in the city of Alexander was occupied, and abstained from assembling with them. And thereupon the synod of holy bishops which assembled at Caesarea in Palestine itself sent up its decree to the God-loving kings of pious memory, Theodosius, Arcadius, and Honorius, and made it known to them in these words:—

“For we have read the letter of our reverend brothers to our reverend brother and bishop¹ Theophilus, and that which was written to us ourselves, the bishops of the East, by the bishops at Capua, and that of the religious Siricius, the bishop of Rome, saying that before all things we ought to look to this point, that is, not to disturb the canon of Nicaea which clearly asserts that it is not permissible for the ordination of a bishop to be performed by one only. And there was further contained also in the epistle of the religious bishop Siricius a delimitation² of the hearing that was to be, in which it was asserted that there ought to be one bishop of Antioch, he who was lawfully and ecclesiastically appointed according to the canon of the Synod of Nicaea, and which clearly defined that the ordination which was performed by one is unlawful and not to be received. Having gladly³ therefore received the exact teaching of bishop Siricius about the ecclesiastical canons, we have followed this letter and determined that these things be ratified, inasmuch as we have laid down lawful and just decisions, that we know one bishop of Antioch only, the religious lord Flavian the bishop.”

E. W. BROOKS.

ORIGEN AND THE DATE OF PSEUDO-CLEMENT.

Two quotations of Pseudo-Clement by Origen have commonly been supposed to constitute the *terminus ad quem* in the settlement of his date. Canon Armitage Robinson has thrown doubt on one of these quotations⁴—the earlier in date, the longer and the more important. I wish to show that considerable doubt attaches also to the other. It occurs in Origen's Commentary on St. Matthew, *series* 77.

¹ The Greek must have been *συνεπισκοπος*.

² Lit. 'division.' But perhaps we should render 'portion.'

³ v. l. 'recently.'

⁴ See the preface to his edition of the *Philocalia* [1893] p. l. Dr. Bigg (in *Studia Biblica*, ii 186 [1890]), had still earlier said of the concluding passages of the chapter of the *Philocalia* which contain the supposed quotation: 'Doubtless they were added by the editors, Basil and Gregory Nazianzen.' But he spoils this suggestion by an unfortunate confusion: for he goes on to speak of the quotation of Pseudo-Clement in Origen's comm. on Genesis as if it were certainly authentic, and not the very passage in the *Philocalia* which he has just rejected!

1. *A priori*, it is strange that Origen should even once have quoted 'Petrus apud Clementem' without Eusebius having noticed the fact.

2. The passage in question of Origen is only known to us in an old Latin translation of extremely free character, in which sentences are transposed or adjusted, lengthened or curtailed, added or omitted, without apparent reason¹. Nothing could be more likely than that an apt quotation should be inserted by the translator.

3. The same passage of Pseudo-Clement is quoted in a slightly different form by the Arian author of the *Opus imperfectum in Matthaeum*, which is printed among the *spuria* of St. Chrysostom. The two quotations are not independent; for (a) Dr. Hort has pointed out that they both follow a not at all obvious quotation from Daniel. This could scarcely be a mere coincidence. (b) Both use the same formula *Petrus apud Clementem*. (c) Both are in a Commentary on St. Matthew, so that borrowing was quite a natural occurrence.

But which was the borrower?

This is only one out of five places in which the *Opus Imp.* quotes Pseudo-Clement². Dr. Hort has therefore tried to show that it may have derived all these passages from Origen *In Matthaeum*. He says, 'Since *Op. Imp.* certainly used Origen here, its use of the Clementine work is not likely to have been independent.' This is certainly a correct argument, but the antecedent is by no means so certain. It is impossible to show that *Op. Imp.* did in fact borrow all these from Origen, and there is no improbability in his possessing a copy of Pseudo-Clement at the time he wrote, c. 400; indeed, the reference to the miracles of Simon (unless that too comes from Origen) implies that he did possess one.

