

THE EARLY EPISCOPAL LISTS. II.

IN the January number of the JOURNAL OF THEOLOGICAL STUDIES I discussed, sufficiently I think for the present purpose, some questions preliminary to an understanding of the evidence of Eusebius with regard to the four episcopal lists which he gives us in his *History* and his *Chronicle*¹—those of the churches of Rome Alexandria Antioch and Jerusalem. In this second paper I propose to approach the consideration of the lists themselves, and to begin with that of Jerusalem, which is quite independent of the other three and is involved in curious complications of its own.

THE JERUSALEM LIST.

For this list our only authorities are Eusebius and later oriental writers whose lists are closely related to, if they are not dependent on, that of Eusebius. It will be convenient in the first instance to concentrate attention on Eusebius alone.

The first and most important point is one which Eusebius himself is careful to press upon our notice, for it distinguished apparently his Jerusalem 'source' from the source or sources on which he drew for the other three churches: *he had a list of names, but no dates were attached to them.* After recording in the *History*, under the reign of Hadrian, the duration of the episcopate of the then bishop of Rome and the then bishop of Alexandria, he goes on to contrast his knowledge of the succession at Jerusalem: 'but the chronology of the bishops at Jerusalem I have nowhere found written out and preserved,'

¹ When that article was written, the work of Schoene, *Die Weltchronik des Eusebius in ihrer Bearbeitung durch Hieronymus* (Berlin, Weidmann'sche Buchhandlung, A. D. 1900), had not yet appeared. I hope to be able to say something of it on a future occasion. It is matter for regret that Schoene has definitely renounced the intention of revising and reissuing his edition of the *Chronicle*, since the recently discovered material renders a new edition imperative.

(τῶν γε μὴν ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις ἐπισκόπων τοὺς χρόνους γραφῇ σωζομένους οὐδαμῶς εἶρον, *H. E.* iv 5). The tenor of this sentence would be quite against any limitation of its scope simply to the bishops down to Hadrian's time, and in fact the corresponding statement in the *Chronicle* occurs at a much later point, Commodus 6 = A.D. 185-186¹, *non potuimus discernere tempora singulorum eo quod usque in praesentem diem episcopatus eorum anni minime saluarentur*². Since, further, the number of names in the list down to the beginning of the third century was unusually large—a point to which I shall have to recur more than once—Eusebius forbore all attempt to invent a separate date of accession for each, and massed them in groups; and as the grouping itself had for the most part to proceed on arbitrary lines, he has not even cared to make the groups identical in the *History* and the *Chronicle*. In the *History* thirteen bishops after James and Symeon, down to the final destruction of Jerusalem in A.D. 135, are enumerated together (*H. E.* iv 5); in the *Chronicle* these are separated, the fourth to the ninth (inclusive) appearing under Trajan 14³, A.D. 111-112, the remainder under Hadrian 7 or 8, c. A.D. 124. In the *History* the next fifteen bishops, after the foundation of the gentile city of Aelia Capitolina on the ruins of Jerusalem, are again catalogued on a single occasion (*H. E.* v 12)⁴, and four more in *H. E.* vi 10; in the *Chronicle* the first name is given separately under Hadrian 19, A.D. 135-136, nine

¹ On the system of reckoning the imperial years see the former article, pp. 187-192.

² Except where the contrary is specially stated, quotations from the *Chronicle* are given from the version of St. Jerome; see the former article, pp. 184-187. In this case the words *usque in praesentem diem* appear to be Jerome's own. The Syriac of Dionysius of Telmahar (Harnack, *Chronologia* p. 83) has for the last clause only *quia non tempus administrationis illorum consignatum est*, and the Armenian agrees with it. Jerome's version elsewhere betrays special knowledge of Jerusalem, in the story of the pig carved over the Bethlehem gate of Aelia (Hadrian 20); though his translation of the *Chronicle* preceded in time his residence at Bethlehem.

³ Schoene gives Trajan 15 with one MS only; his other three agree with the Oxford MS on Trajan 14.

⁴ Eusebius distinctly says *in loc.* that Narcissus, the last name here catalogued, was the fifteenth after the siege under Hadrian and thirtieth from the Apostles; but as a matter of fact only thirteen names are given. Comparison with the *Chronicle* shows that he has in the *History* accidentally omitted the eleventh and twelfth (or, counting from the beginning, the twenty-sixth and twenty-seventh) names, Maximus and Antoninus.

names are grouped under Antoninus Pius 23, A.D. 160-161, and nine again under Commodus 6, A.D. 185-186.

That the origin of this dateless list of names is not to be sought in any Chronicle such as that of Julius Africanus¹ would be *a priori* at least highly probable, for a Chronicle cannot properly contain, and the Chronicle of Eusebius-Jerome does not in fact contain, any undated notices at all. It is true that mere lists of names unequipped with dates not only might be appended to a Chronicle as a species of *pièces justificatives*, but do actually appear in the Chronicle or *Liber Generationis* of Hippolytus, of which indeed they constitute the most important element; but Eusebius leaves us in no real doubt that his source here was local tradition. Palestinian Caesarea was still when Eusebius was born there, as it had been in the time of the Apostles, the civil capital of the province to which Aelia-Jerusalem belonged. The bishops of the two churches, Theophilus of Caesarea and Narcissus of Jerusalem, had together presided over a Palestinian synod on the Easter question at the end of the second century, the Acts of which were still extant when Eusebius wrote (*H. E.* v 23). That the historian himself should investigate on the spot the records of a church at once so nearly connected with his own, and locally at least the inheritor of the *origines* and holy places of Christianity, was natural and inevitable. And the Christians of Jerusalem, it is clear, were not behindhand in satisfying the curiosity of their visitor. They showed him the Chair of St. James; they related to him all the marvels which local tradition had handed down about their bishop Narcissus². Narcissus had by his prayers turned water into oil—after the example of the miracle at Cana—when oil for the lights ran out during the service of the Paschal Vigil, and tiny quantities of the miraculous oil were still preserved and shown by many of the faithful. He had been calumniated on charges which his three accusers had maintained by invoking against themselves, if

¹ See the previous paper, pp. 194-196.

