

BIBLICAL CRITICISM

to the

END OF THE SECOND CHRISTIAN CENTURY

by

EDWARD J. YOUNG

Submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements

for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

The Dropsie College

for Hebrew and Cognate Learning

1943

A P P R O V A L

This dissertation, entitled
BIBLICAL CRITICISM
to the
END OF THE SECOND CHRISTIAN CENTURY

by

Edward J. Young

Candidate for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

has been read and approved by

Joseph Reider

Solomon J. Little

Solomon L. Cross

Date May 14, 1943

BIBLICAL CRITICISM TO THE END OF THE SECOND CHRISTIAN
CENTURY

Table of Contents

	Page
Introduction	3
<u>Chapter One</u> - The Gnostic Sects and Biblical Criticism	
Introduction	11
Simon Magus	
The Ophites	
The Peratae	
The Cainites	
The Archontici.	
Gnosticism Proper	
The Syrian School	
Satornilus	
Tatian	
The Egyptian School	
Valentinus	
The Italian School	
The Epistle of Ptolemy to Flora	
<u>Chapter Two</u> - Marcion and Biblical Criticism	25
Marcion	
Apelles	
The Severiani	
<u>Chapter Three</u> - Non-Gnostic Sects of the First Two Christian Centuries.	38
The Nazarites	

Table of Contents Continued

The Ebionites

The Clementine Homilies

Groups of Minor Importance

Chapter Four - Celsus and the True Discourse.

Pg. 46

Introduction

Celsus' Criticism of the Bible

The Origin of Judaism

The Jewish Nation and Its History

Criticism of the Jewish Religion

Celsus and Biblical Anthropomorphism

Celsus' Criticism of Individual Biblical
Statements

Celsus and the Mosaic Authorship of the
Pentateuch

The Importance of Celsus and His Work

Conclusion

Notes to the Introduction	75
Notes to Chapter One	78
Notes to Chapter Two	95
Notes to Chapter Three	106
Notes to Chapter Four	117

INTRODUCTION

The present day is witness to a considerable amount of scientific and critical study of the Bible. This fact may readily be understood. The Bible is an old work, and was written by many different authors over a period of at least one thousand years. During the long course of its transmission, the text of the Scriptures has passed through many vicissitudes. Into this text inaccuracies and errors have crept, and it is to be expected that enquiring minds should engage themselves in the study of the condition of the text. Again, parallel passages, seeming anachronisms, inconsistencies and difficulties in history and chronology likewise invite the attention of critical scholars.

In the study of the Bible two kinds of criticism may be noted. In the first place there is textual criticism, which is the science that deals with the actual text of the Bible.¹ The textual critic is concerned with the state of the Biblical words. Have they been correctly transmitted? Do they contain interpolations or omissions? Are there cases of incorrect orthography? Why do the manuscripts sometimes vary? These and kindred questions occupy his attention. This science is also referred to as lower criticism, in order to distinguish it from what is known as higher criticism.

Secondly there is that which is known as higher or literary-historical criticism.² By higher criticism is meant that science which deals with the questions of the date and authorship of Scriptural books and the character of their contents. In the strict sense, therefore, everyone who studies such questions is a higher critic. In actual practice, however, emphasis has been shifted from the word higher to the word criticism, so that the term seems almost to have lost its specialized meaning and refers rather to a certain widely prevalent attitude toward the Bible. This attitude

is one which for the most part is hostile toward traditional viewpoints and interpretations. In so far as it seeks to deny traditional viewpoints and to minimize the value of the contents of the Bible, it would be more accurately characterized as hostile or destructive or negative criticism.

The phenomenon which today is popularly referred to as "higher criticism", in so far as it applies to the Old Testament, probably first manifested itself with the publication in 1753 of Jean Astruc's work on Genesis.³ It is a phenomenon which bears more or less of a scientific character, and for the most part is being carried out by men of culture and education. The roots of this modern phenomenon, however, go far back beyond the time of Astruc. Indeed, what is spoken of today as higher criticism is in reality merely the modern phase or manifestation of an attitude or process which goes back to days of antiquity. Criticism of the Bible probably appeared as soon as the Bible became known. It is the purpose of this thesis to trace the history of such criticism, as it refers to the Old Testament, from the beginning of this era down to the end of the second Christian century.

When, however, does the first recorded evidence of such criticism appear? Are examples of it possibly to be found in the Old Testament itself? According to the school of interpretation which bears the name Graf-Kuenen-Wellhausen, there was conflict between the priestly and prophetic class in ancient Israel.⁴ But upon the presuppositions of this school, such conflict was not based upon opposition to a Scripture already in existence. Indeed, this assumed conflict is made one of the reasons for maintaining that the Pentateuch had not yet been written. Hence, even upon the basis of the reconstruction of Israelitish history which has been presented by Wellhausen, criticism of an already existing Scripture does not appear in the Old Testament.

A superficial reading of the prophecies of Jeremiah regarding the New Covenant might lead to the conclusion that this prophet was engaging in criticism of the existing Mosaic legislation.⁵ However, a careful study of the passage shows that such is not the case. Jeremiah realizes the partial and temporary nature of the Old Covenant: Its time has run its course, and God was ready to present a further revelation; He would make a New Covenant whose nature was to be spiritual and eternal.⁶ Such appears to be the meaning of the prophet.

Again, it might appear that certain of the prophets were critical of the sacrificial legislation of the Pentateuch when they assailed the offering of sacrifices.⁶ Here again, however, a sympathetic exegesis reveals that the prophets were condemning not the institution of sacrifice itself but rather its misuse and abuse.⁷ Genuine Biblical criticism does not appear to be found in the Old Testament.

Upon the basis of certain references in the early Church Fathers, it appears that Biblical criticism was carried on in Alexandria during the period of the Ptolemies and possibly even earlier. About such activity very little can be asserted with certainty. One prominent name is that of Aristobulus, of the second century B.C. Apparently he was a serious thinker and a man of influence.⁸ He is described as a peripatetic who believed that the Jewish philosophy was older than that of the Greeks. He also asserted that Plato had derived his ideas from the Mosaic Law.

