The last six Words, the Fifth to the Tenth, prescribe definitely the manner in which the covenant-God of Israel is to be worshipped.

The question of the relative date of the two Decalogues is too large a subject to be discussed in this place. Suffice it to say that the general analogy of the history of religion in Israel favours the view held by many scholars that the earlier of the two Decalogues is that given in Exod. xxxiv. The teaching that JEHOVAH is Israel's God preceded the teaching that the Israelite must do no ill to his neighbour. Theology was the foundation, Morality the superstructure.

W. EMERY BARNES.

ST IRENAEUS ON THE DATES OF THE GOSPELS.

IT is commonly supposed that in a well-known passage of the third book against heresies we have received valuable information from St Irenaeus as to the dates at which the Synoptic Gospels were composed. He is understood to say that St Matthew wrote among the Hebrews at the time when Peter and Paul were preaching at Rome, and that St Mark wrote after the death of those Apostles. The following note is intended to shew that the Bishop of Lyons did not purpose to supply his readers with either of these pieces of information.

There are *a priori* reasons in favour of this thesis. In the first place these supposed statements of St Irenaeus have not been echoed by any ancient writer whatever.

In the second place, the synchronism of Matthew's writing with Peter and Paul's preaching is apparently without motive, for there is no connexion between the two facts. Further, the simultaneous preaching of Peter and Paul in Rome is not a very probable supposition, and might well throw doubt on the value of St Irenaeus's sources.

In the third place, the statement about Mark would be in flat contradiction with Clement of Alexandria, Eusebius and Jerome, who all assure us that Mark wrote in the lifetime of Peter. The words of Papias about Mark are most naturally interpreted in the same sense[1], and St Irenaeus certainly will have attributed great importance to them.

These considerations have induced a good many modern writers to attempt rather violent explanations of St Irenaeus's words, in order

[1] The words Πέτρου ἑρμηνευτὴς γενόμενος may mean either 'having become the Hermeneutes of Peter' or 'who was the Hermeneutes of Peter'. In the latter case the possibility is not excluded that Peter was dead when Mark wrote. Harnack (*Chronol.* i p. 652) has strangely followed Link in rendering γενόμενος as if it were γεγενημένος. I am dealing with this more fully in *Revue Bénéd.* July.

to obviate this difficulty. For example, Patrizi many years ago proposed a new and impossible punctuation, which only deserves mention as an indication of the straits to which conservative scholars were driven. Others (amongst them Grabe, Harvey, and, more lately, Cornely) have insisted that ἔξοδος must mean either the departure of the Apostles from Jerusalem, or, more probably, from Rome, and not their death. But to what well-known departure could ἔξοδος with the definite article, and with no further explanation, be understood to refer? And is not ἔξοδος precisely the word used in 2 Peter i 15 to signify the death of that Apostle? Dr Blass[1] has in consequence explained the statement as an error, resting on a mistaken interpretation of that very text—a somewhat unlikely hypothesis, since St Irenaeus was apparently altogether unacquainted with the second epistle of Peter.

Other writers have been content with the authority of the Bishop of Lyons against the rest of antiquity. Quite recently Dr Stanton writes in Hastings's *Dictionary* ii p. 248: 'It would seem, according to the oldest form of the tradition, to have been after St Peter's death that Mark wrote'; and Dr Zahn, though constitutionally inclined to push back dates as far as he can, has felt himself bound to place not only Mark, but Luke and Acts, after the death of Paul and Peter, in deference to the tradition attested by St Irenaeus.

If, however, we look at the context of this short passage, we shall see that the idea of dating the Gospels is quite foreign to St Irenaeus's argument. We shall see besides that the statement that St Mark wrote only after St Peter's death would be a weakening of that argument, and that St Irenaeus would naturally have avoided drawing attention to the fact, even if he knew it, in such a connexion. We shall see that the context makes the real grammatical meaning of the passage as clear as day, and that in this light all dating of the Synoptic Gospels disappears.

The context shews that St Irenaeus is not giving a history of the origin of the four Gospels, as is commonly thought by those who read only the short Greek extract preserved by Eusebius. He is simply explaining that *the teaching of four of the principal Apostles has not been lost, but has been handed down to us in writing*. He is not in the least concerned to defend the authenticity of the Gospels, still less to give their dates. The Valentinians accepted them all, and St Irenaeus is merely urging upon them the fact that each Gospel is the written record of the matter preached by an Apostle.

It is necessary to read the passage in full. The Greek of the preceding paragraph has not been preserved. I subjoin the Latin:

iii 1. 1 'Non enim per alios dispositionem salutis nostrae cognovimus, quam per eos per quos Evangelium pervenit ad nos; quod quidem tunc

[1] *Acta Apostolorum, Ed. philologica* 1895 p. 5.

praeconaverunt, postea vero per Dei voluntatem in Scripturis nobis tradiderunt, fundamentum et columnam fidei nostrae futurum.'