² *H. E.* vii 19 οἱ τῆδε κατὰ διαδοχὴν ἀδελφοὶ σαφῶς τοῖς πᾶσι ἐπιδείκνυνται; νῖ 9 πολλὰ μὲν οὖν καὶ ἄλλα παράδοξα οἱ τῆς παροικίας πολῖται ὅτι ἐκ παραδόσεως τῶν κατὰ διαδοχὴν ἀδελφῶν τοῦ Ναρκίσσου μνημονεύουσιν, κ.τ.λ. It is probably the special position of the Jerusalem Christians, and what seemed to Eusebius (mistakenly) their special claim to be the exponents of a trustworthy tradition from the beginning of things, that leads him to employ the phrase 'succession' in both passages.

their statements were untrue, fire, wasting disease, loss of sight : and the fate which each of the calumniators had invoked came in turn to pass. He had mysteriously disappeared, no man knew whither, to embrace the ascetic life ; his third successor in the episcopate was ruling when once more he returned, as suddenly as he had gone, and was called upon again to exercise his office. His age was now so great that he was unable even to celebrate the Liturgy, and a Cappadocian bishop, Alexander, was chosen to rule with him and to succeed him ; though, as it was contrary to all precedents that a bishop should be translated¹, or that two bishops should be ruling in the same church, revelations came in to overcome the difficulty, and, as Eusebius heard the story, not only was Alexander supernaturally summoned to Jerusalem, but to all the most zealous members of the Jerusalem community (τοῖς μάλιστα αὐτῶν σπουδαίοις) was granted an identical vision of their meeting the predestined coadjutor outside the city gates.

Naturally then these same christians of Jerusalem were not behindhand when the bishop of Caesarea questioned them as to their possession of a trustworthy account of their episcopal succession. They produced him a written list reaching back to the age of the Apostles. 'Εξ ἐγγράφων, 'from a written source,' is the phrase by which Eusebius in the *History* (iv 5) defines his authority for the assertion that fifteen bishops, all of them Jews, preceded the siege under Hadrian ; in the *Demonstratio Evangelica* (iii 5 ; I take the passage from Harnack, p. 219 n) he says still more precisely that the first bishops in the succession down to Hadrian's siege were Jews, 'whose names are still found on record with the christians of the locality,' ὧν τὰ ὀνόματα εἰσέτι νῦν παρὰ τοῖς ἐγχωρίοις μνημονεύεται.

The purpose of this paper is to ask, What is the value of the list which was thus propounded to Eusebius at Jerusalem as representing the tradition of the local church?

We turn in the first place to external evidence, and we ask what is known, whether through Eusebius himself or through other witnesses, of the history of this church of Jerusalem in the first three centuries.

¹ Alexander's translation was the earliest instance known to the historian Socrates, *H. E.* vii 36.

1. Eusebius had at his disposal—besides the list of bishops which is in question—for the first two centuries after Pentecost at least four Palestinian authorities, whose writings bore more or less upon the subject, and for the second half of the third century (he himself was born in A.D. 274) the recollections of actual contemporaries of the events narrated.

The Jewish historian Josephus¹ related the death of James, 'the brother of Jesus who is called Christ,' as occurring in the interval between the death of the procurator Festus and the arrival of his successor Albinus. But the date assigned in the *Chronicle*, Nero 7², A.D. 61–62, though it cannot be very far from the truth³, is not given in Josephus, and was probably selected on more or less arbitrary grounds by Eusebius himself. From Josephus too (παρέδωκε λευσθησομένους) came the detail of the manner of St. James' death, *lapidibus opprimitur*.

Hegesippus, the Palestinian Christian, wrote his five books of *Memoirs* (now lost) not long after the middle of the second century. From them Eusebius drew (i) a lengthy account of the trial, confession, and martyrdom of St. James⁴; (ii) the statement that Clopas, father of Symeon, St. James' successor, was brother of Joseph, so that Symeon was 'cousin' to our Lord⁵; (iii) the

¹ *Antiquities* XX ix 1, quoted in *H. E.* ii 23: see below, p. 536 n. 3.

² Harnack (p. 130) has rightly seen that this (and not Nero 8) is the correct year; two of Schoene's MSS already gave it, and we can now add the Oxford MS.

³ Festus arrived as procurator in all probability either in A.D. 58 or 59; see my article, *Chronology of the New Testament: Apostolic Age*, in *Hastings' Dictionary of the Bible* i 419–420. Albinus was already in office at the Feast of Tabernacles in the fourth year before the outbreak of the war (*Jewish War* VI v 3), i.e. in the autumn of A.D. 62.

⁴ *H. E.* ii 23. According to Hegesippus St. James was thrown down from a pinnacle of the Temple, then stoned, and finally killed by a fuller with his club. When Clement of Alexandria in the Seventh Book of his *Outlines* (quoted in *Eus. H. E.* ii 1) distinguishes this St. James as ὁ κατὰ τοῦ πτερυγίου βληθεὶς καὶ ὑπὸ κραφῆος ἐξέλαφ πλῆγῃς εἰς θάνατον, he was certainly drawing from Hegesippus.

⁵ *H. E.* iii 11. The form Clopas is given in the Greek text of the *History*, both here and in a definite quotation from Hegesippus in *H. E.* iii 32. On the other hand, both translations of the *History*, Rufinus and the Syriac, appear to give Cleophas; and in the *Chronicle*, Trajan 10, the name is Cleopas (Cleophas) according to the Paschal Chronicle, the Armenian, and both Syriac epitomes; in Jerome Schoene prints *Clopas*, but two of his four MSS read *Cleopas*, and they are now reinforced by the Oxford MS. Similar confusion prevails over the name of his son the bishop. Symeon is the only form known in the *History*, whether in the words of Eusebius (*H. E.* iii 11, 22, 32, 35) or in those of Hegesippus (quoted in Eusebius, *H. E.* iii 32); but in the *Chronicle*, Nero 7, he is called *Symeon qui et Simon* (so all

information that this same Symeon was martyred by crucifixion under the reign of Trajan and governorship of Atticus¹.

Aristo of Pella was another Jewish Christian author, somewhat older than Hegesippus, from whom Eusebius drew his knowledge of the edict of Hadrian, forbidding all Jews even to approach the site of what had once been Jerusalem². Harnack suggests (p. 130) that from him may have come, too, the information that Marcus was the first Gentile bishop, which, both in the *History* and in the *Chronicle*, immediately follows. But Aristo of Pella was only (so far as can be ascertained) the author of a dialogue between a Jew and a Christian, Jason and Papiscus, which is not very likely to have contained historical information about the Jerusalem episcopate. And I see no reason to doubt that it was the Jerusalem list itself which contained, together with the notice of the close of the Jewish succession of bishops, a notice of the commencement of the Gentile line: see below, Table I, p. 541.

Equally unsuccessful is the attempt which has been made to see in Julius Africanus a 'source' for Eusebius in relation to the church of Jerusalem. It is true that Africanus lived in Palestine, not very far from Aelia-Jerusalem. But Harnack rightly points out (p. 129) that Aelia in Africanus' day was a place of no special importance; and in fact there is no single piece of information about its history in Eusebius which can plausibly be referred to him. Chronologically precise notices about Jerusalem do not begin in Eusebius till after the time when Africanus wrote, and the details about Africanus' contemporaries, the two bishops Narcissus and Alexander (*H. E.* vi 9–11), come, as we have seen, from Jerusalem tradition, reinforced only by a fragment of Alexander's correspondence³.

authorities; Schoene in Jerome prints Simo for Simon with only one MS), while under Trajan 10 Jerome and the Paschal Chronicle call him Simon—probably rightly—the Armenian and Syriac Simeon. Where did the name Simon come from? from the Jerusalem list?