Mention should also be made of Aristeas, of the time of Ptolemy Philadelphus, who is described as a truly educated man, and who wrote an interpretation of the Jewish law.⁹ Hecataeus of Abdera is described by Josephus as having become prominent under Alexander the Great.¹⁰ He wrote a book on the Jews, which probably bore the name "About Abraham and the

Egyptians."¹¹

Eusebius gives extracts from the writings of these men, and the extant material leads one to believe that they were serious students and thinkers. Although nothing that might legitimately be called criticism of the Bible appears in the meagre data which is preserved, it may be that among the early Alexandrian scholars some critics were to be found. Clement of Alexandria speaks in such a way as to lead one to believe that there was a sizeable school of Biblical scholars.¹² Mention is also made of a translation of the Scriptures which is earlier than the Septuagint.¹³

In the Septuagint itself traces of critical activity are to be found. The rearrangement of passages in the translation of Jeremiah, for example, is probably due to the fact that the translators were seeking to present the passages in a logical arrangement. Again, it seems quite likely that in actual translation expressions and renderings were at times adopted which were intended to be an improvement of the original.¹⁴ All in all, therefore, it may be said that traces of critical activity do appear in the Septuagint.

In the New Testament, however, such critical activity is not to be discovered. It is true that the writers of the New Testament books did follow the Septuagint version rather than the original Hebrew, but in so doing they were simply employing a text that was adapted to their needs. Such action upon their part in no sense implies a desire to reject the Hebrew text and to substitute the Septuagint. For that matter, not even the Septuagint itself is slavishly followed in the New Testament. For example, James, when addressing the Apostolic Council, made a quotation from the Old Testament in which he followed in the main the Septuagint text of Amos 9:11,12. He departs however from the text and substitutes phrases taken from elsewhere in the Old Testament.¹⁵ This he does apparently because he thinks it will

best suit his purpose so to do. Certainly he cannot be accused of seeking to correct the Septuagint.

The case of James has been cited as but an example. However, if each instance of New Testament usage of Old Testament language be considered, it will be seen that in no case is the attempt made to criticize the text or to find fault with it.

Nor may criticism of the Old Testament teachings be discovered in the New. Christ did not repudiate the Law of Moses but asserted that He had come to fulfil that Law.¹⁶ Nor did the apostle Paul, despite his insistence upon faith, in any sense minimize or decry the Law. To him it was just and holy and true.¹⁷ Likewise the Epistle to the Hebrews with its emphasis upon the new covenant and the contrast between the Aaronic priesthood and that of Christ does not in any sense criticize or minimize the importance of the Law.¹⁸

In the first chapter of the work falsely ascribed to Tertullian, "Against All Heresies," mention is made of a certain Dositheus, the Samaritan, who rejected the prophets upon the ground that they had not spoken under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit.¹⁹ According to the unknown author of this short treatise, the Samaritans sprang from the root of Dositheus' error. Epiphanius considers the followers of Dositheus as constituting the fourth Samaritan heresy in his list.²⁰

In the work falsely ascribed to Jerome, Indiculus de Haeresibus, mention is made of the Meristae who divide the Scriptures and do not believe all the prophets.²¹

For the first definite evidences of criticism which are now extant from the first two centuries of this era and concerning which it is possible to obtain more or less full information, one must look to the various groups

of the Gnostics which came to the height of their prominence during the early portion of the second Christian century.

CHAPTER ONE

The Gnostic Sects and
Biblical Criticism

Introduction.

The second century beheld the Christian Church struggling with foes which were both within and without her pale. The foe within was possibly even more formidable than that which was without. This was the phenomenon known as Gnosticism, a philosophical system which for a time seriously threatened the progress of the church.

Different views have been held as to the nature and origin of Gnosticism. On the one hand it has been regarded as essentially a Christian heresy, far removed from the Christianity of the Church and a truly greivous aberration, but nominally Christian at least. In a re-examination of the subject F. C. Burkitt has recently given fresh emphasis to this position, by declaring that the prime factor in the rise of the Gnostic systems was eschatological.¹

On the other hand, learned endeavors have been made to demonstrate that Gnosticism was essentially Oriental and pagan.² Kidd, for example, asserts that its origin is wholly "non-Christian, indebted partly to Oriental and partly to Hellenic influences." Possibly such questions cannot be decided with absolute certainty, nor are they immediately germane to our discussion. Gnosticism, whatever may have been its origin, appears as a philosophical system which is adverse to the Old Testament. Into its scheme the Old Testament does not fit. Therefore, the Gnostics expend their labors in an endeavor to point out the inferiority of the Old to the New Testament.

The antipathy to Judaism and to the Old Testament which characterized the Gnostics, some more strongly than others, is one which probably is to be traced ultimately to the Gnostic doctrine of creation.³ Among the various

Gnostic groups dualism appeared as an important principle, particularly with the Syrian school and with Marcion.⁴ Spirit and matter were regarded as being opposed the one to the other. Ultimately, the existence of the world is to be traced back to Spirit or the Spiritual World. Its immediate cause, however, was not the Spirit or Supreme God, but rather an emanation from Him, the Demiurge. This Demiurge or "inferior God" was regarded as the God of the Jews. If, therefore, this basic dualism be kept in mind, the underlying cause of much of the criticism of the Old Testament will be more readily understood.

Simon Magus.