Those who preached the Gospel in the beginning, says St Irenaeus, afterwards committed it to writing, and thus it has come down to us, *pervenit ad nos*. This is the thesis which he proceeds to develope:

'Nec enim fas est dicere quoniam ante praedicaverunt quam perfectam haberent agnitionem; sicut quidam audent dicere, gloriantes emendatores se esse Apostolorum. Postea enim quam surrexit Dominus noster a mortuis, et induti sunt supervenientis Spiritus sancti virtutem ex alto, de omnibus adimpleti sunt, et habuerunt perfectam agnitionem; exierunt in fines terrae, ea quae a Deo nobis bona sunt evangelizantes, et caelestem pacem hominibus annuntiantes, qui quidem et omnes pariter et singuli eorum habentes Evangelium Dei.'

This is the developement of the first part of the thesis: the apostles after the resurrection were filled with knowledge of the Gospel, and they went forth and preached the same Gospel in all lands[1].

The explanation of the second part of the thesis has fortunately been preserved in Greek for us by Eusebius. It answers the question 'How has this preaching come down to us in writing?' The reply is that two of the apostles wrote down their own teaching, while two others were reported by a follower:

Ὁ μὲν δὴ Ματθαῖος ἐν τοῖς Ἑβραίοις τῇ ἰδίᾳ διαλέκτῳ αὐτῶν καὶ γραφὴν ἐξήνεγκεν εὐαγγελίου, τοῦ Πέτρου καὶ τοῦ Παύλου ἐν Ῥώμῃ εὐαγγελιζομένων καὶ θεμελιούντων τὴν ἐκκλησίαν. Μετὰ δὲ τὴν τούτων ἔξοδον, Μάρκος ὁ μαθητὴς καὶ ἑρμηνευτὴς Πέτρου, καὶ αὐτὸς τὰ ὑπὸ Πέτρου κηρυσσόμενα ἐγγράφως ἡμῖν παραδέδωκε. Καὶ Λουκᾶς δέ, ὁ ἀκόλουθος Παύλου, τὸ ὑπ' ἐκείνου κηρυσσόμενον εὐαγγέλιον ἐν βιβλίῳ κατέθετο. Ἔπειτα Ἰωάννης ὁ μαθητὴς τοῦ Κυρίου, ὁ καὶ ἐπὶ τὸ στῆθος αὐτοῦ ἀναπεσών, καὶ αὐτὸς ἐξέδωκε τὸ εὐαγγέλιον, ἐν Ἐφέσῳ τῆς Ἀσίας διατρίβων.

The emphasis throughout is upon the writing down of what was preached: καὶ γραφήν, ἐγγράφως, ἐν βιβλίῳ, ἐξέδωκεν. The meaning is surely not obscure. I translate literally, word by word:

'Matthew among the Hebrews in their own language published a writing also of the Gospel [*besides preaching it*],

'Peter and Paul preaching the Gospel [*not to Jews but*] at Rome [*without writing it down*], and founding the Church there [*whose testimony I shall give presently*, viz. iii 3].

'But [*although they died without having written a Gospel*] after their death [*their preaching has not been lost to us, for*] Mark, the disciple and interpreter of Peter, has handed down to us, he also in writing [*like Matthew,*] the things which were preached by Peter,

[1] The impossible construction '*qui quidem . . . habentes*' in the last clause will represent in Greek οἱ δὴ . . . ἔχοντες, which the translator has rendered as if it had been οἳ . . . ἔχοντες.

'And Luke besides, the companion of [*the other*,] Paul, set down in a book the Gospel preached by that apostle.

'Finally, John, the disciple of the Lord, he also published a Gospel, while he was living in Ephesus of Asia.'[1]

The point which St Irenaeus has made against the Valentinians is this: 'We know what the Apostles preached in various lands, for we possess written records of what was preached in Palestine, in Rome, and in Asia by four Apostles. Two of these wrote down their own preaching. That of the other two has been preserved in writing by their disciples.'

(1) A careful study of the passage will certainly convince the reader that the genitive absolute εὐαγγελιζομένων cannot possibly be pressed to mean 'during the time that Peter and Paul were preaching'. The notion of contemporaneousness is almost as faint in the phrase as in the English 'While Peter and Paul preached at Rome'. The chief point in the clause is the contraposition of 'at Rome' to 'among the Hebrews'. The only simultaneity implied is that both events occurred during the same period—the apostolic age—and presumably the earlier part of it. But Irenaeus has no intention of asserting that the three events—the writing of the Gospel, the preaching of Peter at Rome, and of Paul in the same city—occurred in some given year. This would merely have confused the one point he wished to emphasize. The general period when all three events occurred was *the time subsequent to the going forth of the Apostles to preach*, of which mention was made in the preceding sentence: 'They went forth to the ends of the earth . . . preaching the Gospel. . . . Matthew preached it (and also wrote it) among the Hebrews, Peter and Paul doing the same at Rome, but not writing.'