¹ *H. E.* iii 32. Harnack (p. 129) translates ἐν βουλευτῷ Ἀττικῷ, 'under the proconsul of Syria, Atticus' (whom he then identifies with Sextus Attius Suburanus, consul in A.D. 104): but βουλευτὴς = consularis not proconsul, and in fact neither the governor of Judaea nor the legate of Syria would ever have been called 'proconsul.'

² *H. E.* iv 6, cf. *Chronicle* Hadrian 18.

³ *H. E.* vi 11. This letter, written to the people of Antioch (in Egypt), was in Eusebius' time 'preserved with us,' ἀπ' ἡμῶν, which perhaps suggests the library at Caesarea rather than the archives of the church of Jerusalem.

Apart then from a single statement in Josephus, at the latest point where the Jewish writer was likely to be brought into contact with the history of the Christians of Jerusalem, Hegesippus remains so far the only authority from whom we have reason to know that Eusebius drew. But there are still left a few statements made by Eusebius without indication of source, and we proceed to ask whether these or any of them can be referred to Hegesippus or, if not, whether any new authority must be postulated outside the Jerusalem list and Jerusalem tradition.

(a) At the beginning of the Second Book of the *History*, Eusebius announces his intention of investigating 'the events that followed the Ascension, noting some things out of the divine scriptures and adding others from other records which we shall as occasion offers mention.' He first narrates from the Acts the election of Matthias and ordination of the Seven, with the martyrdom of Stephen, and proceeds according to his programme to reinforce the canonical by external matter¹. 'Then (τότε δὴτα) too James who was called brother of the Lord, for he too was named son of Joseph . . . this James then, whom because of his superiority in virtue the ancients surnamed the Just, was the first they tell us to be entrusted with the throne of the episcopate of the church in Jerusalem'; or more definitely in the *Chronicle*, Tiberius 19 (the year after the Crucifixion) = A.D. 32-33, 'James the brother of the Lord is ordained bishop by the apostles,' compare *H. E.* ii 23 πρὸς τῶν ἀποστόλων; in *H. E.* vii 19 it is even 'at the hands of the Saviour himself and the Apostles.' This reckoning of the episcopate of James from the Ascension—the Liberian list shows a similar procedure in regard to St. Peter's Roman episcopate—goes back, I cannot doubt, to Hegesippus himself², for the quotation in *H. E.* ii. 23 begins with words which exactly satisfy the statement of Eusebius

¹ Zahn (*Forschungen* vi 229) is wrong, I am sure, in supposing that the episcopate of St. James is here meant to be placed *after* the death of Stephen; it is only that the non-canonical is placed *after* the canonical record.

² Clement of Alexandria too uses the phrase μετὰ τὴν ἀνάληψιν τοῦ σωτῆρος of St. James' episcopate (*H. E.* ii 1, from the Sixth Book of the *Outlines*), and we have already seen that Clement draws on Hegesippus for the history of St. James. On the other hand, the statement that St. James was 'ordained by the Apostles' may perhaps have been derived by Eusebius only from this passage of Clement—where Peter, James, and John are said to have chosen James the Just bishop of Jerusalem—and not go back to Hegesippus himself.

in ii 1, 'And together with the apostles James the brother of the Lord succeeds to the church, he who was called Just by all men from the Lord's time down to our own.' What Hegesippus meant by *διαδέχεται τὴν ἐκκλησίαν μετὰ τῶν ἀποστόλων* was that James together with the apostles succeeded to the (government of the) Church after the Lord himself. It is probable indeed that he expressly said that our Lord had himself entrusted the episcopate of the church at Jerusalem to James, since not only Eusebius (*H. E.* vii 19 *ut sup.*) but the Clementine Recognitions and Epiphanius repeat the statement, and no common source is so likely as Hegesippus¹.

(b) The notice that 'after the martyrdom of James and the taking of Jerusalem which immediately followed, the survivors of the apostles and personal disciples of the Lord together with the Lord's kinsmen after the flesh' met at Jerusalem to elect the successor of St. James (*H. E.* iii 11) is introduced with the words *λόγος κατέχει*, 'the story holds.' Bp. Lightfoot thought that this phrase in Eusebius always means 'authentic and trustworthy information.' Harnack, on the other hand, while going further than Lightfoot in connecting it with written sources, holds the exactly opposite opinion of the value implied—'a source which for some reason or in some respect is not quite to be relied on².' Perhaps it is truer to say that Eusebius in using it carefully abstains, so far as the words themselves go, from giving an estimate of value one way or the other. Anyhow there is nothing in this particular case that militates against the authorship of Hegesippus, who is named (in connexion with the relationship of Clopas and Joseph) in the immediate neighbourhood. The truth of the story itself is another matter; it is difficult to suppose that the Jerusalem church was left without a head for at least eight years—since James was martyred at latest in A.D. 62, and the siege was not over till A.D. 70³—so that,

¹ Clem. Recogn. i 43; Epiph. *Haer.* lxxviii 7. I take these references from Zahn, *Forschungen*, vi 229, 230, who has, however, overlooked the important reference to Eusebius; nor can I quite gather whether he sees the real meaning of the phrase *διαδέχεται τὴν ἐκκλησίαν μετὰ τῶν ἀποστόλων* as I have just interpreted it in the text.

² Lightfoot, *Ignatius and Polycarp*¹ i 58 n; Harnack, *Chronologie* p. 128 n.

³ Even if with Zahn (*Forschungen* vi 302) we reject the whole account of James' martyrdom in Josephus as a fabrication, and place it rather with Hegesippus at the Passover of A. D. 66, four or five years still remain to be accounted for; though in this case it is true that the war would be a sufficient explanation.

whatever basis there may be for the rest of the story, its chronology at least is unsatisfactory.

(c) With the same phrase λόγος κατέχει is introduced the explanation of the absence of any extant chronology of the bishops of Jerusalem. Eusebius had nowhere found their dates recorded, 'for the story holds that they were very short-lived,' κομιδῇ γὰρ οὖν βραχυβίους αὐτοὺς λόγος κατέχει γενέσθαι (*H. E.* iv 5). The most natural explanation seems to me here to be that the historian asked his informants at Jerusalem why there were no dates to their list and why there were so many names on the rolls of the see, and that the explanation that they were all very short-lived was the answer to both these questions. In this case λόγος κατέχει would mean no more than the local tradition of the church at Jerusalem as it existed in Eusebius' day.

