

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](https://paypal.me/robbradshaw)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *Journal of Biblical Literature* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_jbl-01.php

THE BIBLE OF THEOPHILUS OF ANTIOCH

ROBERT M. GRANT

SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY, THE UNIVERSITY OF THE SOUTH

IN A time when it is generally recognized that the original text of the Bible cannot be recovered, unless by some lucky chance a New Testament autograph might come from the sands of Egypt, greater emphasis is being laid on families of manuscripts and on the readings current in the time of the fathers. Among the fathers the apologist Theophilus, bishop of Antioch at the end of the second century, must be regarded as a significant witness. He is the first Christian writer to reproduce pages of the Old Testament; he quotes extensively from the New Testament; and his theological outlook is based on the Bible. His testimony is important not only in regard to the text but also in regard to the canon of scripture. We shall also discuss the way in which he interprets the chronological data of the Old Testament.

I. OLD TESTAMENT

Like many other apologists for Judaism and Christianity, Theophilus bases his arguments chiefly on a single foundation, the inspiration and accuracy of the friend and prophet of God, Moses. It was Moses who under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit described the creation of the world (III 25), the true cosmogony; it was Moses who was a minister of the divine law^{*} which was ordained by God (III 9, 23).

The cosmogony is written in "the book entitled *Γένεσις κόσμου*" (II 29). To Maranus, whose notes are reprinted in

^{*} But God is the *νομοθέτης*, not Moses as in Cleodemus-Malchus and Josephus. The author of *Περὶ ὕψους* (c. 40 A. D.) calls Moses *ὁ τῶν Ἰουδαίων θεσμοθέτης*; see H. Mutschmann in *Hermes* 52 (1917), 161-200.

the Migne edition of Theophilus,² reference to a book of the Bible seemed out of place here, for Theophilus says that "the matters concerning them (Cain and Abel) have a fuller narration, not to mention the constitution of exegesis; therefore the book itself which is entitled *The Genesis of the Cosmos* can teach students the details of the narrative." The difficulty with this statement is that Theophilus goes on to tell the narrative in some detail, and to provide some exegesis. But still more detail is given in the book of Genesis itself (chapter 4), and it will be observed that Theophilus does not say that exegesis will be found there. Moreover elsewhere he does not refer to his own works in this way³ and he is eager for Autolyclus to read the inspired scriptures (III 1). The title *Γένεσις κόσμου* is unusual, but is found at the beginning of the fifth-century Codex Alexandrinus of the Septuagint, a manuscript with which Theophilus' readings occasionally agree, at the beginning of a tenth-century manuscript at Venice⁴ and at the end of a third-century papyrus codex which contains Gen 1 1—35 s.⁵

An examination of the text of Gen 1 1—3 19 (Theophilus II 11, 19–21) reveals no special tendency in Theophilus' version, but out of approximately 60 instances in which Theophilus' variants from the text as given by Rahlfs agree with other manuscripts, seventeen agreements are with manuscripts which Rahlfs regards as "Lucianic," ten of these being with the cursive manuscript 75,⁶ a manuscript which Rahlfs⁷ calls "in der Genesis . . . Vertreter des Lukian-textes." The "Lucianic" text of the Septuagint was for many centuries regarded as the work of the martyr-scholar of Antioch, Lucian (d. 312), but recent studies have shown that it was known to Josephus. "Who was the real author of this Antiochene recension of the Alexandrine Bible, and how

² Migne, *PG* 6 (1857), 199.

³ Theophilus II 28, 30, III 3, 19.

⁴ 121 Holmes-Parsons = "y" Brooke-McLean.

⁵ H. A. Sanders-C. Schmidt, *The Minor Prophets in the Freer Collection and the Berlin Fragment of Genesis* (1927), 559:29.

⁶ Oxford Univ. Coll. 52, written about the year 1125. Brooke-McLean call it "n."

⁷ *Septuaginta I. Genesis* (1926), 28.

much older it may be than Josephus, we do not know."⁸ It was current in the fourth century from Antioch to Constantinople, according to Jerome.⁹ But since we possess only one manuscript of Theophilus, and since his agreement with the Lucianic text is only about 30 percent in this long quotation, no certain conclusion as to his use of it is possible.

Where his text in Genesis is in disagreement with all the manuscripts collated by Rahlfs or Homes-Parsons, the extent of his agreement with the readings of other church fathers is negligible. Out of eighteen examples, however, four are in agreement with Arabic versions; but this proportion is too low to be significant, and in any case the Arabic text is "singularly mixed."¹⁰

As for Exodus, in II 35 Theophilus quotes the last five of the ten commandments of the "holy law," though in the Deuteronomic order (Deut 5 18–19). In III 9 Theophilus gives "ten headings of the great and marvelous law which serves for all righteousness." One would expect to find the Decalogue; but instead Theophilus quotes *περὶ εὐσεβείας* the first two commandments, omitting the third and fourth on swearing and Sabbath-keeping. *Περὶ τοῦ καλοποιεῖν* he gives the fifth; *περὶ δικαιοσύνης* the sixth, seventh (Deuteronomic order), eighth, ninth and tenth. To fill up the required ten he quotes three verses (6–8) of Ex 23: "Thou shalt not wrest the judgement, keep thee far from every unjust word; the innocent and righteous thou shalt not slay; thou shalt not justify the impious man or accept a gift; for gifts blind the eyes of those who see and pervert just words." Whether these "commandments" are to be divided after "word" or "slay" is uncertain, but in any case a two-fold division must be made in order not to exceed the total of ten.

In Judaism the Decalogue was ordinarily divided into two tables of five commandments each. Some such arrangement underlies the arrangement of Theophilus, who divides the first group into *περὶ εὐσεβείας* and *περὶ τοῦ καλοποιεῖν*; the second

⁸ H. St. J. Thackeray, *Josephus the Man and the Historian* (1929), 67.

⁹ *Praef. in libr. Paralipomenon*, Migne, *PL* 28, 1392 f.

¹⁰ F. C. Burkitt in Hastings, *Dictionary of the Bible I*, 137.

group are *περὶ δικαιοσύνης*. A similar division is to be found in Philo¹¹ who points out that the fifth commandment (honoring one's parents) is placed on the dividing line between the two groups of five, the first of which includes the most sacred commandments while the second sets forth those which require justice to men. But the division Theophilus makes, into three and seven, is difficult to understand, especially since in II 35 the last five are quoted in a slightly abbreviated form, and no allusion is made to Ex 23 6-8.

