10</sup>).

And still we ask which of the fragments of Papias can, upon Lightfoot’s theory, be placed in the second column of his work — “the interpretations” which “were its main object.” The asking of this question is far from interfering with Lightfoot’s main contention that there were in Papias’s work quotations from our Gospels, while it is here suggested that they were cited by Papias in proof of the fulfilment of the ancient oracles which he explained of the Christ.