With these notices the information given in Eusebius of Jerusalem affairs down to the middle of the third century is exhausted; and the point that needs to be borne in mind is that, apart from Hegesippus and three individual notices (that in Josephus, Narcissus' Paschal synod, and the letter of Alexander), Eusebius had nothing at his command by which the value of the Jerusalem traditions could be checked; and in particular, that between the martyrdom of Symeon under the Emperor Trajan at the beginning of the second century, and the participation of Narcissus in a synod on the Paschal question in the papacy of Victor at its close, there is no single fact given us, other than the destruction of Jerusalem and foundation of Aelia Capitolina about A.D. 135, which can confirm or even illustrate the episcopate of any one out of nearly thirty bishops. Whether authorities other than Eusebius come to our rescue here, is a question which I shall ask in a moment.

On the other hand, from the middle of the third century Eusebius becomes an almost contemporary authority, and could derive his information from eye-witnesses. That in the persecution of Decius, A.D. 250, bishop Alexander confessed Christ at Caesarea and died in prison, being succeeded by Mazabanes¹—that after about fifteen years' episcopate Mazabanes was followed

¹ So the *History*, vi 39, with Syncellus; Jerome has Mazabanus, and so according to Schoene the Armenian; the only Syriac epitome which contains the notice gives Mazabana. Epiphanius' list goes with Jerome's.

by Hymenaeus 'who was famous through a long period of years of our own day'¹—that not long before the great persecution Hymenaeus died, and that, after the brief episcopate of Zabdas, Hermon occupied the 'throne' of St. James during the persecution itself²—all this may be accepted without hesitation, and needs no further examination. It is only for so much of the Jerusalem list as precedes the death of Alexander that fresh light must be sought in the authorities whose information adds to that given by Eusebius.

2. The sources other than Eusebius available for our present purpose are five in number: Epiphanius and four chronographers of the ninth and tenth centuries, namely Syncellus, Nicephorus, the *Χρονογραφείον σύντομον*, and Eutychius.

Epiphanius (whose book on *Heresies* was published c. A.D. 375) having occasion in his 66th chapter to mention the claim of the Manichæans that their founder Manes was himself the Spirit promised to the disciples, meets it by cataloguing all the bishops who succeeded one another in Jerusalem between the days of the apostles and the appearance of Manes in the reigns of Aurelian and Probus, A.D. 270-282 (ed. Oehler, ii 432). It is possible that he selected the Jerusalem succession for this purpose just because the number of names in it was so abnormally large, every name adding of course additional weight to an argument which turned on Manes' remoteness from the apostles: it is possible also that Epiphanius' personal connexion with Palestine—he was a native of Eleutheropolis near Jerusalem—had something to do with it. His list enumerates thirty-seven names from James to Hymenaeus, in the course of which some dozen or more synchronisms with the imperial chronology—sometimes vaguely to an emperor's reign, sometimes more precisely to a particular year in a reign—are inserted at irregular intervals. In this point of view he occupies a position intermediate between Eusebius, who gives hardly any notes of time, and the four writers now to be named who

¹ *H. E.* vii 14. The *History* gives no precise date, so that the Valerian 13 of the *Chronicle*, = A.D. 265-266, rests on the approximate results of Eusebius' personal investigation, not on written authority.

² The *Chronicle* gives the year Diocletian 15, = c. A.D. 299, for Zabdas, and Diocletian 18, = c. A.D. 302, for Hermon.

agree in attaching to each bishop's name the number of years of his episcopate.

George Syncellus, an official of the church of Constantinople, composed his *Chronographica* about the year A.D. 800. It is one of the chief sources from which portions of the original Greek of Eusebius' *Chronicle* can be recovered. Nicephorus, patriarch of Constantinople, who died in A.D. 828, was the author of a *Chronographica Brevis* to which was appended his celebrated Stichometry of canonical and deuterocanonical books. The author of the *Χρονογραφείον σύντομον* discovered by Mai, which professes to be constructed 'out of the labours of Eusebius,' is unknown: but he wrote in A.D. 853. These three are Greek writers: the fourth, Eutychius, patriarch of Alexandria, whose *Annales* reach down to A.D. 937, wrote in Arabic¹.

The first table which follows deals only with the variations in the names of the bishops of Jerusalem down to Alexander as we have them in Eusebius, Epiphanius, and the four later authorities, and does not touch questions of date. In the first column I give the list which Eusebius received at Jerusalem as reconstructed from the *History* and the *Chronicle*: in only two cases does there appear to be any room for doubt, namely No. 14 where the *History* has Joseph and the *Chronicle* probably Josés, and No. 21 where the *History* has Gaius and all authorities for the *Chronicle* Gaianus. That the list of Epiphanius in the second column is in some way related to the list of Eusebius is shown not only by the close agreement in number and order of names, but by the common notice (the only non-chronological notice in the Epiphanian list) which marks off the Gentile from the Jewish bishops; and if Epiphanius drew direct from one

¹ On these four chronographers see Lightfoot, *St. Clement of Rome* i 240 ff, who only deals specially with their Roman lists, and Harnack, *Chronologie* i 92 ff, who prints and discusses their lists of all four successions, Rome Antioch Alexandria and Jerusalem. Since the terminology of Lightfoot and Harnack differs—both call the Anonymus A and Eutychius D; but whereas Lightfoot makes Nicephorus B and Syncellus C, Harnack inverts these two—I have thought it best in the table which follows to adhere to the chronological order, and to call Syncellus (1), Nicephorus (2), the Anonymus (3), and Eutychius (4). This has at once the advantage of showing which of them can have made use of which, and also brings next to one another the two pairs which examination shows to be most closely connected, Syncellus and Nicephorus, the Anonymus and Eutychius.

of Eusebius' two works, it must have been from the *Chronicle*, with which he agrees against the *History* in not omitting Nos. 26 and 27, Maximus and Antoninus, and in the orthography of Nos. 14 and 21, Josis and Gaianus. But the variations in the third and fourth names, where Epiphanius has Judas and Zacharias for the Justus and Zacchaeus of Eusebius, suggest that Epiphanius drew not from Eusebius but from Eusebius' source, that is, from the tradition of the Christians of Jerusalem, to whom Epiphanius equally with Eusebius had had the advantage of near neighbourhood.

TABLE I.

I. Eusebius	II. Epiphanius <i>Hær.</i> lvi 20	III. ^a (1)=Syncellas (2)=Nicephorus	IV. ^a (3)=Chron. Syntomon (4)=Eutychius
1. Iacobus	Jacobus		
2. Symeon <i>Chron. adds qui et Simon</i>	Symeon		
3. Iustus <i>Ἰουδαῖος τις ὄνομα Ἰούστος H.E. iii 35</i>	Iudas ...	(1) (2) Iustus (1) has also Iudas ...	(3) (4) Iudas (3) adds ἀλλὰ τοῦ Ἰούστου
4. Zacchaeus	Zacharias ...	(1) Zacchaeus (2) Zacharias	(3) (4) Zacchaeus
5. Tobias	Tobias		
6. Benjamin	Beniamin		
7. Ioannes	Ioannes		
8. Matthias <i>Mattai Syr. a^b Matathius Arm.</i>	Matthias ...	(1) Matthaïos? (2) Matthaïos	(3) Matthaïos
9. Philippus	Philippus	(3) Philetus
10. Senecas <i>Enecas Arm.</i>	Senecas ...	(1) Enecas	
11. Iustus	Iustus		
12. Leuis	Leuis ...	(1) Leuis	(3) Moses, ἀλλὰ τοῦ Λεῦος
Leui Lat. Syr. Arm.		(2) Leui	(4) Leui

The words used of the third bishop by Eusebius, *H. E.* iii 35, *Ἰουδαῖος τις ὄνομα Ἰούστος*, perhaps explain the confusion between Justus and Judas; I imagine that the Jerusalem list may have run either *Ἰουδαῖος Ἰούστος* or more probably *Ἰούδας Ἰούστος*.