Since Gnosticism itself was of a more or less syncretistic character, it is not surprising that some of its precursors should have appeared in Samaria, for Samaria had long been of mixed population.⁵ Mention has already been made of Dositheus, the Samaritan. One of those who has justly been regarded as a precursor of Gnosticism was Simon Magnus, who is mentioned in Acts 8:10 as being regarded by the Samaritans as "that power of God which is called Great."⁶ Epiphanius presents a positive statement as to Simon's attitude toward the Old Testament. According to Epiphanius he held that the Law was not from God, nor were the prophets from the good God. Rather he divides the Old Testament books and claims that anyone who believes in the Old Testament will surely die.⁷

In the Clementine Homilies Simon is represented as taking exception to certain anthropomorphic representations of the Scriptures.⁸ When, in reference to the wickedness of Sodom (Genesis 18:21), God says, "Come, and let us go down and let us see whether they do according to their cry which

has come unto me; or, if they do not, that I may know," this is held to indicate the ignorance of God.⁹ This ignorance is further thought to be seen in the expulsion of Adam from the garden (Genesis 3:22).¹⁰ God says, "—lest he put forth his hand, etc.", and this use of lest is appealed to as an indication of ignorance. The expulsion from the garden is also indicative of God's envy.¹¹ Furthermore, God repents (Genesis 6:6), and Simon takes objection to such a representation of the Deity.¹² He also expressed other objections to Scriptural anthropomorphism. The phrase, "The Lord smelled a scent of sweetness" (Genesis 8:21) indicates that He was in need; and His pleasure in the fat of the flesh shows that He was not good. His tempting of Abraham (Genesis 22:1) makes it clear that He is wicked and ignorant of the result of the temptation.¹³ As will become evident, such criticism is of a similar nature with that of the leading Gnostics and of Marcion.

The Ophites

One of the groups which was apparently pre-Christian in origin and which may be regarded as a precursor of the principal schools of Gnosticism is that which is known as the Ophites.¹⁴ About its identity very little can be positively affirmed. The origin of the cult is unknown, although it is placed by some before the time of Christ.¹⁵ The views and tenets of the Ophites are purely heathen, and their relationship to the mythology of Syria and Chaldea has been pointed out.¹⁶ We learn of them principally through the writings of Irenaeus, Hippolytus, Tertullian and Epiphanius.¹⁷

The Ophites or Naaseni, as they are sometimes called, worshiped the serpent or Naas. To Naas was dedicated every shrine and every mystery.¹⁸ According to Pseudo-Tertullian the Ophites exalted the serpent as being the

one who gave to mankind the knowledge of good and evil.¹⁹ He it was who was really the first teacher of mankind. The fall, therefore, was in reality a fall upwards.²⁰ Consequently, the followers of the Serpent possessed a deep antipathy for the Demiurge or God of the Old Testament, and it was this antipathy which expressed itself in their practical glorification of the serpent, the opponent of the Old Testament God.

This perversion of the Old Testament appears against the background of a heathen mythology, the exact nature of which is difficult to ascertain. It may be noted however, that the Ophites postulated a hebdomad, the first place of which was occupied by a being known as Ialdabaoth.²¹ Upon an occasion, Ialdabaoth, being uplifted with pride, cried out, "I am father and God, and above me there is no one."²² His mother, however, rebuking him, declared that the father of all was the first anthropos, and Anthropos the son of Anthropos.²³ In the resulting confusion, Ialdabaoth exclaimed, "Come, let us make man after our image."²⁴ Upon hearing this, the six powers together formed a man, immense of size both in breadth and length into whom was breathed the spirit of life and who became possessed of intelligence and thought. This created being gave thanks to the first Anthropos, thus arousing the jealousy of Ialdabaoth.²⁵

The creation of Eve was produced from the enthymentesis of Ialdabaoth.²⁶ Prunicus, laying hold of her, emptied her of her power. Others, however, named her Eve, and having fallen in love with her, begat sons by her, who are called angels. Sophia, however, devised a scheme, whereby Eve and Adam would transgress the command of Ialdabaoth.²⁷ Both of them, therefore, ate of the three from which God had prohibited them to eat. Through this act of eating, they attained to the knowledge of that power which is above all, and left their creators.²⁸

Ialdabaoth, however, cast Adam and Eve from Paradise.²⁹ He, himself, had desired to beget sons by Eve, but his mother opposed him and secretly emptied Adam and Eve of the light which they had received, so that "the spirit which proceeded from the supreme power might participate neither in the curse nor opprobrium."³⁰ Hence, they were cast down to this earth from heaven, and with them the serpent.

When Adam and Eve came to this world their once light and clear bodies became more gross and sluggish.³¹ Prunicus, however, taking compassion on them, caused them to take cognizance of their condition, and Sophia guided them to food, after the partaking of which they had carnal knowledge of one another and begat Cain, whom the serpent impelled to deeds of evil. Then came Seth and Norea, from whom all mankind was descended.

Because men did not worship him as God and father Ialdabaoth became enraged and sent the deluge.³² However, Sophia intervened and saved Noah and his family. Then, Ialdabaoth chose Abraham and made a covenant with him and later, through the hand of Moses, he brought forth Abraham's descendants from Egypt, gave them the Law, and made them Jews.³³ Seven days were chosen, called the Hebdomad.³⁴

The prophets were distributed as follows: Moses, Joshua, Amos and Habakkuk to Ialdabaoth; Samuel, Nathan, Jonah and Micah to Iao; Elijah, Joel and Zechariah to Sabaoth; Isaiah, Ezekiel, Jeremiah and Daniel to Adonai; Tobias and Haggai to Eloi; Michaiah and Nahum to Oreus; Esdras and Zephaniah to Astanphaeus.³⁵ The meaning of this division is not as clear as could be desired. Irenaeus reports that each one of these gives glory to his own father and God, and through them also Sophia has spoken concerning the first

Apparently some of the Ophites asserted that Sophia herself became the serpent and so was an enemy with the creator of Adam. She is said to have placed knowledge within him, and so the serpent became known for his wisdom. The position of our intestines and their figure in the form of a serpent also reveals our hidden "generatrix".³⁷

Without doubt the Ophites were doing far more than engaging in a mere allegorical interpretation of the Bible. Nor were they merely seeking to compel the Old Testament to support their views. Rather, it would seem, were they endeavoring to force the Old Testament to reverse its own message. The God whom the Scriptures set forth they would despise. The serpent, whom the Bible presents as the agent through whom sin entered the world, was exalted. It is in this exaltation of the serpent that the Ophites in reality showed themselves to be critics of the Bible. Allegorical interpretation with them was more or less of secondary importance. It was the Biblical teaching about God and about the serpent which they were concerned to destroy. Despite the apparent cloak of allegory, therefore, we may here discern evidence of criticism of the Bible.³⁸ Such criticism was not the product of careful study and meditation; it was rather the natural result of a confused philosophy standing in opposition to the Bible.