If this be so—and I do not see how it can reasonably be supposed that Irenaeus meant anything more definite than this—it is interesting to find that nothing whatever is added to the famous words of Papias: Ματθαῖος μὲν οὖν Ἑβραΐδι διαλέκτῳ τὰ λόγια συνετάξατο. The ἐν τοῖς Ἑβραίοις is merely an inference made by Irenaeus, for he wanted a parallel to ἐν Ῥώμῃ and to Ἀσίᾳ. That he is actually using Papias is shewn by the close parallel of ἐν τοῖς Ἑβραίοις τῇ ἰδίᾳ διαλέκτῳ αὐτῶν

[1] It should be noticed that Tertullian has understood Irenaeus rightly, *c. Marc.* iv 5: 'Eadem auctoritas ecclesiarum apostolicarum caeteris quoque patrocinabitur evangeliis, quae proinde per illas et secundum illas habemus, Ioannis dico et Matthaei, licet et Marcus quod edidit, Petri affirmetur, cuius interpres Marcus; nam et Lucae digestum Paulo adscribere solent. Caput magistrorum videri, quae discipuli promulgarint.' Here Tertullian has caught the idea of Irenaeus that the four Gospels represent four Apostles and various churches—Rome, Palestine, Ephesus, and St Paul's foundations. But the rest of the argument makes it clear that Tertullian did not understand any dates to be given, for he goes on to say that Luke was not probably the oldest, as Marcion thought, but rather likely to be later than the others, as not written by an Apostle.

with Ἑβραΐδι διαλέκτῳ. The necessity of emphasizing the writing down caused the change from συνετάξατο (so Schwartz for the common reading συνεγράψατο in Euseb. *H.E.* iii 39) to γραφὴν ἐξήνεγκεν. The latter word insinuates that the publication was authoritative, by the Apostle himself.

(2) With regard to St Mark the case is clearer still. The two Apostles preached at Rome and did not write. How then do we know what they preached? A little further on St Irenaeus will assure us that the tradition of the Roman Church witnesses to their teaching. But here he gives a different answer. *After their death* their actual words would have been lost, had not Mark and Luke (already) written them down. This is the force of the perfect παραδέδωκε, 'Mark has handed down to us after their death what Peter used to preach, for he wrote it down'. It is obvious that 'after their death' has no connexion with 'in writing', but that it goes with 'has handed down'. It is evidently implied that the preaching of Peter has been preserved to us *after* his death by being written down *before* his death. 'And Luke also, the follower of Paul, set down in a book the Gospel which that Apostle used to preach.' Here again St Irenaeus seems to have presumed that it was while Paul was still preaching that Luke wrote. When once we follow the argument of Irenaeus, his meaning is perfectly unmistakeable; nor in reality will the Greek bear any other meaning[1].

It follows that these two clauses about Matthew and Mark should not have been quoted by Harnack (*Chronol.* i 165) as examples of dating events by contemporary Apostles and bishops, for there is no attempt to give any dates at all. The utmost that we can gather is that all three Synoptists were thought by Irenaeus to have written before the death of St Peter and St Paul.

We have seen that the words about Matthew are simply Papias re-written. The same is quite evident with regard to the words about Mark. The expression ἑρμηνευτὴς Πέτρου is borrowed directly from Papias. The addition μαθητής represents the statement of Papias that Mark followed not Christ, but Peter. Again Papias tells us that Peter had no intention of composing a regular Gospel in order (οὐκ ὥσπερ σύνταξιν τῶν Κυριακῶν ποιούμενος λογίων). Accordingly Irenaeus talks of the *Gospel* of Matthew, of Luke-Paul, and of John; but with regard to Peter he only has τὰ κηρυσσόμενα, for Papias tells us that Peter merely πρὸς τὰς χρείας ἐποιεῖτο τὰς διδασκαλίας.

[1] If Irenaeus had wished to lay stress on the fact that the two Apostles were already dead when Mark wrote, he would not only have been giving away his case to the Valentinians, but he would have been obliged to use the aorist instead of the perfect, and some other word for παραδίδωμι, for instance τὰ ὑπὸ Πέτρου κηρυσσόμενα ἔγραψεν, and the meaning would have been clear; and if he had said κεκηρυγμένα it would have been clearer still.