^a In these columns I only note divergences from the list of either Eusebius or Epiphanius or both.

^b By Syr. a I mean the seventh or eight-century Syriac epitome of the *Chronicle* printed in Schoene ii 203 (Harnack p. 85); by Syr. b the ninth-century epitome of Dionysius of Telmahar (Harnack p. 83).

I. Eusebius	II. Epiphanius <i>Haer. lvi 30</i>	III. (1)=Syncellus (2)=Nicephorus	IV. (3)=Chron. Symeonon (4)=Eutychius
13. Ephres ... Ephros Syr. a Aphros Syr. b Ephrem Arm.	Vaphris (Οὐδ- φρις) ...	(1) (2) Eph- raim ...	(3) Ephraemias, δαλα- χοῦ Ephraim (4) Ephraim
14. Ioses <i>vel</i> Ioseph ... Ioses Lat. Syr. b Iose Syr. a Ioseph <i>Hist.</i> : Arm. Lat. codd FP	Iosis ...	(1) (2) Ioseph	(3) Iosias, δαλαχοῦ Ioseph (4) Arsanius, <i>probably transliterated wrongly out of Iosias</i>
15. Iudas ... All these of the cir- cumcision. Of the Gentiles:	Iudas These of the circumcision. And of the Gen- tiles these:		(3) <i>has the two his- torical notices</i>
16. Marcus ...	Marcus		
17. Cassianus ...	Cassianus		(3) (4) <i>add Eusebius</i>
18. Publius ...	Publius		
19. Maximus ...	Maximus		
20. Iulianus ...	Iulianus		
21. Gaianus <i>vel</i> Gaius ... Gaianus <i>Chron.</i> Gaius <i>Hist.</i>	Gaianus ...	(1) Gaius (2) Gaianus	(3) (4) Gaius
22. Symmachus ...	Symmachus		
23. Gaius ...	Gaius	(3) <i>omits Gaius</i> (4) <i>has Gabianus, app. for Gaianus</i>
24. Iulianus ...	Iulianus	(1) (2) <i>add</i> Elias ...	(3) (4) <i>add Elias</i>
25. Capito ... Apion Arm.	Capito ...	(1) <i>has Apion of St Capiton</i>	
26. Maximus ... Maximinus Arm. <i>omitted in Hist.</i>	Maximus ...	(1) (2) Maxi- mus ...	(3) (4) Maximus
27. Antoninus ... <i>omitted in Hist.</i>	Antoninus ...	(1) (2) Anto- ninus ...	(3) (4) Antoninus
28. Valens ...	Valens		
29. Dolichianus ... <i>so Hist. and Syr. a</i> Dulichianus Arm. Lat. cod B Dulcianus Lat. codd OAPF Dulcinus Syr. b	Dolichianus	(2) Dulichianus	
30. Narcissus ...	Narcissus		
31. Dios ...	Dios		
32. Germanion ...	Germanion		
33. Gordius ...	Gordius ...	(1) Sardianus (2) Gordias	(3) <i>omits Narcissus</i>
34. Narcissus ...	Narcissus		
35. Alexander ...	Alexander		

With regard to the later lists, it is clear (i) that they have elements in common as against both Eusebius and Epiphanius, for all four agree in inserting an additional bishop, Elias, between Nos. 24 and 25, and substantially in calling No. 14 Ephraim: (ii) that among the four, Syncellus and Nicephorus go together as against the Anonymus and Eutychius, the last two inserting another additional bishop, Eusebius, between Nos. 17 and 18, and agreeing with Epiphanius in calling the third bishop Judas: (iii) that as with these exceptions there is no joint reading of any two of the four authorities which does not find some support in the various witnesses to the text of Eusebius, these lists again cannot be wholly unrelated to the Eusebian list. It is also clear, from what will be said in the succeeding pages, that the chronology of all four came (with several stages intervening) ultimately from a common source: and since Eusebius contained no chronology, the common source here was not Eusebius himself, but at most an authority who may, for matters other than chronological, have drawn from Eusebius direct; it is, however, also possible that the common source may have been early enough to have had immediate access, like Eusebius and Epiphanius, to the Jerusalem tradition. Of any influence of Epiphanius on the 'common source' of the four there is no trace¹, though at a later stage the Anonymus and Eutychius have possibly drawn from him in their Nos. 3 Judas and 14 Josias.

It will be noticed that two of these writers, Syncellus and the Anonymus, display a knowledge of more than one source. Four times the Anonymus prefaces with the word ἀλλὰχού, 'elsewhere,' a variant tradition: Nos. 3 Justus, 12 Leues, 13 Ephraim, 14 Joseph. These variants all correspond with names given by Syncellus, and as he wrote half a century before the Anonymus, I see no reason why their origin should not be looked for in him. With Syncellus himself the matter is not quite so simple. At No. 3 he has both Justus and Judas; and as his pair, Nicephorus, has only Justus, the Judas must have come in from outside. At No. 25 he has Ἀπίων οἱ δὲ Καπίων: all other authorities give Capito (Καπίων), *except the Armenian*

¹ I shall rather have to ask later on whether Epiphanius has not drawn his chronology from the 'common source.'

version of the Chronicle which reads Apion. Nor is this coincidence of Syncellus and the Armenian against the rest unique; for No. 10 they are the only two witnesses that give Enecas for Senecas. In both cases the two Syriac epitomes side with the majority: and it must be confessed that the grouping Syncellus-Armenian in favour of two such remarkable errors is a problem in the textual criticism of Eusebius not easy to explain¹.

But to return to the point from which I started, it does not seem that the four chronographers, even if they do go back for their list of names to the Jerusalem tradition, add anything from it which can modify the list of Eusebius-Epiphanius. Neither the Elias of all four, nor the Eusebius of the Anonymus and Eutychius, has any valid claim on the evidence as we know it to be inserted into the succession². It is time then to turn from the investigation of the names of the Jerusalem list, to the investigation of the chronology as we find it fragmentarily in Epiphanius and completely in the four chronographers; beginning with the latter because of their completeness.