But that Origen should have made five distinct quotations from Pseudo-Clement, together with some remarks about the miracles of Simon, without their attracting the notice of Eusebius, seems to be totally impossible. The words with which the quotations are introduced are *Petrus apud Clementem exposuit* twice; *Petrus apud Clementem exponit*; *in historia Clementis Petrus exponit*; *Petrus dicit apud Clementem*. This would seem to imply belief in the authenticity of the

¹ The Old Latin begins *tom. xii. 9* (the Greek is extant from *tom. x* to *tom. xvii*). In its first chapter it omits several sentences of the Greek, and inserts a curious remark that 'disciples of bishops should be taught, by the example of the Apostles, to repeat whatever opinions they may have heard about their bishops outside.' The inference is that the paraphrast was a bishop himself. The second chapter is wholly remodelled. At the beginning of the third chapter 'What of John, the son of thunder?' becomes 'What of James and John?' and so on throughout.

² These are quoted by Harnack, *Altchr. Litt.* i 224, and discussed by Dr. Hort, *Clem. Recogn.* 43-9. Dr. Hort points out also a reference to the miracles of Simon.

work cited; the writer appears to take the words to which he refers as the words of St. Peter himself reported by Clement. The quotation in Origen is similarly introduced: *Tale aliquid dicit Petrus apud Clementem*. It is inconceivable that the careful bishop of Caesarea should have passed over a series of some five or six of such phrases, if they had really occurred in his favourite Origen. It is also *prima facie* unlikely that Origen, writing in 245 or later, at the age of 60 or more, should have been wholly taken in by a work at most twenty or thirty or forty years old, and probably full of nonsense, unless it was wholly different from the Homilies and Recognitions as we know them.

Since then Origen cannot have been the source of all these quotations and references in the *Op. Imp.*, it follows that the Arian author had himself a copy of Pseudo-Clement. But if so, it seems most unnatural to suppose that he quoted four times from the original and once from Origen's solitary extract.

4. A comparison of the quotations leads us to the same result:—

Origen; in *Matt.* ser. 77 (on *Matt.* xxvi 13). Delarue iii 894. P.G. xiii 1725.

Ps. Chrys. *Op. Imp. in Matt.* xxvi (P.G. lvi 770, Chrys. vol. vi p. cxv) on *Matt.* x 41.

- i. Tale aliquid dicit et Petrus apud Clementem.
2. quoniam opera bona quae fiunt ab infidelibus in hoc saeculo iis prorsunt, non et in illo ad consequendam uitam aeternam.
3. et conuenienter, quia nec illi propter deum faciunt sed propter ipsam naturam humanam.
4. qui autem propter deum faciunt, id est fideles, non solum in hoc saeculo proficit iis sed in illo, magis autem in illo.

1. Sed audi mysterium quod Petrus apud Clementem exposuit.
4. si fidelis fecerit opus bonum, et hic ei prodest liberans eum a malis et in illo saeculo ad percipiendum regnum caeleste, magis autem ibi quam hic.
2. si autem infidelis fecerit opus bonum, hic ei prodest opus ipsius, et hic ei reddet deus bona pro opere suo. in illo autem saeculo nihil ei prodest opus ipsius.
5. nec enim collocatur inter caeteros fideles propter opus suum.
3. et iuste, quia naturali bono motus fecit bonum, non propter deum.
6. ideo in corpus suum recipit mercedem operis sui, non in anima sua.

The resemblance with the supposed original passage in *Hom.* xiii 13 and *Recog.* vii 38 is so slight, that some will suppose that it is a lost original which is quoted.

a. If so, it is possible that *Op. Imp.* quotes verbally, while this is impossible in the case of *Orig. trans.*, which relates an opinion of Peter, and does not profess to quote the words. In any case, if the quotations be assumed to be fairly accurate, the longer, fuller and direct one is more likely than the shorter and oblique version to be the prior of the two.