It was customary in the early church to reinterpret the Decalogue, since it was regarded as the permanently binding law which God gave to the true Israel on Sinai.¹² Ptolemaeus¹³ called it the pure legislation of God, the law of God, "those ten words divided into two tables, for the forbidding of things not to be done and the injunction of things to be done." Similarly Irenaeus¹⁴ states that without observance of the Decalogue salvation is impossible. Theophilus' combination of the "judgements" of Ex 21-23 with the Decalogue can be paralleled in the third-century Syrian *Didascalia Apostolorum*.¹⁵ The law is "the Decalogue and the judgements which the Lord spoke before the people made a calf and committed idolatry."¹⁶

As for the rest of the Old Testament, Theophilus does not quote any other books of the Pentateuch, and outside the Psalms (of David) and the Proverbs (of Solomon) he quotes only the prophets. In the first book he quotes directly only Prov 24 21-22 under the title *ὁ νόμος ὁ τοῦ θεοῦ*. (I 11). This of course is a general classification, and is not intended to be more precise than the reference to Is 28 11 f. as "in the law" in I Cor 14 21. Elsewhere in the first book he often alludes to or quotes from the Psalms, sometimes combining them with phrases from prophetic books.

¹¹ *Decal.* 106.

¹² See my article, "The Decalogue in Early Christianity" (*HTR* 40 [1947] 1-17).

¹³ Epiphanius, *Haer.* xxxiii. 5. 3 (I, 454 Holl).

¹⁴ Irenaeus, *Adv. haer.* iv. 14. 3 (II, 186 Harvey).

¹⁵ *Didasc. apost.* 26 (p. 219:15 Connolly).

¹⁶ Something like this idea is already found in Barnabas iv. 8.

In the second book he quotes from and names the Law (Exodus), David (Psalms), Solomon (Proverbs), Hosea, Habakkuk, Malachi, Isaiah and Jeremiah. The quotations are usually somewhat free, and often attempt to improve the style of the Septuagint.

In the third book Theophilus quotes by name from the Law (Exodus), David (Psalms), Solomon (Proverbs), Joel, Zechariah, Isaiah, Jeremiah and Ezekiel. Here the quotations are somewhat closer to the ordinary text of the Septuagint, though freedom is still preserved. In the chronography, of course, there are also allusions to Genesis, Judges, Kingdoms III and IV (I and II Kings) and perhaps Ezra.¹⁷ Zechariah was the last of the prophets (III 23); the prophet Daniel was a contemporary of Jeremiah (III 29).

In all these citations the attempt to establish a single type of text for Theophilus' Septuagint is a failure. A. Rahlfs¹⁸ remarks on the list of Assyrian kings in II 31, "Here he has combined Is 37 38 with the Lucianic text of Kingdoms IV 17 4." But as Rahlfs¹⁹ himself admits in regard to Irenaeus, Clement, Origen, Hippolytus and the *Didascalia*, "the situation here is like that in Josephus; there are single Lucianic readings, but the completed Lucianic type, as we know it from our Lucianic manuscripts, is not yet in evidence."

Theophilus' division of the Old Testament into groups of books is of considerable interest. In his *De Vita Contemplativa* 25, Philo mentions "laws, and oracles delivered by prophets, and hymns and the other (writings) by which knowledge and piety are mutually increased and perfected." Here we find the tripartite division into the law, the prophets, and the writings, which was common in Judaism, rabbinic and Hellenistic alike. The possibly Antiochene evangelist Luke²⁰ quotes Jesus as making a division into the Law of Moses, the prophets, and the psalms, where the psalms stand for, but do not alone constitute,

¹⁷ Theophilus III 25, note 21 Otto.

¹⁸ *Septuaginta-Studien* 3 (1911), 114 f.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, 138.

²⁰ Lk 24 44.

the "writings." In a work which Theophilus knew, Josephus²¹ gives the following classification: five books of Moses (the laws and the earliest traditions), thirteen prophets, and four books of hymns and practical precepts.²² Another list of "the books of the Old Covenant" is provided by Theophilus' contemporary Melito, bishop of Sardis.²³ He lists five books of Moses; then a group consisting of Joshua, Judges, Ruth, four books of Kingdoms, two of Chronicles, Psalms of David, Proverbs (Wisdom) of Solomon, Ecclesiastes, Song of Songs, and Job; and finally the prophets — Isaiah, Jeremiah, the twelve in one book, Daniel, Ezekiel and Esdras. This list obviously has nothing to do with the Jewish lists we know from other sources, and entirely disregards the tripartite division which Theophilus, following Josephus, retains.

Only the Law, the Prophets, and the hymns and practical precepts are cited by Theophilus, except in two instances, both in Book III. In III 12 Theophilus quotes Jer 6 16, substituting *ανάπαυσις* for *ἀγνισμός* and thus ending the quotation in the manner of Matt 11 29.²⁴ Then he goes on, "Judge a just judgement, for in these matters is the will of the Lord your God." This first clause is from Zech 7 9, but not the rest. In *Apostolic Constitutions* ii. 35 (p. 64 Lagarde) the first clause is followed by the apocryphal saying of Christ, "Be approved money-changers." This inclines one to suppose that the verse in Theophilus is also apocryphal, from some apocryphal book of prophecy such as the pseudo-Ezekiel²⁵ which Clement of Rome and Clement of Alexandria used, or the apocryphal Jeremiah which Jerome knew, containing Matt 27 9. This apocryphal Jeremiah, which a Jew of the Christian Nazarene sect brought to Jerome's attention, was written in Hebrew,²⁶ but need not have been known

²¹ *Contra Apionem* i. 38-41.

²² On the content of each group see H. E. Ryle, *The Canon of the Old Testament* (1893), 165 f.

²³ Eusebius, *HE* iv. 26. 14.

²⁴ A. Resch, *Agrapha: aussercanonische Evangelien-fragmente* (1889), 51.

²⁵ C. Bonner, *The Homily on the Passion by Melito Bishop of Sardis and Some Fragments of the Apocryphal Ezekiel* (1940), 183-90; K. Holl, *Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Kirchengeschichte II. Der Osten* (1927-28), 33-43.