The primary results are, as was to be expected, the same for the chronology of the list as they were for its names. All four chronographers go back to a single original: for all four agree exactly in nineteen episcopates out of thirty-eight. Syncellus and Nicephorus agree exactly with one another in eleven more cases, the Anonymus and Eutychius in eleven more also: and if the two recensions be restored, as Harnack (p. 100) has restored them, they would have agreed apparently in thirty-one episcopates, while in seven they gave different figures. Six of the seven occur in the Jewish part of the list, and in each of them the Anonymus and Eutychius give a higher figure than the other two. The seventh relates to the separate rule of Alexander after Narcissus' death, and here Syncellus and Nicephorus exceed the others by seven or eight years.

The hypothesis of two editions of the *Chronicle* by Eusebius, which on other grounds Salmon Lightfoot and Schoene all accept, is doubtless the easiest way of accounting for the difficulty.

² Harnack (p. 102 n) accounts for *Εὐσεβίου ἑνῇ β'* as a confusion of a marginal note which meant that the 'second,' i.e. the gentile, list of the historian began there. [If Cassianus (who precedes Eusebius in Anon. and Eut.) were indeed the chronographer of A.D. 147—see below, p. 547—the meaning might be that from this point Eusebius the historian was sole authority for the list.]

TABLE II.

Epiphanias	(1) Syncellus (2) Nicephorus	(3) Anonymus (4) Eutychius	A. D.
1. Iacobus 'was martyred in Jerusalem by being beaten with a club: down to Nero'	28	28	31
2. Symeon 'was crucified under Tra- jan'	23	26	59
3. { Iudas Zacharias [Zacchaeus (1) (3) (4)]	[Iudas 7 Sync.] Iustus 6	Iudas 7	85
4. Tobias	4	9 or 7	
5. Benjamin	4	5 or 3	
6. Ioannes 'until the nineteenth year of Trajan'	2	3	
7. Matthias [Matthaeus (2) (3)]	2	2	109
8. Philip [Philetus (3)] ...	2	2	
9. Senecas [Enecas (1)] ...	1	1	
10. Iustus 'until Hadrian'	4	5	119
11. Lewis	4	5	
12. Vaphris	2	2	
13. Iosis... ..	2	3	
14. Iudas 'down to Antoni(n)us II' 'these were bishops of Jerusalem from the circum- cision. And of the Gentiles these,'	2	2	131
15. Marcus	8	8	
16. Cassianus	5	5	
17. Publius	5	[Eusebius 2] 5	
18. Maximus	4	4	
19. Iulianus 'All these down to the tenth year of Antoninus Pius'	2	2	155
20. Gaianus [Gaius (1) (2) (3) (4)]	3	3	
21. Symmachus	2	2	
22. Gaius [om. (3): Gabianus (4)] 'until the days of Verus, his eighth year'	3	3	163

Epiphanius	(1) Syncellus (2) Nicephorus	(3) Anonymus (4) Eutychius	A. D.
24. Iulianus	4 [Elias 2]	4 [Elias 2]	
25. Capito [Apion or Capito (1)]	4	4	
26. Maximus 'until Verus 16'	4	4	175
27. Antoninus	5	5	
28. Valens	3	3	
29. Dolichianus 'down to Commodus'	[Narcissus 12 Sync.]	Dolichianus 4	187
30. Narcissus	[Dolichianus Sync.] 4	Narcissus 12	
31. Dius... .. 'until Severus'	8	8	207
32. Germanion	4	4	
33. Gordius 'until Antoninus' [sc. Caracalla]	5	5	216
34. Narcissus the same ... 'until Alexander son of Mameas, not the Macedo- nian but another'	10	10	226
35. Alexander 'until the same Alexander'	Alexander 15 'the martyr'	7 or 8	233
36. Mazabanus 'until Gallus and Volusia- nus'	21	21	254
37. Hymenaeus 'until Aurelian'	23	23	277

Let us now compare these lists of the years of each episcopate with the notices in Epiphanius, and see whether any contact can be established or made probable between the fourth-century writer and one or other of the two recensions in which the complete chronology has come down to us.

If we turn to the Epiphanian list, as printed in the first column, we shall at once be able to account for certain of the appended notices as already familiar to us. From Hegesippus came the *data* that James was beaten to death at Jerusalem—though not the words 'down to Nero'—and that Symeon was crucified under Trajan. From the Jerusalem list came the note about Jewish and Gentile bishops between the names Judas and Marcus¹. And as we saw in the previous article (p. 193) that

¹ It is possible that all these three notices were taken by Epiphanius out of Eusebius. But we know that he had access to Hegesippus, and we have above seen it to be probable that he had access to the Jerusalem list.

Clement of Alexandria appears to quote a chronographer of the tenth year of Antoninus Pius, it is probable that this lost chronographer (of whom I shall speak in a moment) may also be the source of the note to No. 20 'All these down to the tenth year of Antoninus Pius.' There remain thirteen notices, attached to Nos. 1 [μέχρι Νέρωνος only], 7, 11, 15 [μέχρι α' Αιτωνίου only], 23, 26, 29, 31, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37. I cannot but think that reflection will make it probable to every one that so large a number of notices as this must have been adapted by Epiphanius from some complete chronology. And as a matter of fact if a starting-point be made with Epiphanius' year for the Crucifixion, A.D. 31, and if the chronology of the Anonymus and Eutychius be followed—omitting of course the two bishops Eusebius and Elias, unknown to Epiphanius—the result brings us down to the year A.D. 277, a date twenty years removed from the true date of Hymenaeus' death [c. A.D. 298], but similar to one form of the term given by Epiphanius, the reign of 'Aurelian' [A.D. 270–275], and identical with the other form, the reigns of 'Aurelian and Probus' [A.D. 270–282]¹. Similarly the death of the next preceding bishop, Mazabanes, is put by the chronology in A.D. 254, and by Epiphanius under Gallus and Volusian [A.D. 251–253], but the true date is c. A.D. 265. The death of Alexander is in the chronology A.D. 233, in Epiphanius 'under Alexander Severus' [A.D. 222–235]—apparently towards the end of the reign, since he makes the death of his predecessor Narcissus fall in the same reign—whereas in fact he suffered under Decius, A.D. 250. This remarkable agreement in error in the case of these three bishops, and especially in the case of Alexander, seems to me not likely to be fortuitous. The earlier bishops cannot be tested in the same way, because we do not know their true dates. But if we look only at the names of the reigns in Epiphanius, and omit the years added in some of the earlier cases to the name of the reign, we shall find a similar agreement with the chronographers, except in the single case of the note to No. 15. The proportion of agreement and difference seems to me to be sufficiently marked to warrant the conclusion that

¹ According to Zahn (*Forschungen* vi 289) Epiphanius when he said the fourth year of Aurelian (*Harr.* lxvi 1) meant really the fourth year of Probus, which is the date given for Manes in Eusebius' *Chronicle*.