The Peratae

A branch of the Ophites was known as the Peratae.³⁹ They also exalted the serpent.⁴⁰ In a sense also, they magnified Cain, asserting that his sacrifice was not acceptable to the god of this world who approved rather of the bloody sacrifice of Abel. In this respect, therefore, they also perverted the teaching of the Old Testament. They made other references to

the history of Genesis and Exodus, however, and in one instance probably speak of a book of Moses.⁴¹ Here, again, we behold a heathen mythology in conflict with the Scripture.

The Cainites

This group glorified Cain, Esau, Korah, the Sodomites and such like for its ancestors.⁴² Cain they considered to be a martyr to the wrath of the Demiurge.⁴³ This attitude can probably be traced to their hostility to the Creator whom they called Mystra.⁴⁴

It is difficult fairly to evaluate the teaching of the Cainites, because so little is known of them, and that little comes through the hands of their opponents. Possibly there is a reference to them in the book of Jude, "...went in the way of Cain, and ran riotously in the error of Balaam for hire, and perished in the gainsaying of Korah."⁴⁵ The reference however cannot be proven, and the Cainites must remain as a more or less unknown group which, upon the basis of its philosophy perverted the Old Testament.

The Archontici

Both John of Damascus and Epiphanius also make mention of the Archontici. These rejected the Old Testament, although they made use of it by falsely interpreting it.⁴⁶ In both of the above mentioned authors the Archontici are placed between the Sethites and the Ardonians in the discussion. According to Epiphanius, they referred everything back to many beginnings.⁴⁷ Apparently this heresy was confined principally to Palestine, although it had spread abroad to some extent when Epiphanius wrote.⁴⁸ Apart from its rejection of the Old Testament, this sect also used certain secret

books.⁴⁹

The Syrian School

Satornilus

The Syrian school of Gnosticism bears a somewhat Oriental character.⁵⁰ It insisted upon a rigid and austere morality and, unlike some of the Gnostic sects, upon a strict moral life. Among its adherents a principle of dualism is to be found, which underlies their antagonism to the Old Testament.

One of the representatives of this school was Satornilus of Antioch, a contemporary of Ignatius, who apparently followed in the steps of Menander, giving to the doctrines of the latter a more Christian character.⁵¹ Satornilus set forth an antithesis or dualism between Satan and the God of the Jews, both of which he believed to be angels.⁵² In line with his Gnostic tendencies, he and his followers taught that some prophecies had been uttered by the angels who had created the world and some by their enemy Satan.⁵³ The grounds for this attitude apparently are to be found in the Gnostic tenets which were held by Satornilus.

Tatian

In his early life while at Rome, Tatian came under the influence of Justin Martyr and was converted to Christianity.⁵⁴ It was as a Christian that he wrote his Oratio ad Graecos, and in this work expressed a high regard for the Scriptures.⁵⁵ About ten years after the death of Justin he began to proclaim ideas patterned somewhat after those of Valentinus, and journeyed to the east.⁵⁶ His Gnosticism was of a somewhat eclectic nature and severely

ascetic. As was the case with the other members of the Syrian school, dualism became prominent in Tatian's teachings and hence his disparagement of the Old Testament as the work of an inferior God.⁵⁷ He is also known for his Harmony of the Gospels or Diatessaron, a work in which his Docetic opinions are probably reflected.⁵⁸

What was unique and, according to Irenaeus original, in the views of Tatian was that he denied salvation to Adam. "Adam cannot even attain unto salvation", he said.⁵⁹ These opinions concerning the Scriptures appear the more remarkable when they are compared to the tribute which he had formerly paid to the Scriptures in writing of his conversion.⁶⁰ "I happened", he had written, "to meet with certain barbaric writings, too old to be compared with the opinions of the Greeks, and I was led to put faith in these by the unpretending cast of the language, the inartificial character of the writers, the foreknowledge displayed of future events, the excellent quality of the precepts, and the declaration of the government of the universe as centered in one Being."⁶¹

The reversal of Tatian's attitude toward the Scriptures was the fruit of his acceptance of Gnostic tenets. His principal concern, however, was not to engage in Biblical criticism, but positively to present the views which he held.⁶²

The Egyptian School

Valentinus

One of the greatest of all the Gnostic thinkers was Valentinus, a fact which may be recognized by the stature of the adversaries who took up

the pen against him.⁶³ He is said to have been a native of Egypt and to have been educated in Alexandria.⁶⁴ He journeyed to Rome and there attained to the height of his influence and power. Valentinus has left no explicit criticism of the Old Testament, and yet, upon the basis of remarks made by certain Church Fathers, it appears that he did engage in such criticism.

According to Pseudo-Tertullian Valentinus approved of some parts of the Law and Prophets and disapproved of others, and hence, in the eyes of the unknown writer, he should be regarded as disapproving of all.⁶⁵ Apparently also he had engaged in emendation or alteration of the text for the sake of improving it.⁶⁶ Irenaeus plainly attributes such action to deceit. According to him the followers of Valentinus transpose passages and disregard the order and continuity of the text.⁶⁷ Valentinus and his followers were primarily not Biblical critics but were interested in the exposition of a philosophical system.⁶⁸ Hence, they quite likely did not bring to the study of the Bible that care which Irenaeus believed was necessary. To him, therefore, their methods of Biblical study would appear to be unjust. It is this which probably accounts for his strong language.