²⁶ Jerome, *Comm. in Matt.* xxvii. 9, *PL* 26, 213.

to Theophilus in that language. The verse Matt 27 9 is a curious combination of Zech 11 12-13 and Jer 18 1-2.²⁷ It is introduced by the expression, "Then was fulfilled that which was spoken through Jeremiah the prophet." Just so Theophilus introduces his combination of verses from Jeremiah and Zechariah under the heading "Jeremiah," and alters "purification" of the Septuagint version to "rest" as in Matt 11 29. The most probable conclusion, then, is that both the evangelist and Theophilus made use of a version of Jeremiah which had been altered from the ordinary version which we possess. The reason for these alterations cannot always be determined, though in the case of Matt 27 9 it was obviously to provide Old Testament proof of the foretelling of Judas' throwing away the thirty pieces of silver. This section is peculiar to Matthew, as in the earlier verse (11 29) which is apparently parallel to Pseudo-Jeremiah.

The other instance is to be found in III 19, where Theophilus derives Noah's Greek name, Deucalion, from his saying *Δεῦτε, καλεῖ ὑμᾶς ὁ θεὸς εἰς μετανοίαν*. The idea that Noah preached repentance is a common Jewish notion based on Gen 6 6,²⁸ and found among Christian writers in II Pet 2 5, I Clement 7 6, 9 4, and *Orac. Sib.* i, 128 ff. None of them but Theophilus, however, equated Noah with Deucalion;²⁹ and Theophilus alone puts forward this etymology. Whether he made it up himself or took it from some apocryphal book cannot be ascertained.

One other book, which Theophilus never quotes, but whose influence pervades his writings, is the Hellenistic-Jewish Wisdom of Solomon. This work, apparently composed in the first century B.C. (or A.D.) was known possibly to the evangelist Matthew³⁰ and to St. Paul, probably to the *auctor ad Hebraeos*³¹ and certainly to Clement of Rome.³² In the second century it was used

²⁷ S. E. Johnson in *HTR* 36 (1943), 140.

²⁸ See F. Spitta, *Der zweite Brief des Petrus und der Brief des Judas* (1885), 146.

²⁹ Justin, *Apol.* ii. 6(7) also does so; cf. Philo, *Praem.* 23.

³⁰ Matt 27 43.

³¹ Hebr 1 3, 3 3 f., 4 12, etc.

³² I Clement 3 4, 27 5.

by Irenaeus,³³ Clement of Alexandria (many times), and the author of the Muratorian fragment, who says that it was composed "ab amicis Salomonis." Possibly this is an error of the manuscript's very clumsy copyist or translator for ὑπὸ Φίλωνος, as S. P. Tregelles³⁴ suggested. Jerome³⁵ says that some ancient writers stated that it was a work of Philo Judaeus.

Theophilus refers to Solomon as "prophet" (II 10) and as "king and prophet" (III 13), and mentions "the surpassing wisdom which Solomon had" (III 22). This reminds us of the term "all-virtuous Wisdom" which, according to Eusebius,³⁶ Irenaeus "and the whole chorus of ancients" used in referring to the book of Proverbs. In his list of books in the Jewish canon Melito³⁷ calls the Proverbs of Solomon ἡ καὶ Σοφία. A possible solution of these difficulties is that at the end of the second century Wisdom was coming to be regarded as scripture by Christians and as apocryphal by Jews, who never accepted it and identified the name "Wisdom" with Proverbs. Theophilus, influenced both by Jewish and Christian teachers, does not venture to quote it as scripture, but he knows the book.

Its influence can be traced above all in Theophilus' doctrine of creation, where the universe was made by God's Logos and Sophia (Wisdom 9 1-2). But there are other less obvious parallels. Sophia is a spirit (1 6; Theophilus I 7), and as a spirit it is very subtle (7 23; Theophilus II 13); it is the breath of God (7 23; Theophilus I 7). The Spirit of the Lord fills the world and embraces everything (1 7; Theophilus I 5), and is in all things (13 1; Theophilus II 4). In regard to man, God made him for incorruption and gave him an immortal soul (2 25; Theophilus I 8, II 19: "most persons say"), but through envy of the devil (the serpent in Eden) death entered the world (2 24; Theophilus II 29). Though Sophia rescued Adam from his transgression (10 1), Cain fell away in anger and perished (10 3; Theophilus II 30). God did not make death (1 13; Theophilus II 25). Theo-

³³ Eusebius, *HE* v. 8, Irenaeus, *Adv. haer.* iv. 38. 5 (II, 296) = Wisdom 6 20.

³⁴ *Journal of Classical and Sacred Philology* 2 (1855), 37.

³⁵ *Praef. in libr. Salomonis*, PL 28, 1308.

³⁶ *HE* iv. 22. 9.

³⁷ *HE* iv. 26. 14.

philus' idea of God is also in many respects similar to that of the author of Wisdom: God loves all things (11 24; Theophilus I 3); we know God as the craftsman from his works (13 1; Theophilus I 5 f.) and their beauty (13 3; Theophilus I 6). And God's providence guides mankind (14 3; Theophilus I 5, III 8). In this connection both Wisdom and Theophilus attack idolatry (13 10; Theophilus I 10).

It is evident that some of these parallels could be merely ordinary expressions of Hellenistic Jews, like the names and attributes of God common to Wisdom and Theophilus.³⁸ But it seems probable that, like other second-century Christians, Theophilus knew and was strongly influenced by this work of "the prophet Solomon," though he is slightly hesitant about the immortality of man's soul.³⁹

II. NEW TESTAMENT

The importance of Theophilus' knowledge of the New Testament lies in the fact that with the exception of Serapion, bishop of Antioch in the decade after him, he is the only witness we have for the canon at Antioch in the late second century. In the time of Ignatius (c. 115) the Gospel of Matthew had certainly been known there, as well as the theology we call Johannine. Ignatius also seems to have made use of I Corinthians and Ephesians, and it is not improbable that he knew a collection of ten Pauline letters. But as C. C. Richardson⁴⁰ points out it is difficult to determine with certainty whether he knew more than I Corinthians. Ignatius does not quote directly from any documents. His references are never more than allusions.

Theophilus' use of the Pauline letters is somewhat different. He uses ten Pauline phrases in his first two books:

³⁸ See R. Marcus, "Divine Names and Attributes in Hellenistic Jewish Literature," *Proc. Amer. Acad. for Jewish Research* 2 (1931-32), 45-120. On the content of Wisdom see J. Fichtner in *ZNW* 36 (1937), 113-32.

³⁹ Compare II 19 with I 8. On this whole problem see L. Dennefeld, *Der alttestamentliche Kanon der antiochenischen Schule* (Freiburg, 1909).