β. If, on the other hand, one of the two authors made up this elaborate doctrine out of the hints in *Ps. Clem.*, we must notice that the order of the paragraphs has been altered, as may be seen by the numbers I have attached to them. Now where Origen's Greek is still extant, it is observable that the old Latin translator habitually dislocates his order in just this manner. It is natural to suppose that he found the passage in *Op. Imp.*, and observed its likeness to the doctrine of Origen in a particular passage; he inserted it there, together with the text of Daniel, turning it inside out, in the same way that he was accustomed to treat Origen.

γ. *Op. Imp.* actually gives two details which are not in *Orig. tr.*; I have numbered them 5 and 6.

δ. We have seen that *Petrus apud Clementem* is the ordinary formula of quotation in *Op. Imp.*, and that it cannot have borrowed from Origen in the other cases. If *Orig. tr.* is not here the borrower, the identity of expression is a most remarkable coincidence.

5. An examination of the whole passage in Origen shows that the omission of the quotations from Daniel and from Clement makes the sense clearer¹. An examination of the passage, as given in the footnote with numbers introduced for clearness, shows that Origen divides good actions thus:—

He then proceeds to give illustrations of each kind. The quotations from Daniel and Clement are given to illustrate (1); (2 a) and (2 b) have

¹ Origen, 'What is oil and unguent? Difficult to say . . . Sicut ergo generaliter omne quo quis ungitur oleum appellatur, olei autem aliud est unguentum, [aliud non]; item unguenti aliud est mediocre unguentum, aliud pretiosum; sic omnis actus iustus opus dicitur bonum. operis autem boni, (1) aliud est quod facimus propter homines, uel secundum homines, (2) aliud autem quod propter deum et secundum deum. item hoc ipsum quod facimus propter deum, (2 a) aliud est quod proficit ad usum hominum, (2 b) aliud quod non proficit ad usum hominum, sed tantum ad gloriam dei. utputa (1) bene quis facit homini naturali iustitia motus, non propter deum, quomodo faciebant interdum et gentes et multi faciunt homines; opus illud oleum est vulgare, non magni odoris, et ipsum tamen acceptabile apud deum; [sicut Daniel significat, dicens ad Balthasar deum non cognoscentem: Audi consilium meum rex, peccata tua eleemosynis redime. tale aliquid dicit et Petrus apud Clementem, quoniam opera bona . . . magis autem in illo.] (2) quod autem fideles faciunt propter deum, hoc est unguentum boni odoris. hoc ipsum autem

no other illustration than the unction of the Feet and the Head of Christ, which Origen is explaining. The long interruption seems to make the second division hang fire too long, while the fourth sentence of the quotation from Clement uncomfortably anticipates what Origen is just going to say.

But the quotations are not even pertinent, in so far as they speak of Belshazzar redeeming his sins, and of infidels who are rewarded in this world but not in the next. For there is nothing outside the quotations which has reference to reward for good actions, whether in this life or in the life to come. I believe that, if we had the original Greek, we should find Origen was solely interested in the comparison of the actions of Christians with oil and ointment, and that he said nothing about what is gained by those actions.

6. A general comparison of the whole context shows that if *Op. Imp.* borrowed from Origen, as Dr. Hort supposed, it borrowed the quotations and nothing else whatever. Yet on that hypothesis we should certainly have expected some further similarity. If, on the other hand, the translator of Origen was the borrower, we should expect that, apart from the passage actually quoted, there would be no likeness of detail or of general presentment. And in fact there is none¹.

If it is thus established that there is no solid ground for supposing that Origen knew Pseudo-Clement, several matters become much