Epiphanius adds his testimony to that of Pseudo-Tertullian to the effect that the followers of Valentinus reject the Old Testament and the prophets.⁶⁹

The Italian School

The Epistle of Ptolemy to Flora

Almost nothing is known of Ptolemy save that he was the author of a letter to a Christian lady, Flora by name, in which he endeavored to convert her to Gnosticism, supporting his arguments by an appeal to Scripture.⁷⁰

He was really a representative of the Valentinian Gnosis, and his epistle probably presents the earliest attempt to deal with difficulties in the Old Testament in a scientific way.⁷¹

Ptolemy's argument may be summed up as follows: There are those who believe that the Law has been established by God the Father.⁷² Others, however, have adopted a different procedure, and ascribe it to the devil by whom they also assert the world to have been founded.⁷³ But both are deceived, because it does not appear likely that the Law can come from the perfect God, since it is ^Lint_L itself imperfect, and in need of being fulfilled, and contains precepts which are alien to the nature and mind of such a God.⁷⁴

Nor can the Law be attributed to the adversary, for he is unjust, whereas the Law enjoins justice.⁷⁵ To attribute it to the adversary is to overthrow the words of the Saviour who said that a house or city divided against itself cannot stand. There is, however, thinks Ptolemy, a solution to this problem.

In the first place, it should be recognized that the entire law which is embraced in the five books of Moses, was not given by one author, not even by God alone, but some of the laws were drawn up by men. Some parts of the Law are given by God; others must be attributed to Moses, whereas still others were the work of the elders who were among the people.⁷⁶ That this was the true state of the case may be learned from the words of the Saviour in which He discusses the question of divorce. God joined the man and the woman together and forbade divorce. Moses, however, permitted it and so acted contrary to the decrees of God.⁷⁷ This Moses did of necessity and not of his own free will (τοῦτο οὐ κατὰ προαίρεσιν ποιήσας τὴν ἑαυτοῦ, ἀλλὰ κατὰ ἀνάγκην).

So likewise did the elders modify the fifth commandment, as Christ pointed out. The Divine Law was, "Honor thy father and thy mother, that it may be well with thee."⁷⁸ The elders, however, said, "A gift to God, by whatsoever thou mightest be profited by me."⁷⁹ Isaiah also had condemned the people, saying, "This people honoreth me with their lips, but their heart is far from me. In vain do they worship me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men."⁸⁰ From these examples, concludes Ptolemy, it may be seen that the Law is divided into three parts, and contains ordinances of Moses, of the elders and of God.⁸¹

That part of the Law which proceeds from God, continues Ptolemy, is again divided into three parts.⁸² One consists of genuine precepts, freed from mixture with evil, which may be called the law proper. This Christ came not to destroy but to fulfil.⁸³ Another is that part which the Saviour did away with as being contrary to His own nature.⁸⁴ Lastly, there are those laws which may be called typical and symbolical.⁸⁵ These the Saviour employed in a spiritual manner.

To the first part, Ptolemy would attribute the Ten Commandments.⁸⁶ To the second belong the laws of retaliation, such as "an eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth."⁸⁷ This part of the Law has been done away by the coming of the Son of God.⁸⁸ The third portion of the Law has to do with circumcision, the Sabbath, fasting, Passover, unleavened bread, and other similar prescriptions,⁸⁹ all of which are figures and types, as is indicated by the use which the apostle Paul makes of them.⁹⁰

Who, then, is this God which has given the Law?⁹¹ For if it did not come from the perfect God, nor from the devil, it must have been from another, and such is actually the case. The Law comes from the Demiurge and maker of

this world and all it contains, who serves as occupying a middle position.⁹²

In this brief epistle which Epiphanius has preserved, there may be discerned an endeavor to grapple with the problem of the Old Testament from the Gnostic point of view. To Ptolemy the Law is not perfect and so is not to be attributed to a God who is perfect. It is rather the work of an inferior God, the Demiurge. To solve his problem, therefore, Ptolemy has recourse to his philosophical presuppositions.

Apparently, however, he has been more discerning than some Gnostics in his treatment of the Law. Because of its difficulties, this Law appears to him to be of diverse authorship. Hence his assertion that God and the elders composed it.

At the same time it must be noticed that Ptolemy did not actually deny the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch, for he clearly asserts that the entire Law was embraced in the five books of Moses.⁹³ At first sight it might seem as though he were contradicting himself, but such was not the case. Apparently he believed that the Pentateuch was actually composed by Moses, but that not all of the laws which it contained were the work of Moses as a law-giver. Moses did compose some of these laws, as Ptolemy recognizes, but the author of others was God and still others were the laws of the elders. All were placed in the five books of Moses. It would seem, therefore, that in some respects, Ptolemy was a second century forerunner of Astruc, for he seems to make Moses the compiler although not the author of all the laws in the Pentateuch.⁹⁴

Although the philosophical presuppositions of Ptolemy's criticism is apparent, yet there may be seen in the "Epistle to Flora" a genuine effort to grapple with the problem of the Old Testament as that problem would appear

to a Gnostic. Ptolemy is deserving of credit for his recognition of the fact that different types of laws are present in the Pentateuch, and although his solution of the problem would not appeal to us today, yet far more than any other Gnostic, so far as is known, did he seek to present a solution to the difficulties which he believed were to be found in the laws of the Old Testament.