⁴⁰ *The Christianity of Ignatius of Antioch* (1935), 61 f.

1. δοκιμάζοντες τὰ διαφέροντα (Theophilus I 2; Rom 218; Phil 1 10)
2. ἡ πολυποικίλος σοφία τοῦ θεοῦ (I 6, also II 16; Eph 3 10)
3. ὑπὸ θεοῦ τεταγμένος (I 11; Rom 13 1)
4. τὸν πλοῦτον τῆς σοφίας τοῦ θεοῦ (II 12; Rom 11 33 Vulgate [not Iren.], Novation, Hilary)
5. διὰ . . . λουτροῦ παλιγγενεσίας (II 16; Tit 3 5-6)
6. τὰ ἐπίγεια φρονούντων (II 17; Phil 3 19)
7. τὰ ἄνω φρονούντες (II 17; Col 3 2)
8. δύναμις ὧν καὶ σοφία αὐτοῦ (II 22; I Cor 1 24)
9. πρωτότοκον πάσης κτίσεως (II 22; Col 1 13)
10. κληρονομήσαι τὴν ἀφθαρσίαν (II 27; I Cor 15 50)

Some of these passages might possibly be derived from the popular philosophy of the day, but when taken together they show that Theophilus was acquainted with a collection of Pauline letters, probably including the Pastoral Epistles.

Another passage quoted from the Pauline epistles by Theophilus is Rom 2 6-9 (I 14) with which is combined the apocryphal verse cited in I Cor 2 9, a verse which was popular in the second century.⁴² Outside the verses and phrases already mentioned there are several other reminiscences of St. Paul in Theophilus, mostly from the Corinthian epistles. It is probable that the expression ἔχοντες τὸν νοῦν κατεφθαρμένον in I 1 comes from II Tim 3 8, since Theophilus probably knew the Pastorals.⁴³ In I 7 "put off the mortal and put on incorruption," is from I Cor 15 53 f. In I 13 the phrase ταῦτα δὲ πάντα ἐνεργεῖ is also Pauline (I Cor 12 11), though St. Paul calls τὸ ἐν καὶ τὸ

⁴² It is quoted, whether from I Corinthians or not, in I Clement 34 8; II Clement 11 7 (where "promises" is the antecedent), *Mart. Polyc.* 2 3, the Baruch-book of the Ophite Justin (Hippolytus, *Ref.* v. 26), and referred to in II Clement 14 5. It is of course based on Is 64 4.

⁴³ It may be said in passing that since the three Pastoral Epistles were regarded as not only Pauline but also in some sense scripture by Theophilus (III 14, quoted below) soon after 180, then are not likely to have been composed against Marcion as recently as 160, where some recent criticism dates them. On the reason for their omission from the Beatty papyri see H. A. Sanders in *AJP* 58 (1937) 370-72.

αὐτὸ πνεῦμα what Theophilus refers to as ἡ τοῦ θεοῦ σοφία. The example of the seed which dies in order to rise (I 13) is doubtless either from I Cor 15 36-37 or Jn 12 24. In II 1 there is probably a reminiscence of I Cor 1 18, 21, 23 which is the same as the *μωρίαν δὲ εἶναι τὸν λόγον ἡμῶν* in III 4. The phrase *ιδιώτης τῷ λόγῳ* in II 1 comes from II Cor 11 6. The words *ἀληθῆ καὶ δίκαια καὶ προσφιλῆ* used to describe the teachings of the Sibyl in II 36 are taken from Phil 4 8, where they occur in the same order. Finally, Theophilus refers to II Cor 11 19 in III 4: *φρόνιμος γὰρ ὧν ἡδέως μωρῶν ἀνέχη*.

Did Theophilus regard the Pauline letters as scripture? Harnack⁴³ devoted an article to arguing that he did not. Syrian evidence of the third century seemed to show that the Pauline epistles were not regarded as scripture, and the later bishop of Antioch, Serapion, is not clear as to what books should be read in church. Harnack distinguished between Book I and II where there is no explicit quotation and Book III, where in chapter 14 Theophilus seems to refer to a combination of I Tim 2 1-2, Titus 3 1, and Rom 13 7-8 as *ὁ θεῖος λόγος*. Against such an equation Harnack's strongest arguments were that 1) Theophilus never cites Paul as scripture although he knows his letters. 2) The point of Theophilus' argument here is that the writings of the prophets and the gospels are joined with the law. 3) In I 11 Theophilus cites a Pauline phrase (Rom 13 1) but proves his point by Prov 24 21-22. 4) Similarly in III 14 Paul and scripture are both given. This argument may be answered as follows: 1) Theophilus does refer to the Pauline letters as "the divine word," and does so here; his expression *θεῖος λόγος* may be compared with the *ιερός λόγος* which Philo uses of Scripture. 2) For the purposes of Theophilus' argument among the prophets are included the evangelists (II 34), and since the only evangelists he knows well, Matthew and John, are apostles, Paul could easily be included among them. Furthermore the apostles are considered to be prophets by his contemporary Clement of Alexandria.⁴⁴ 3) Harnack himself pointed out that here we are deal-

⁴³ "Theophilus von Antiochia und das Neue Testament" (*ZKG* 11 [1889-90] 1-21).

⁴⁴ *Strom.* v. 6. 38.

ing with three different writings; and here Theophilus' point is that by praying for the emperor one does God's will. This point is not made by St. Paul in Rom 13; it is made in Prov 24 4. The passage in question reads (III 14):

And in regard to our benevolence not only to our co-religionists, as some think, Isaiah the prophet said (66 5), *Say to those who hate you and cast you out, Ye are our brethren, that the Lord's name may be glorified and appear in their joy.* The gospel (Matt 5 44, 46): *Love, it says, your enemies and pray for them that persecute you. If ye love them that love you, what reward have ye? This also the thieves and publicans do.* And it teaches those who do good not to boast, lest they be man-pleasers. *Let not, it says, thy left hand know what thy right hand doeth,* (Matt 6 3). And further the divine word commands us to *be subject to rulers and authorities* (Tit 3 1) and to *pray for them that we may lead a tranquil and quiet life* (I Tim 2 1-2). And *it teaches to render to all all (their dues),⁴⁵ honor to whom honor (is due), fear to whom fear, tribute to whom tribute; and not to owe any man anything, save alone to love all* (Rom 3 7).

Here the words *ἔτι μὴν καὶ* show that the divine word from the Pauline epistles is on approximately the same level as prophet and gospel quoted before.