opus fidelium propter deum, quod est unguentum, (2 a) aliud fit ad utilitatem hominum, utputa eleēmosynae, infirmorum uisitationes, peregrinorum suscepciones, humilitas, mansuetudo, indulgentia, et caetera huius modi quae hominibus prosunt, haec qui facit in Christianos pedes domini ungit unguento, quia ipsi sunt domini pedes cum quibus ambulat semper; quod praecipue solent facere poenitentes pro remissione peccatorum suorum. et illud est opus quod dicitur unguentum odori-ferum quidem, non autem summum. (2 b) qui autem castitati studet, in ieiuniis et orationibus permanet, in aduersis patientiam habet sicut Iob, in tentationibus ueritatem dei non timet confiteri; quae omnia caeteris hominibus nihil prosunt, sed tantum ad gloriam dei proficiunt; hoc est unguentum quod ungit caput domini Christi, et exinde per totum corpus Christi, id est per totam decurrit ecclesiam; et hoc est unguentum ualde pretiosum, ex cuius odore tota repletur domus, hoc est ecclesia Christi. et hoc opus est proprium non poenitentium, sed perfectorum sanctorum. aut certe doctrina quae necessaria est hominibus, per quam nutriuntur animae pauperes in spiritalibus bonis, aut forte et debiles in peccatis, hoc est unguentum mediocre, quo pedes domini unguuntur. agnitio autem fidei uerae quae ad solum pertinet deum, unguentum est pretiosum quo ungitur caput Christi deus.¹

¹ There are two points only to be noticed. First, while *Op. Imp.* speaks continually of works *propter Christum* and *in Christianos*, Origen has once only *in Christianos*, and this is presumably due to the translator. Secondly, the words in Origen 'naturali iustitia motus,' though they precede the quotation, are probably not an exact translation of any words of Origen, but are taken from the quotation as we find it in *Op. Imp.* 'naturali bono motus.' In paraphrasing the quotation itself, *Orig. tr.*, for the sake of variety, gives 'propter ipsam naturam humanam.'

clearer. Harnack has shown that the Pseudo-Clementine literature is of no importance in the history of Catholic dogma (*History of Dogma*, E.T. 1894, I, 316). Mr. Headlam says it is outside the current of Church life (*J. T. S.* iii p. 58). Dr. Hort complains that it has left no traces in the eighty years between Origen and Eusebius (*Clem. Recog.*, 1901, pp. 31-2). If it did not exist till the end of the third century there is nothing surprising in these phenomena.

Again, in spite of the points of contact with Bardesanes, and of the doctrinal similarity with the book of Elkesai, we know of no Jewish-Christian community in the early third century with which to connect these strange writings, while in the fourth century we know from Epiphanius of their use by a definite community of heretics. Our other knowledge of these same heretics is from Ambrosiaster (writing under Damasus) and from Victorinus Rhetor (after 360).

The use of *archiepiscopus* in the Recognitions suggests that this book dates from the fourth century in the form in which Rufinus found it: while the discussion of *ὁμοούσιος* in the Homilies suggests that the present form of the Homilies also is post-Nicene.

Lastly, the important evidence of Eusebius is to be considered:—*ἦδη δὲ καὶ ἕτερα πολυεπὴ καὶ μακρὰ συγγράμματα ὡς τοῦ αὐτοῦ [Κλήμεντος] ἐχθὲς καὶ πρῶν τινὲς προήγαγον, Πέτρου δὲ καὶ Ἀπίωνος διαλόγους περιέχοντα· ὧν οὐδ' ὅλως μνήμη τις παρὰ τοῖς παλαιοῖς φέρεται. οὐδὲ γὰρ καθαρὸν τῆς ἀποστολικῆς ὀρθοδοξίας ἀποσώζει τὸν χαρακτῆρα* (iii 38). Eusebius not only says that the wordy and lengthy writings were altogether unknown to the ancients (in which statement it would appear we are not in a position to contradict him), besides being heretical, but he also asserts that they were only brought forward 'the other day.' This is hardly compatible with the date ordinarily assigned to the origin of the Pseudo-Clementine literature; but it tallies exactly with the view which I have ventured to bring forward in this note, that Pseudo-Clement wrote after Origen, and indeed probably not long before Eusebius.

JOHN CHAPMAN.

ON THE MOHAMMEDAN GOSPEL OF BARNABAS.

THAT the Mohammedans have amongst their literature a document called the 'Gospel of Barnabas' is well known, but no complete translation or analysis appears to have been printed. The matter has a twofold interest. The Arabic Barnabas Gospel would show how the facts as to the foundation of Christianity were understood, or misunderstood, by the disciples of the Prophet. The many references to Jesus in the 'Koran' and the identity of certain incidents therein recorded