CHAPTER TWO

Marcion and Biblical
Criticism

One of the most hostile opponents of the Old Testament during the second Christian century was Marcion. Marcion was a native of Pontus and the son of a Christian bishop.¹ About 138 A.D. he came to Rome and there united with the church.² At Rome he met Cerdo, and no doubt was greatly influenced by the latter's views, particularly by his dualism. Cerdo had pointedly proclaimed that the God of the Old Testament and that of the New were different beings. He repudiated both the Law and the Prophets, and his views were carried on by his followers who became known as the Cerdonians.³

The dualism of Cerdo influenced Marcion and played a large part in his thinking, coloring his views as to the relationship between the Old and New Testaments. To Marcion there were two gods, one a warrior god, austere and judicial, the other good and kind.⁴ One of these is the Creator, says Tertullian, and Him it is impossible to deny, but the other is Marcion's own god, whose existence cannot be proved.⁵ To the Creator Marcion applied Christ's figure of the corrupt tree bringing forth corrupt fruit, and so concluded that the Creator had produced moral evil.⁶ Christ however seemed to Marcion to possess a different disposition from that of the Creator, having "simple and pure benevolence".⁷ Hence, in Christ there was revealed a new divinity. Thus, at the basis of Marcion's speculations lies this distinction between the Creator God of the Old Testament and the good God of the New.⁸

Marcion also made a separation between the Law and the Gospel or the Old and New Testaments. Indeed, logically it was this separation between the Law and the Gospel which suggested the distinction between the God of the Old Testament and that of the New.⁹ "Marcion's special and principal work", alleges Tertullian, "is the separation of the law and the gospel."¹⁰ From the diversity of the two documents in which the Law and the Gospel are contain-

ed, Marcion would contend also for a diversity of gods. Marcion therefore is to be known as the "author of the breach of peace between the Gospel and the Law."¹¹ Such is Tertullian's opinion.

It can readily be seen, then, why Marcion disparaged the Old Testament. If the tree be corrupt, the fruit must likewise be corrupt. And if the Creator be imperfect, so must His revelation be imperfect. Likewise, if there be imperfections in the Law, as Marcion believes there are, it follows that the author of the Law must be inferior to the God of the New Testament.

The strictures which Marcion passed upon the Old Testament were set forth in a work of his known as the "Antitheses".¹² In this volume he contrasted the teachings of the Old Testament with those of the New, to the disparagement of the former. The work is not preserved in full by any of the Church Fathers, and it is mentioned by name only by Tertullian. However, from the remarks made by Tertullian, it is possible to obtain a fair idea of the nature of this work of Marcion's.

Marcion's criticism first directs itself to the account of man's fall into sin. If God is truly good and knows the future, so he reasoned, why should he permit the one who bore his very image and likeness to be deceived of the devil and so to fall from obeying the Law unto death?¹² If God had been truly good, He would have been unwilling for such an event (evenire tale) to have occurred. Had He possessed foreknowledge (praescius) he would not have been ignorant of the future, and had He possessed sufficient power, he could have prevented the fall.¹³ Since, however, the fall has as a matter of fact taken place, it must be concluded, so Marcion's argument continues, that God can be reckoned neither good nor possessing foreknowledge nor powerful. Since, therefore, God is not such a God, this event has taken

place.¹⁴ Such is the nature of the criticism which Marcion advances.

It may be seen that the account of the fall itself is not the immediate object of Marcion's attack, but is made rather the cause for assailing the Creator. However, when the Creator himself is rejected as an unworthy deity, so also does it follow that the Scriptural account of the fall is rejected. This was, as a matter of fact, the case with Marcion. The assault upon the theology of the Old Testament leads ultimately in Marcion's case to a rejection of the Old Testament itself.

Tertullian is ready with a reply. The works of the Creator are good, he argues, and so testify of His goodness. Likewise do they bear witness to His power, for they themselves are powerful.¹⁵ That God possesses foreknowledge is testified to by the prophets. By the attributes of prescience God foreknew all things when He appointed to them their places, and appointed to them their places when He foreknew them.¹⁶ Had God not foreknown sin, He would not have warned against it under penalty of death. The entrance of sin into the world, reasons Tertullian, is evidence of weakness, not in the Creator, but, if anywhere, in the creature.

The Scriptural account of God's dealings with Adam and with Cain is also thought to be evidence of weakness upon the part of God.¹⁷ When God calls to Adam, "Where art thou?" he acts as though He were ignorant of where Adam was.¹⁸ When, furthermore, Adam declared that he was hiding from God because he was naked, God asked whether Adam had eaten of the forbidden tree, as though He were in doubt.¹⁹ Tertullian, however, disposes of these objections by pointing out that the calling of Adam's name was not an indication of ignorance, but rather a knock-out blow (sugillatio) at the sin which had just been committed. The voice which inquires is the voice of one who is

both rebuking and sorrowing.²⁰

Likewise God inquires of Cain as to the whereabouts of Abel his brother.²¹ Whether or not Marcion had actually criticized this statement of the Scripture is not perfectly clear, but it is quite conceivable that he did, and that for this reason it was mentioned by Tertullian. This seems to be borne out by a further reference to God's coming down to visit Sodom and Gomorrhah. Marcion is warned not to wax merry over God's "going down", because such blows can likewise be directed against Marcion's own god, who "came down to achieve what he desired."²² From this discussion it would appear that Marcion had probably alluded unfavorably to the Scriptural account of Cain and of God's visitation of Sodom and Gomorrhah.

In the account of the golden calf, reasons Marcion, Moses appears to be even greater than God. For, in His very wrath against the people God was petty. "Now, therefore, let me alone," said God, "that my wrath may wax hot against them: and that I may consume them: and I will make of thee a great nation."²³ Moses, however, intervenes to avert God's anger, "For", said he, "thou shalt not do this; or else destroy me together with them."²⁴ In thus acting, however, Moses was, according to Tertullian, a prefiguration of Christ as the deprecator of the Father and the one who offered his own life for the salvation of the people.