Thus Theophilus seems to have known a collection of Pauline epistles which included at least Romans, I and II Corinthians, Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians and the three Pastoral Epistles. He regarded them as inspired, though not as authoritative as the Old Testament.

Did Theophilus know Hebrews? Two passages in II 25 have been thought to indicate his use of it; but the phrase *στερεὰ τροφή* might come from Hebr 5 12 but could equally well, if not better, be due to observation. And while the sentence *εἰ δὲ χρῆ τὰ τέκνα τοῖς νονεῖσιν ὑποτάσσεσθαι, πῶς μᾶλλον τῷ θεῷ καὶ πατρὶ τῶν ὄλων* somewhat resembles Hebr 12 9, it is a Stoic commonplace.⁴⁶ The expression "fire" used of God in a rhetorical passage in I 3 need not, of course, come from Hebr

⁴⁵ It is a question whether τὰ πάντα ought not to be emended following Rom 13 7 to τὰς ὀφειλάς, which is required in the construction τῷ τὴν τιμὴν τὴν τιμὴν, etc.

⁴⁶ Compare Epictetus, *Diss.* ii. 10. 7.

12 29; it reflects Deut 4 24. Two passages adduced by Jacquier seem entirely irrelevant.⁴⁷

Of the Catholic Epistles Theophilus has very vague echoes from I and II Peter:

1. τῆς ἀθεμίτου εἰδωλολατρίας (Theophilus II 34)
ἀθεμίτοις εἰδωλολατρείαις (I Pet 4 3)
2. φαίνων ὡσπερ λύχνος ἐν οἰκῆματι
συνεχομένῳ (Theophilus II 13)
ὡς λύχνῳ φαίνοντι ἐν αὐχμηρῷ τόπῳ (II Pet 1 19)
3. οἱ δὲ τοῦ θεοῦ ἄνθρωποι, πνευματοφόροι πνεύματος ἁγίου
καὶ προφήται γενόμενοι (Theophilus II 9) οὐ γὰρ θελή-
ματι ἀνθρώπου ἠρέχθη προφητεία ποτέ, ἀλλ' ὑπ' πνεύ-
ματος ἁγίου φερόμενοι (II Pet 1 21) ἐλάλησαν ἀπὸ θεοῦ
ἄνθρωποι.

He does not know them intimately if he knows them at all. There are no references to the Johannine epistles or the Apocalypse, which according to Eusebius he used in writing against Hermogenes, except for the identification of serpent, Satan, and dragon in II 28, which probably reflects Apoc 12 9.

As for the Gospels, Theophilus seems to know Matthew, John, and Luke, though he prefers the apostolic gospels of Matthew and John. The sayings of Christ quoted from Matthew are not quoted merely as sayings of the Lord⁴⁸ but as from "the gospel" or "the gospel" (εὐαγγέλιος) voice" (III 14, 16). The phrase "gospel voice" is also to be found in Clement,⁴⁹ but neither the adjective εὐαγγέλιος nor the noun is used of a book by any earlier Christian author except Justin.⁵⁰ From the gospel of Matthew Theophilus quotes five verses to show the high morality of Christians. Like other apologists he cites freely; he ameliorates the rigor of Matt 5 28 by adding "another's" to "Everyone looking on a woman to desire her has already com-

⁴⁷ E. Jacquier, *Le Nouveau Testament dans l'église chrétienne* i (1911), 225: Hebr 6 7 in II 16 and I 1; Hebr 3 7 in I 11.

⁴⁸ As, e.g., in Ptolemaeus' *Epistle to Flora*.

⁴⁹ *Paed.* i. 8. 71.

⁵⁰ *Apol.* i. 66. 3.

mitted adultery with her in his heart;" he reverses the order of the Lord's commands in 5 32; with Codex Bezae he substitutes "despitefully use" for "persecute" in 5 44; he adds "thieves" to the "publicans" of 5 46; and he makes explicit by adding "hand" to the "left" and "right" of 6 3. There is no reason, however, to assume the existence of a special variety of text which he is using, for all the apologists make alterations.

The quotation in II 13, τὰ γὰρ παρὰ ἀνθρώποις ἀδύνατα δυνατά ἐστὶν παρὰ θεῷ might possibly be Theophilus' own improvement of Matt 19 26, but it is much closer to Lk 18 27, and should probably be regarded as a witness to Theophilus' knowledge of that gospel.

Theophilus' quotation of John has occasioned a considerable controversy. It is not that he ends Jn 1 3 at the words οὐδὲ ἔν, for so do the Syriac, Old Latin, and Sahidic versions, as well as Irenaeus, Clement, Origen, Tertullian and the Valentinians. It is the manner of his quotation.

II 22: When God wanted to make what he had planned, he begot this λόγος προφορικὸς, the firstborn of all creation (Col 1 15), not always conversing with his Logos. Whence the holy scriptures and all the inspired men, (one) of whom John says: *In the beginning was the Logos, and the Logos was with God*, showing that originally God was alone with the Logos in him. Then he says, *And the Logos was God; all things came into being through him, and without him nothing came into being.*

Here we have a quotation from a book, and one written by the inspired man John. It is the first explicit quotation from John in the history of Christianity.⁵¹ Theophilus was far from being profoundly influenced by the Fourth Gospel; as J. N. Sanders⁵² points out, "A little further on he equates *Logos* and *Spirit* in a passage . . . (II 10) which seems to show that he had not fully grasped the teaching of the Fourth Gospel on this point."⁵³ For

⁵¹ See my article in *HTR* 35 (1942) 95-116, where however Theophilus is not discussed.

⁵² *The Fourth Gospel in the Early Church* (1943), 36.

⁵³ But the New Testament of Theophilus was not limited to the Fourth Gospel; his concept is based on II Cor 3 7.