Epiphanius already had before him a complete chronology of the bishops of Jerusalem, nearly resembling that of the Anonymus and Eutychius. That he should make some blunders in applying it, is only what we should expect of Epiphanius.

This result, interesting as it is for the criticism of our authorities, does not help us in our main problem, the criticism of the Jerusalem list itself: for it is certain that the chronology, even though it now appears to be older than Epiphanius, is not older than Eusebius, who found no chronology at Jerusalem; and being grossly erroneous wherever we can test it, it may be dismissed from further consideration.

But there still remains one notice in Epiphanius, to which I promised to recur, the reference to the tenth year of Antoninus Pius. If there was a chronographer of this year, as the evidence of Clement of Alexandria and Epiphanius taken together seems to imply, can a name be put to him? Schlatter's conjecture that it was Judas, the last Jewish bishop of Jerusalem, has been completely disposed of by Harnack, who himself suggests Cassianus. The *Exegetica* of Julius Cassianus are quoted by Clement as fixing the date of Moses, in near neighbourhood of his mention of calculations from Moses to David, from David to the second year of Vespasian [i.e. the taking of Jerusalem], and from Vespasian to the tenth year of A. Pius (*Strom.* i 21 101; i 21 147). And if Cassianus was the chronographer of this tenth year of Pius (=A.D. 147), and busied himself, as the evidence of Epiphanius suggests, with Jerusalem bishops, is it not natural, it may be asked, to go on to identify him with the Cassianus whom the list names as second gentile bishop of Jerusalem? What we do know, however, of the chronographer Cassianus appears to be fatal to this identification, since Clement of Alexandria speaks of him as a leader of the Docetae, and gives no hint of his having been at any earlier period a Catholic bishop. But even when we have renounced the attempt to find a name, there still remains just a possibility that Epiphanius may be so far right that some chronographer of the year 147 did take some notice of the episcopal succession of Jerusalem.

If this were the case, we should at last have found something of what we set out to seek, an authority older than, and unknown to, Eusebius. Yet it would still be very unlikely that the name-

less chronographer really gave a list of all the twenty bishops who precede in Epiphanius' list the notice of the tenth year of Pius: for not only was the church of Aelia then singularly unimportant, but the complete severance of traditions and associations, which must have intervened between the Jewish church of Jerusalem and the gentile church of Aelia Capitolina, would have made it unnatural for a writer of that day to look upon the Jewish bishops as in the same line of succession with the Gentile.

Such is the solitary fragment of testimony that can, under the most favourable circumstances, be thought to offer any external support to the Jerusalem tradition propounded to Eusebius of the list of bishops between Symeon and Narcissus: and seeing how little it amounts to, we are in effect thrown back wholly on internal considerations and evidence of intrinsic probability as our final criterion.

1. I have already said that the feature of the list which arrested the attention of Eusebius, and would of course arrest the attention of the most casual observer, is the abnormally large number of names which it contains. Down to the destruction of Jerusalem under Hadrian fifteen names are catalogued: and as we know that Symeon, the second bishop, died only under Trajan, that is at earliest c. A.D. 100, only thirty-five years at most are left to be spread over thirteen episcopates. Nor is this feature peculiar to the Jewish portion of the list: it marks the early Gentile episcopates to almost the same extent. From Marcus to Dolichianus are fourteen names, and they have to be compressed into the space between A.D. 135 and A.D. 195, the epoch of the Paschal controversy, when Narcissus was already bishop: nor is there much more room for the succeeding three or four names.

The only explanation of which Eusebius had heard was that the Jewish bishops were *κομὴν βραχυβίους*, 'excessively short-lived.' It cannot be said to be absolutely impossible that twenty-eight bishops should have succeeded one another in the space of a single century, since the Popes of the early middle ages, and especially of the tenth century, followed almost as rapidly. Yet the scholars who have investigated the question in our own day have rightly felt that this solution is unsatis-

factory. Harnack characterises it bluntly as false, and sees in the multiplicity of names an argument against episcopacy: these numerous 'bishops' are not lineal successors, but contemporary presbyter-bishops, and Alexander was the first monarchical bishop in the gentile church of Aelia (pp. 129, 221). The explanation might have seemed a specious one, if we had only had to do with the bishops of the Jewish church previous to A.D. 135, for it would be a tenable hypothesis that episcopacy in the later sense was not universal before that time, just as it would be a tenable hypothesis that some limited number of bishops had followed one another from accidental causes in very rapid succession: it is the extension of the phenomenon to the end of the second century which is fatal to either theory. We might possibly believe in thirteen bishops reigning on an average only two and a half years; we cannot believe in twenty-seven bishops reigning on an average only three and a half years. We might possibly admit the existence of presbyter-bishops at Jerusalem: it is impossible to believe that the church of Aelia was still at the beginning of the third century clinging to a polity which, if it ever existed at all, was already becoming antiquated before this gentile church had been founded.

The same obstacle lies in the way of accepting yet a third explanation, that offered by Professor Zahn (*Forschungen* vi 300), who thinks that all fifteen Jewish bishops of the list must have been real bishops, and that as they cannot all, it would seem, have been bishops of Jerusalem, some names from neighbouring sees, such as Caesarea, must have been incorporated in the Jerusalem list. But since this would be possible (if at all) only of the time when the church of Jerusalem was the metropolis and head-quarters of Christianity in Palestine, the explanation must be pronounced quite inapplicable to the second half of the problem, that is, to the gentile bishops of A.D. 135-210; for the church of Aelia was at that time decidedly inferior in importance to the church of Caesarea, and probably also to many other churches in Palestine.

The catalogue of Eusebius contains then, on the face of it, a difficulty, and this difficulty has proved itself incapable of resolution to all the scholars from Eusebius onwards who have dealt with it.

2. I go on to ask whether it is really reasonable to suppose that any one at Jerusalem should have possessed in Eusebius' day a true record of the succession of bishops there from the beginning, and I say confidently that such a supposition is precarious in the extreme. The break in continuity between Jerusalem and Aelia must have been absolute. The Christians of Jerusalem must have been, it is natural to think, of the most conservative type of Jewish churchmanship: the Christians of Aelia, if at first there were any of them at all, would have been not only Gentiles by race, but inimical, by the very fact of their consenting to settle in the pagan city, to all that pertained to Judaism or even to Jewish Christianity¹. It is scarcely conceivable that they would have looked on themselves as the inheritors and lineal successors of the Jewish community, or would have treasured up the names of the Jewish bishops as the predecessors of their own. And if these names were recorded neither in literature², nor in the local tradition of the first generations of Gentile Christians, it is not easy to see what guarantee of genuineness the informants of Eusebius could have given for this section of the list. The case is no doubt not so strong *a priori* against the Gentile names. Yet there would be no known parallel to the preservation down to the fourth century of a complete list of episcopal successions reaching back to the first half of the second. If Eusebius found no such catalogue in his own church of Caesarea—it may be assumed, I think, that he would somewhere have betrayed knowledge of it, had it existed—it would be matter for surprise if the obscure community at Aelia had been more careful in its records. The smaller the church, and the smaller the city to which it belonged, the less likelihood was there of its being fortunate enough to find continuous chroniclers from the start.