Certain laws, particularly the lex talionis, were also made the subjects of Marcion's strictures.²⁵ Apparently he believed that this law gave permission for mutual injury, although Tertullian endeavors to convince him that it was intended on the whole as a provision to restrain violence.²⁶ The committing of crimes and wrong deeds was to be prevented by the fear of an immediately following retribution. The permission of such retribution,

continues Tertullian, was the prohibition of provocation.²⁷

Quite possibly Marcion had also uttered criticism of the law which pronounced certain animals to be unclean.²⁸ But this was done, Tertullian reasons, both to encourage continence and as a precaution against lust and luxury, and to restrain an eager desire for money, and to educate man for fasting.²⁹ Likewise, the sacrifices which Marcion had apparently described as burdensome and the ceremonies about whose troublesome scrupulousness he had evidently complained, were not needed by God Himself, but were evidences of God's desire to draw unto Himself and His worship a people who were prone to idolatry and transgression.³⁰

The ceremonial and civil law, therefore, with all its details, was promulgated not in severity, as Marcion had evidently indicated, but rather in the highest benevolence to subdue the nation's hardness of heart. Its purpose, therefore, was beneficent and not onerous.

The Creator is furthermore charged with having been responsible for the fraud and theft of gold and silver which the Hebrews are supposed to have practised against the Egyptians.³¹ The Israelites thus acted dishonestly, so Marcion apparently charged. Both Irenaeus and Tertullian reply to this cavil in much the same manner. The Hebrews merely took what was due to them for a recompense for their long period of servitude.³² If then, the action of the Hebrews was not deserving of censure, the God of the Hebrews could in no wise be blamed for what they had done.³³

It was God who hardened the heart of Pharoah and his servants, and hence God is to be censured, thinks Marcion.³⁴ Such an objection, however, is treated by Irenaeus as being of a superficial nature. Although not explicitly stated as such, this objection is intended to be understood as one of the objections of the Marcionites against the Old Testament. Those who

thus allege such difficulties, continues Irenaeus, have not carefully read the Gospel. He then proceeds to draw analogous instances of reprobation from the New Testament and by a discussion of the Divine purpose in dealing with men.

Marcion also considered God to be fickle and one who contradicted his own commandments.³⁵ He charged God with having prohibited work upon the Sabbath day, and yet at the siege of Jericho with having ordered the ark to be carried around the city for eight days, which of course involved labor upon the Sabbath. But the law of the Sabbath prohibits human works and not those which are divine, replies Tertullian. On the Sabbath day, he continues, God removes from man the human works of daily life. Those who carried the ark around Jericho on the Sabbath day were not performing human works but divine, and that too, at the express commandment of God.

Tertullian proceeds to discuss the brazen serpent and the golden cherubim as not being violations of the Second Commandment. Why he engages in such discussion is not perfectly clear. Whether Marcion had actually asserted that the erection of the brazen serpent and the golden candlestick were violations of the Second Commandment and so indicative of change and instability in God or whether Tertullian is merely seeking to present this material in an endeavor to enforce his argument is not as clear as might be desired. At any rate, Tertullian is quite positive in his position that neither the golden candlestick nor the brazen serpent constitute in any sense a transgression of the second commandment.³⁶

God is also charged with being unjust in his dealings with men, sometimes disapproving when He should approve and at times giving approbation and so lacking in foresight, when He should rather pass censure.³⁷ So Saul was chosen before he had shown himself as one who would despise Samuel. Solomon

was rejected before he had become the prey of foreign women. To these strictures Tertullian replies, endeavoring to indicate that the decisions of God are rendered in accordance with perfect justice.

When God is represented in the Scripture as repenting, this does not mean that God does so with fickleness and improvidence, as Tertullian accuses Marcion of asserting.³⁸ When He declares, "It repenteth me that I have set up Saul to be king," this does not mean that He acknowledged some evil work or error, as Marcion appears to have alleged. Nor in the case of the Ninevites, when God is declared to have repented, is there any self incrimination. Apparently Marcion, because of his desire to criticize the God of the Old Testament, or else because of a superficial reading of such passages, did not understand the nature of such anthropomorphic language as that which the Scripture employs in the above instances.

Marcion also declared that certain Old Testament characters such as Abel, Enoch, Noah, Abraham and all the prophets did not partake of salvation.³⁹ This exclusion from the blessings of salvation was due to the fact, alleged Marcion, that these men knew that their god was constantly tempting them, and yet they did not run to Jesus, and so their souls remained in Hades.⁴⁰

Marcion rejected the use of allegory in his interpretation of the prophecies.⁴¹ The prophecies, he thought, had either been fulfilled already in history or else they would be fulfilled in the future at the time when the Antichrist should come. The Scripture, Marcion believed, was to be interpreted literally and not to be allegorized.⁴²

In part, at least, the low view of the Old Testament God which appears to have been Marcion's was due to his rejection of all allegory in interpretation. Beside the Christ of the New Testament the God of the Jews was made to appear in a poor light. It is unfortunate that the exact

language of Marcion's Antitheses is not extant, but the contrast between the gods of the two testaments is abundantly clear from the discussions of the Church Fathers. Each of these contrasts redounds to the discredit of the God of the Jews, and so constitutes at least an indirect criticism of the Old Testament.

Christ's love, reasoned Marcion, was universal, but the God of the Old Testament was particularistic, having set his affection only upon the Jewish nation.⁴³ Again, the Christ of the New Testament is an unknown Deity, being known only of the Father, but the God of the Jews was known to all, for he was the Creator.⁴⁴ Apparently also, this God was not omnipotent, because he needed material from which to create. The creation of the world according to Marcion, therefore, was not a creatio ex nihilo.⁴⁵

Moses also is subject to criticism for interceding in the struggle of the brothers. In so doing, he acted differently from Christ.⁴⁶ David also offended the blind at the taking of Jerusalem.⁴⁷ Furthermore, David was to be despised as a murderer and an adulterer.⁴⁸

Nor does Elijah compare well with Christ in the judgment of Marcion, for Christ forbade His disciples to call down fire from heaven, but when Elijah demanded it, God granted his desire.⁴⁹ Again, Christ loved little children, but the God of the Old Testament was willing to send bears to devour the children who mocked Elisha.⁵⁰ Furthermore, Christ healed a leper merely by His word, but Elisha required Naaman to dip himself in the Jordan seven times, thus employing means.⁵¹ Also, Elisha healed only one leper, whereas Christ healed ten.⁵²

Again, Christ hung upon the cross, whereas the Creator God of the Old Testament had said, "Cursed be everyone that hangeth upon a tree."⁵³

This showed, according to Marcion, that Christ belonged to another god.⁵⁴
It is but another evidence of the inferiority of the one deity to the other.