Theophilus the gospel is on the same level, more or less, as the scriptures; it too is prophetic and inspired; but it is not quite itself scripture. In III 12 Theophilus regards the Law as the highest authority and goes on to prove that the writings "of the prophets and of the gospels" agree with it, because of the fact that "all the inspired ones have spoken by one spirit of God." We may compare the mention of "the Law and the Prophets and the others who followed after them" and similar phrases in the Greek prologue to the Wisdom of Jesus ben Sira.⁵⁴ Josephus, as has been observed, also makes a three-fold division in *Contra Apionem* i. 58-41: the five books of Moses, and "prophets after Moses," and four other books containing "hymns to God and precepts for human life." It is this last group, the "writings," to which in Theophilus' mind the gospels and the Pauline epistles are more or less equivalent. As E. J. Goodspeed⁵⁵ says, Theophilus' view of the Fourth Gospel is "evidently transitional," but his classification must be ascribed to Jewish models, especially Josephus, and to his own strong individualism. It is not derived from the tradition of the Antiochene church. That this is the case may be observed in a letter of the later bishop Serapion. On a visit to the nearby church of Rhosus Serapion was asked by a group there to allow the public reading of the Gospel of Peter. He merely glanced at the book and gave his permission. On his return to Antioch the more orthodox members of the community at Rhosus wrote him a letter informing him that the gospel had originated among the Docetists ("seemists" in regard to Christ's incarnation). Serapion at once obtained a copy from Docetists at Antioch and upon going through it with care found that most of it was from the "true teaching of the Saviour," but that there were certain accretions, which he listed at the end of his pastoral letter. He advised the community to expect him immediately.⁵⁶ Unfortunately we do not know the result of his visit though critics have assumed that it ended the use of the gospel at Rhosus. It is clear, however, that the gospel was read in church there after Serapion's first visit, if

⁵⁴ H. E. Ryle, *op. cit.*, 143.

⁵⁵ *The Formation of the New Testament* (1926), 62.

⁵⁶ Eusebius, *HE* vi. 12. 3-6.

not before; the argument of Vaganay⁵⁷ that ἀναγιγνωσκέσθω means "Let it be read in private" does not seem to be borne out by the facts, since a controversy would hardly arise over a book known only to a few. The principle on which Serapion rejected the Gospel of Peter is given in his first sentence: "For our part, brethren, we receive both Peter and the other apostles as Christ,⁵⁸ but the writings which falsely bear their names we reject, as men of experience, knowing that such were not handed down to us."⁵⁹ Evidently the traditional apostolic books are the true books, and these must have been the ones which in the preceding decade Theophilus used.

Theophilus' knowledge of the Acts of the Apostles is probable from his quotation of the "negative" golden rule in II 34. It was commonly quoted in this form in the second century;⁶⁰ it is found thus in Codex Bezae in Acts 15 20 and 29; and there is no reason to assume that Theophilus is giving it from oral tradition or from some apocryphal book since he associates it with the decree of the apostolic council. Elsewhere he quotes from our New Testament, though in the free manner of second century writers.

We may conclude, then, that in Theophilus' day the New Testament at Antioch consisted of at least three of the four gospels, the Acts of the Apostles, at least eight Pauline epistles, possibly the epistles of Peter, and the Apocalypse. All these works were regarded as inspired, and for the purposes of his apology Theophilus was able to present them as the equivalent of the "writings" of the Jewish canon. From the evidence of Theophilus, however, it seems unlikely that at Antioch in his day they were regarded as scripture in the same way in which the Old Testament was so regarded. With the Scillitan martyrs he could have summed most of them up as "libri, et epistolae Pauli, viri iusti."⁶¹ Yet the phrase ὁ θεὸς λόγος in III 14

⁵⁷ L. Vaganay, *L'évangile de Pierre* (1930), 6.

⁵⁸ Gal 4 14.

⁵⁹ Eusebius, *HE* vi. 12. 3.

⁶⁰ A. Resch, *op. cit.*, 95; see L. J. Philippidis, *Die "Goldene Regel" religionsgeschichtlich untersucht* (1929), 25.

⁶¹ *Acta Scill. Mart.* 12 (p. 29 Knopf-Krüger).

makes it probable that the Pauline epistles were at least on the way to becoming scripture. And if such was the case with the epistles, the gospels, which were even more highly regarded, must have been closer to scripture still.

III. BIBLICAL CHRONOLOGY

The Biblical chronology is one of the most important elements in the apologetic of Theophilus. In it he follows the ordinary methods by which educated Jews sought to prove the antiquity and truth of the writings of Moses and the other prophets. To most writers and readers of apologetic works antiquity was, indeed, a proof of truth. Arnobius⁶² provides a rare exception when he calls antiquity "errorum plenissima mater." Ordinarily Jewish or Christian apologists sought to show that pagan writers must have borrowed their learning from Moses, since he was earlier than they.

Systematic chronology was a creation of Alexandrian learning.⁶³ Its first exponent was Eratosthenes of Cyrene, third head of the library at Alexandria, whose *Περὶ χρονογραφιῶν* in one book included events from the fall of Troy to the death of Alexander, probably dated by Olympiads. His work was used and expanded by the second-century grammarian Apollodorus of Athens, who dedicated his four books of *Χρονικά* to Attalus II of Pergamum (159–138 B. C.). A still larger work was that of Castor of Rhodes in the first century B. C., whose *Χρονικά* in six books were accompanied by a synchronistic table. Under the Roman empire were produced the chronographies of Varro, Thallus, Phlegon of Tralles (a freedman of Marcus Aurelius), and the unknown chronographer whose work used by Clement of Alexandria ends with the death of Commodus. Of Jewish attempts to use this rich chronographical material we know very little. Justus of Tiberias, the contemporary and rival of Josephus, wrote a *Χρονικὸν Ἰουδαίων βασιλέων τῶν ἐν τοῖς στέμμασιν* which extends as far as the third year of Trajan, when Justus

⁶² *Adv. gentes* i. 57 (PL 5, 796A).

⁶³ On this subject see H. Peter, *Wahrheit und Kunst: Geschichtsschreibung und Plagiat im klassischen Altertum* (1911), 312–15.

died. His work apparently was used by (Justin) *Cohortatio* 9, Tatian and Clement of Alexandria.⁶⁴ Josephus himself in *Antiquities* and *Against Apion* provides occasional chronological information, of which some comes from the Old Testament and some from an unknown source, perhaps the Jewish historian Demetrius.⁶⁵

The contacts of early Christianity with chronography were few. The only attempt in the New Testament to give a precise date is made by the possibly Antiochene evangelist Luke in 3:1-2.⁶⁶ The apologist Justin knows that Moses lived before all the Greek writers,⁶⁷ but like the Jewish writers Artapanus and Eupolemus does not prove his point by chronology. His disciple Tatian, following either Justus of Tiberias or Alexander Polyhistor,⁶⁸ mentions many historians but prefers to refer to Berossus the Chaldaean, and to quote Ptolemy priest of Mendes in Egypt. He gives a few dates according to Olympiads, but does not attempt to compose a complete chronography. Of the chronography of his contemporary Cassianus, mentioned by Clement of Alexandria,⁶⁹ almost nothing is known.⁷⁰

Theophilus, then, was the first Christian writer to construct a chronological scheme from Adam to his own day; but it was entirely without influence in the Christian church. The reason for this is doubtless to be found in his omission of any reference to the life of Christ; and in any case the chronography of Julius Africanus, which was written soon after, was far more complete. Only Lactantius seems to have known Theophilus' third book; Christian writers generally ignored it. And as opinion on theological matters hardened into dogma, Theophilus' differences from more orthodox (and accurate) chronographers became suspect. Though the opinions of such a writer as Philaster are not authoritative, they reflect the state of opinion in the fourth

⁶⁴ A. v. Gutschmid in *Jahrb. f. class. Philol.* 6 (1860) 703-08.