It results then, so far, that the preservation of an authentic list

¹ Not more than twenty or twenty-five years after the foundation of Aelia Justin Martyr (*Dial.* ch. 47) gives us to understand that some of his fellow churchmen refused the name of Christian and the hope of salvation to any who still observed the Jewish law, which presumably the Christians of Jerusalem had observed down to its second destruction.

² Hegesippus no doubt might have catalogued them, for we know that he was interested in the local 'successions'; but if he had done so, Eusebius would have referred to him as an authority, instead of saying (*Dem. Ev.* iii 5) that the names of these Jewish bishops were still preserved in local tradition.

was not probable in itself, and that the list actually produced contains an unsolved, perhaps even an insoluble, difficulty. The presumption that this list was unhistorical will be raised to a high degree of probability, if it can be shown that the time and place of its production were such as to offer special and almost irresistible temptation to forgery.

3. I have spoken of the humble beginnings from which unquestionably the community of gentile christians in Aelia must have grown. Few chapters in the history of the early Church are more curious than the rise of the rulers of this once insignificant body to the fifth place in the precedence of the catholic hierarchy as ratified by the council of Chalcedon: and though it was a far cry to the recognition of the patriarchate, yet the movement by which the church of Aelia began to see in itself the inheritor of the august traditions of the Holy City must have had its roots back in the second century. The impulse perhaps came from outside, as pilgrimages to the Holy Places grew in favour, and pilgrims expressed their veneration for the church which had such memories in its keeping. Melito of Sardis visited the East and 'reached the Place where the Gospel was proclaimed and the Gospel history was acted out¹.' Alexander, according to the local tradition which in this point there is no reason at all to doubt, was visiting Jerusalem from Cappadocia 'for the sake of prayer and investigation of the Places²,' when he was made coadjutor to Narcissus. Origen, before he wrote his Commentary on St. John, had 'been at the Places for investigation of the footsteps of Jesus and of His disciples and of the prophets³.' Firmilian of Cappadocian Caesarea interviewed Origen while on a visit to Palestine 'for the purpose of the Holy Places⁴.' It would seem that soon after A.D. 200 'the Places' was already a technical term in the language of pilgrimage, though it is clear that it applied to the Holy Land at large, and not to the Holy City only. But one can easily understand how

¹ Eus. *H. E.* iv 26 εως του τωπου γερόμενος ενθα ετηράχθη και επράχθη: the verbs have no subject, but are impersonal.

² Eus. *H. E.* vi 11 εὐχῆς καὶ τῶν τόπων ιστορίας ἐνεκεν (the words are Eusebius' own).

³ *Comm. in Jo.* vi 40 (c. A.D. 230-235): he bases his support of the reading 'Bethabara' against 'Bethany' in Jo. i 28 by his personal knowledge, γερόμενος ἐν τοῖς τόποις ἐνὶ ιστορίαις τῶν ἱερῶν, &c.

⁴ Jerome, *de Vir.* Ill. 54 sub occasione sanctorum locorum.

the consciousness of living at the centre of things would fill more and more space in the minds of the faithful of Aelia, and how, as the old controversies between Jewish and Gentile christians faded into a forgotten past, a new generation would lay stress on the possession of the sites of the Gospel history, and therewith on the continuity of a tradition which testified to and guarded them. And this continuity would express itself most perfectly in a single line of episcopal succession, such as all the great churches possessed: Jerusalem, if it wished to rival them, ought to possess it too.

At what precise date the feeling that 'Jerusalem ought to possess' developed into the conviction that 'Jerusalem does possess' and the extant list came into being, it is not easy to say. The council of Nicaea in A.D. 325 did not do more than allow the bishop of Aelia precedence in the province next to the metropolitan of Caesarea. But since Eusebius, bishop though he was of the rival see, speaks of 'Theophilus of Caesarea and Narcissus of Jerusalem' as presidents of a Palestinian synod earlier than A.D. 200 (*H. E.* v 23), it is clear that a position of something like equality with Caesarea must have been a *fait accompli* at the beginning of the fourth century: and no doubt local ambitions kept ahead of external recognition. It may well be therefore that the list of bishops was already to hand some years or even decades before Eusebius inquired for it: but if not, we may be sure that the same informants who related the miracles of Narcissus would have been ready also to produce in writing a complete episcopal succession, sooner than confess the absence of it to their neighbour of Caesarea.

Such a forgery of an episcopal catalogue is not, of course, an isolated or unique phenomenon. The pages of the two volumes so far published of the Abbé Duchesne's invaluable *Fastes épiscopaux de l'ancienne Gaule* offer more than one instructive parallel: compare especially the lists of Geneva Limoges Poitiers and Auch (i 220, ii 47, 77, 92). And the comparison explains to us at once, what we have so far found nothing else to explain, the unusual and unexampled number of names in the list of Jerusalem; for these ecclesiastical forgeries are characterised by no feature more distinctive than the addition of names to the succession of a see with the object of enhancing its antiquity.

Thus at Poitiers eight names are prefixed at the beginning of the list before St. Hilary; at Auch five names are inserted between known bishops of A.D. 511 and 533, and eight names between known bishops of A.D. 551 and 585. At Limoges additional bishops creep in one by one in later redactions, just as we saw Elias and Eusebius appear in later stages of the catalogue of Jerusalem. In all these instances there was a genuine nucleus, just as there was a genuine nucleus at Jerusalem in the names of James and Symeon at the beginning, and of Narcissus, Alexander, and their successors at the end of the list. It is more than possible that occasional names in the interval between Symeon and Narcissus derive from genuine tradition or from scattered notices in writers like Hegesippus. It is even conceivable that whole portions of the list were borrowed from such original authorities as the chronographer of A.D. 147—if he ever existed, and if he said anything about bishops of Jerusalem at all. But on the evidence before us, it is impossible to be satisfied of the substantial genuineness of the list. We must be content to know for certain no more than the names and martyrdoms of the two first bishops, the Lord's brother and the son of Clopas—the substitution of a Gentile for a Jewish line after A.D. 135—the episcopate of Narcissus at the end of the second century, his retirement and return¹—the coadjutorship, succession and martyrdom of Alexander.

The results of investigation into the fourth of Eusebius' lists are thus, it appears, almost wholly negative. We cannot adduce the succession at Jerusalem as a continuous witness to primitive episcopacy. In another paper I hope, after dealing more briefly with the catalogue of Antioch, to discuss that of Alexandria, and then to approach the core of the problem in the case of the catalogue of Rome.

C. H. TURNER.

¹ Not however the names of the three bishops given as ruling during his absence, which are far from being above suspicion.