It follows that the information given to us by Irenaeus about Matthew and Mark has no independent value of its own; it is simply Papias written out, with a purpose.

What he says about Luke is also of no importance. In chapter xiv of this book he remarks that the Acts of the Apostles shew Luke to have been inseparable from Paul. Luke therefore was to Paul what Mark was to Peter,—so he argues,—consequently, as Mark wrote down what Paul preached, so Luke may be considered to have recorded the preaching of Paul. I do not believe St Irenaeus had any authority for this statement beyond this misleading parallel.

The sentence about St John may be from Papias, as it tallies perfectly with the fragment in the Latin prologue: 'Evangelium Iohannis manifestatum et datum est ecclesiis ab Iohanne adhuc in corpore constituto, sicut Papias nomine, Hierapolitanus, discipulus Iohannis carus in exotericis id est in extremis quinque libris retulit.'[1] St Irenaeus says 'published while living in Ephesus of Asia'; Papias is represented as saying 'published and gave to the churches [of Asia] while yet in the body'.

The remark of Papias is so very obvious that there is nothing to surprise us in the fact that Eusebius did not think it worth quoting, if it is genuine.

On the other hand it is clear why in early writers no echo is found of the supposed dates given by St Irenaeus for Matthew and Mark. They had the continuous Greek before them, and they understood him rightly.

He does, however, date John after the rest, for ἔπειτα is clearly to be taken of time. I shewed in the *Revue Bénédictine* for October 1904 that this is what Clement of Alexandria meant when he said that the Gospels containing the genealogies were the first to be written (Euseb. *H. E.* vi 14): the carnal genealogies of Matthew and Luke were written before the spiritual genealogy given by St John in his prologue; the mention of Mark is an importation by Eusebius from the *Adumbratio* on 1 Peter. I am sorry I published the proof of this so hastily, for I have since found further evidence that it is correct.

The result is that no date is given by the ancients for the Gospel of St Mark, except that it was written while Peter was at Rome. For St Luke there is no date given at all. For St Matthew we have Eusebius's statement (*H. E.* iii 24) that it was written when he was about to leave the Hebrews in order to go elsewhere. This would perhaps imply the 'dispersion of the Apostles' as the date in the mind

[1] So the Cod. Reg. published by the Blessed Thomasius. The Cod. Tolet. may be right in adding *in Asia* after *ecclesiis*. (Text in Wordsworth's Vulgate Gospels pp. 490–1.)

of Eusebius; but it may be only an amplification by the historian of what he read in Irenaeus[1]. There is also Origen's statement (Euseb. *H.E.* vi 25) that Matthew was the first to write; he has been copied by Epiphanius and Jerome. But it is doubtful if much credit is due to this statement. I believe Papias mentioned Matthew before Mark; so did Irenaeus, and Origen found this order in his Bible. But the fact that Matthew was an Apostle accounts for this.

For St John there is universal consent that he wrote last.

JOHN CHAPMAN.

THE EPISTLE OF ST JUDE AND THE MARCOSIAN HERESY.

HAVING been for some years engaged on an edition of the Epistle of St Jude and the Second Epistle of St Peter, I was interested to see that an attempt had been made, in the April number of this JOURNAL, to bring forward some new evidence bearing on the date and authenticity of the former Epistle. I am not, however, convinced by Mr Barns's paper, and am grateful to the Editors for allowing me to state here the reasons which lead me to an opposite conclusion. I agree with Mr Barns in holding, in opposition to Spitta, Zahn, and Dr Bigg, that Jude's is the earlier of the two Epistles, but I cannot see any plausibility in the suggestion that 2 Peter was written by a Montanist bishop between the years 185 and 195 (p. 392), and cannot therefore attach any weight to the inference that Jude must have been written between 122 and 185. I proceed to examine the more substantial arguments put forward by Mr Barns and others against the traditional view that Jude was written by the Brother of the Lord.

'There are', says Mr Barns, 'two passages in the Epistle which point to its post-apostolic origin. The writer is moved to action by the danger which threatens *the faith once for all delivered to the saints* (*v.* 3). It is clear that the faith was already recognized as a fixed tradition, treasured by the Church as the safeguard of the *common salvation*. The writer also bids them remember *the words which had been spoken before by the Apostles* (*v.* 17), which implies that the apostolic writings already enjoyed some kind of canonical authority in the Church.' Again 'the salutation (ἔλεος ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη καὶ ἀγάπη πληθυνθείη) is unique

[1] St Irenaeus says the Apostles went to the ends of the earth. He then adds that Matthew wrote 'among the Hebrews'. Eusebius may well have supposed that Matthew wrote at Jerusalem before starting for the ends of the earth, and at the request of those whom he was leaving.