⁶⁵ *FHG* III 216.

⁶⁶ See my note in *HTR* 33 (1940) 151-54.

⁶⁷ Justin, *Apol.* i. 44. 8, 54. 5.

⁶⁸ A. Puech, *Recherches sur le discours aux grecs de Tatien* (1903), 86 ff.

⁶⁹ *Strom.* i. 21. 101.

⁷⁰ See A. Schlatter, *Der Chronograph aus dem zehnten Jahre Antonins* (1894).

century; and he regards as a heresy the opinion of those who say the number of years from the beginning of the world is uncertain.⁷¹ Moreover, since the Byzantine chronographers uniformly followed Africanus, there was no reason to read the work of his unimportant predecessor.

Theophilus himself names his extra-biblical sources: Josephus (including the quotations of Berossus, Menander of Ephesus, and Manetho), Thallus, and Chryseros the Nomenclator, a freedman of Marcus Aurelius.

Theophilus' use of Josephus is largely confined to the quotations he takes from him, for while Josephus like Africanus gave 187 for the generation of Methusalah, Theophilus following the Septuagint wrote 167; the total from Adam to the flood is thus 2242 for Theophilus as against 2262 for Josephus and Africanus. Again, for the generation of Nahor,⁷² shortly before Abraham, the Septuagint has two readings (179 and 79) which Josephus or his source evidently averages, arriving at the figure 120; Theophilus, reading his Septuagint where he saw *οε'* rather than *οθ'*, copied the mistaken figure (75 instead of 79). A similar error is to be found in Theophilus' figure for Ehud of *η'* (8) instead of the Septuagint's *π* (80).⁷³ The primary source of the chronology is the Septuagint. It has sometimes been thought that Theophilus is following an intermediate source, but in view of his boldness in handling the decalogue and in constructing selections from the prophets we may assume the work is his own, though naturally he was aware that he had predecessors. In III 25 he lists "Joachim, eleven years, then another Joachim, three months and ten days." As Rahlfs⁷⁴ points out, the ten days are from II Chron 36 9, though the names are from IV Regn (II Kings) 23 36 and 24 8, for the name is given as *Ἰεχονίας* in Chronicles. Rahlfs supposed that Theophilus or a predecessor found *Ἰωακειμ* in his text of Chronicles; but it is more likely that in Theophilus' chronological researches he found that they were the same. He was aware that *Ἰερουσαλημ* and *Ἰεροσολυμα* were identical (II 31). He omits Samgar,⁷⁵ for no date is given for

⁷¹ Philaster, *De haer.* 112.

⁷² Gen 11 24.

⁷³ Judg 3 30.

⁷⁴ *Septuaginta-Studien* 3, 115.

⁷⁵ Judg 3 31.

him in the Bible, but at the end of III 24 he sets forth the chronology in a curious way. "Then Samson judged them twenty years; then there was peace among them forty years; then Samera judged them a year, Eli twenty years, Samuel twelve years." Here he is certainly not following Josephus, who writes, "After the death of Samson, Eli the high priest ruled over the Israelites."⁷⁶ This one year of "Samera" is also included by Africanus who calls him Samgar; according to Syncellus⁷⁷ the year was required to make the total of his chronology come out in accordance with the 450 years of judges in Acts 13 19 f. But as Gelzer⁷⁸ remarks, this idea is Syncellus' own; Africanus' total is actually 491, and we do not know why either Africanus or Theophilus gave Samgar a year. According to A. Schlatter⁷⁹ the chronography of Theophilus has probably undergone later interpolation from Africanus. The year of Samgar must, however, remain a mystery.

It might be thought from the phrase "our forefathers," applied to Abraham and David (III 24, 25, 28) and "by the will of God" describing the building of the temple of Solomon (III 25) that Theophilus is reproducing a source, but the dividing line between Christianity and Judaism is in Theophilus' mind non-existent.⁸⁰ We cannot ascribe these phrases to a source. Judaism and Christianity are the same — the Hebrews are our forefathers too (III 20); his whole argument from chronology depends on this assumption. It is such a serious matter for him that he begins the Biblical genealogies with a prayer (III 23): "I ask grace from the one God according to his will to speak all things accurately and with regard to truth, so that you and whoever reads these things may be guided by his truth and grace."⁸¹

⁷⁶ Josephus, *Ant.* v. 318.

⁷⁷ Georgius Syncellus, 331 (Dindorf).

⁷⁸ H. Gelzer, *Sextus Julius Africanus und die byzantinische Chronographie* I (1880), 91.

⁷⁹ Schlatter, *op. cit.*, 56 f.; H. Gelzer, *op. cit.*, I. 23 agrees.

⁸⁰ Compare Irenaeus, *Frag. graec.* xx (II, 489 Harvey); Clement, *Strom.* i.5.31 (T. Zahn, *Forschungen zur Geschichte des neutestamentlichen Kanons* III [1884], 254 n. 1); [Justin], *Coh.* 9 init., 10 fin.

⁸¹ The idea of praying for accuracy may have been suggested by Plato (*Timaeus* 27c); cf. W. L. Knox, *St. Paul and the Church of the Gentiles* (1939),

Before beginning the Biblical genealogies, however, Theophilus had discussed the flood. It was a matter of considerable importance to his chronology, for if with Apollonius the Egyptian he were to admit the age of the world to be 153,075 years, or with Plato 20,000 years from the flood up to the present day, the Biblical chronology would necessarily be proved wrong. Similarly, he attacks the myth of Deucalion and Pyrrha, as well as that of Clymenos,⁸² for Moses told how these events really happened. There was only one flood, from which eight people were saved under the leadership of Noah.

Moses, who wrote about the flood, led the children of Israel out of Egypt under a Pharaoh named Tethmosis (III 20). At this point Theophilus begins summarizing the narrative of the early third-century Egyptian priest Manetho, which he found in Josephus.⁸³ To Josephus' work Theophilus adds only confusion. From Manetho both Josephus and Theophilus prove that Moses, the contemporary of Tethmosis, lived 900 or 1000⁸⁴ years before the Trojan war (III 21 *ad fin.*).

For the date of the temple of Solomon Theophilus takes a fragment of Menander of Ephesus from Josephus,⁸⁵ and summarizes what Josephus quotes.⁸⁶ This is intended to prove that the twelfth year of Hiram, the contemporary of Solomon, was 133 (or 134) years and eight months before the foundation of Carthage. The date of the foundation of Carthage is not given, however;⁸⁷ but Theophilus states that the temple was built 566 years after the Exodus, a figure which according to the chronology of III 24 f. should be 541. It is one of Theophilus' additions to the text of Josephus.⁸⁸

p. 11, n. 2. In spite of his prayer, Theophilus is prepared to admit errors of 50 to 200 years (III 29)!

⁸² The text should be emended to "Clymene," the wife or mother of Prometheus.

⁸³ *Contra Apionem* i. 94–98.

⁸⁴ Nearly 1000, according to Josephus.

⁸⁵ *Contra Apionem* i. 117.

⁸⁶ *Ibid.*, i. 121–24.

⁸⁷ Josephus, *op. cit.*, ii. 17, cites Apion as dating it in the first years of the seventh Olympiad, which began in 752 B. C.

⁸⁸ *Contra Apionem* ii. 19 gives 612; *Ant.* viii. 61, only 592; I Regn. 6 1, 480.

In Josephus⁸⁹ there follows a series of long quotations from the early third-century Berossus of Babylonia.⁹⁰ Theophilus puts off until III 29 any reference to them, and then he is content merely to summarize their contents. It need hardly be said that all Theophilus knows of these three writers comes to him through Josephus.

Another source of Theophilus is the chronographer Thallus,⁹¹ who tells of Bel, king of the Assyrians, who helped Kronos, king of the Titans⁹² against Zeus and the other gods. Alexander Polyhistor,⁹³ following Eupolemus, identified Bel with Kronos, while Berossus⁹⁴ identified him with Zeus. Thallus tells us that "in defeat Ogyges fled to Tartessus, in a land then named Akte but now called Attica, where Ogyges then ruled."⁹⁵ Various emendations have been proposed for this text, but it is possible to accept it as it stands (emending only "Ὀγγυγος from the ὁ γύγος of V) and explain it with F. Jacoby⁹⁶ by reference to a fragment of Thallus' predecessor Castor of Rhodes:⁹⁷ "Bel was king of the Assyrians, and under him the Cyclopes helped Armazd, who was fighting the Titans, with lightning and jets of flame. And kings of the Titans were known at that time; one of them was the king Ogyges." Nevertheless there is some support for this much of Müller's emendation:⁹⁸ "And in defeat *Kronos* fled to Tartessus, in a land then named Akte," for Dionysius of Halicarnassus i. 34.5 reads: ἡ ἄλλη δὲ ἀκτὴ σύμπασα ἢ νῦν Ἰταλία καλουμένη τῷ θεῷ τούτῳ ἀνέκειτο, Σατορνία πρὸς τῶν ἐνοικούντων ὀνομαζομένη. To emend the first ὁ γύγος to Kronos would also explain the needless duplication of Ogyges' name

⁸⁹ *Contra Apionem* i. 128–60.

⁹⁰ See P. Schnabel, *Berossos und die babylonisch-hellenistische Literatur* (1923).

⁹¹ III 29; see R. Laqueur in *RE* V A 1225 f.; H. A. Rigg, Jr., in *HTR* 34 (1941) 111–19.

⁹² *τιτανως*, Venice ms.; Titanorum, Tertullian, *Apol.* 19.

⁹³ *FHG* III 212B.

⁹⁴ Berossus, *Frag.* 12 (p. 255:40 Schnabel).

⁹⁵ F. Jacoby, *FGH* II B (1929), 1157 no. 2.

⁹⁶ *FGH* II D (1930), 837.

⁹⁷ *FGH* II B, 1132.

⁹⁸ *FHG* III 518.

at the end of the sentence. Theophilus deduces from Thallus the point that Moses is older than any other writers, older than Kronos or Bel or the Trojan war. For according to Thallus Bel lived 332 years before the Trojan war, while Moses lived 900 or 1000 years before it.

A final source for Theophilus' chronography is the list of Roman rulers and the length of their reigns compiled by Chryseros the Nomenclator, a freedman of Marcus Aurelius, with whose death the list ends (III 26). A *nomenclator* (*nomen* and *calare*) was a slave whose duty it was to whisper in his forgetful master's ear the names of persons whose acquaintance the master valued.⁹⁹ Chryseros' list began with the founding of Rome in the seventh Olympiad, the seventeenth day before the Kalends of May, in the days when the year had only ten months. Theophilus quotes this fact from Chryseros, but makes no use of it. He does not correct his own tables; probably Chryseros had already done so. From this list Theophilus notes the reign of Tarquinius Superbus, during which Cyrus king of Persia died — *A.U.C.* 220. After this time there were consuls for 453 years whose names Chryseros lists but Theophilus omits. Then following Chryseros Theophilus gives the length of the reign of each ruler from Julius Caesar through Marcus Aurelius. His source seems accurate when compared with other chronographers, especially with the almost contemporary source of Clement;¹⁰⁰ but certainty as to all the figures cannot be reached in view of the carelessness of the eleventh-century copyist of the Venice manuscript, who seems to have become especially fatigued toward the end of Theophilus' chronography.

IV. CONCLUSION

For Theophilus of Antioch the most important part of the Bible, and indeed the only part which could definitely be called "scripture," was the Old Testament. It provided information about the creation of the world and moral guidance for Chris-

⁹⁹ Bernert in *RE* XVII 817.

¹⁰⁰ *Strom.* i. 21. 144.

tians. Properly understood, it could prove the antiquity of the biblical revelation. Theophilus' principal guide in this understanding was the Jewish apologist Josephus.

Theophilus' Old Testament text in some respects resembles that used by Josephus, but cannot be definitely identified. Similarly his New Testament text seems, from our point of view, to be eclectic. His idea of a biblical canon seems to be based on Josephus.