This same inferiority is also indicated by the disfavor with which Marcion looked upon the Jewish people. In his opinion they had constantly sinned against their god and were untrue to him.⁵⁵ Likewise did Marcion reject the Old Testament commandment of marriage.⁵⁶ This is to be expected in view of the asceticism which he enjoined. To him marriage was "corruption and fornication" (Irenaeus, op.cit., I:28:1), nor would he baptize those who had been married.⁵⁷

Apparently Marcion also desired to discover an antithesis between the Old and New Testament deities by teaching that Christ revoked or abrogated the Sabbath which the Creator had established.⁵⁸ Likewise, Christ received publicans, but to the Jews they were strangers.⁵⁹ Christ prohibited divorce, although Moses permitted it.⁶⁰ The Law cast out a woman with an issue of blood, but Christ healed such a one.⁶¹ The Old Testament Christ merely promised to restore the Jews to their land, whereas the Christ of the New Testament has brought a heavenly and eternal kingdom.⁶²

Irenaeus charges Marcion with being the only one who openly dares to mutilate the Scriptures.⁶³ Epiphanius accuses him of rejecting the Law and the Prophets. Upon the basis of such allegations as those which have been considered above, Marcion supports his contention that the God of the Old Testament is an imperfect deity and not upon an equal plane with the good god of the New Testament.

Summary

Marcion's criticism of the Old Testament fits in well with his general religious and philosophical position. The idea of suddenness as applied to the revelation of Christianity was strongly emphasized. Christ suddenly descended into the city of Capernaum and the revelation which He brought had no connection with the past.⁶⁴ This divorce between the Law and the Gospel may readily be discerned in the attitude which Marcion adopted toward the Old Testament.

It follows therefore, that, as far as the Old Testament was concerned, he was not primarily interested in nor concerned with questions of literary or historical criticism. There is no evidence that Marcion ever sought to deny the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch, for example, or that he sought to discover a plurality of authors. Rather he seemed to be more concerned to bring to light passages in which he thought God was shown to be inferior to the God of the New Testament.

It is regrettable that his "Antitheses" is not extant, for if it were one could more justly judge the quality of Marcion's objections to the Old Testament. The investigator is dependent solely upon Tertullian and Irenaeus, and occasionally they present their opponent's argument in scarcely more than a few words.⁶⁵ Upon the basis of the sources which are available, however, it would appear that Marcion's strictures upon the Old Testament were sometimes superficial in nature, and apparently offered at times without serious consideration of the background and context. At times too Marcion reveals himself as somewhat superficial in his exegesis, as when he interpreted God's cry to Adam "Where art thou?" as an indication of ignorance upon

the part of God.

Marcion seems to have had a fair acquaintance with the contents of the Old Testament. Whether such acquaintance was acquired as the result of actual reading and study or whether it was due to hearsay and report is a question which probably cannot be answered satisfactorily. Suffice it to say that the approach of Marcion to the Old Testament was not that of an impartial student but of one who employs the Scripture to suit his purpose.⁶⁶

Apelles

One of Marcion's immediate followers was Apelles who taught that there was but one god or fundamental principle.⁶⁷ Apparently Apelles had become Marcion's disciple in Rome. However, he went to Alexandria, later returning to Rome, possibly influenced to a certain extent by the theological thought of Alexandria. In Rome he founded a school and worked with a prophetess named Philoumena and exerted great influence.

Apelles was the author of a work known as Syllogisms, in which he sought to prove that whatever Moses had written about God was false.⁶⁸ He attempted to overthrow the Law and the Prophets, apparently being under the impression that they had not known God.⁶⁹ The things written therein he believed to be merely of human origin, and hence false.⁷⁰ Of the exact nature of the strictures which Apelles passed upon the Old Testament, however, nothing is known except that which has been stated above.

The Severiani

In his work against heresies, Epiphanius discusses the Severiani immediately after the followers of Apelles.⁷¹ He is not sure of their exact date nor apparently of the locality in which they flourished. The group took its name, however, from a certain Severus, who is said to have followed Apelles.⁷² The description which Epiphanius gives reveals that in some respects the Severiani were a branch of the Ophites. They looked upon the devil as the son of the great principle, and called him both Ialdabaoth and Sabaoth. From him came the serpent.⁷³ They looked upon woman and marriage as the work of the serpent,⁷⁴ and taught that man was half of God and half of the devil.⁷⁵

The precise classification of this group is difficult to determine. It seems best, however, to discuss them in the order adopted by Epiphanius, and for that reason they are treated here after Apelles. This group accepted certain secret books.⁷⁶ They also rejected the Old Testament.⁷⁷

CHAPTER THREE

Non-Gnostic Sects of the
First Two Christian
Centuries

The Nazarites

In the early church there were certain groups which might be generally classified as Jewish Christians. One such was the group known as the Nazarenes, which apparently consisted of Christians of Jewish birth who practised the Jewish manner of life. Epiphanius discusses the Nazarenes at some length and also mentions a group which he calls Nazarites (Ναζαραῖτοι).¹ These Nazarites revered the patriarchs and other characters mentioned in the Pentateuch; they nevertheless rejected the Pentateuch itself.² Like testimony is furnished by John of Damascus who adds that they did not consider the writings of the Pentateuch to be from Moses.³

The sources in which this information is to be found are so meagre that it is difficult to tell why the Nazarites should accept Moses and not his law. Quite possibly this attitude toward the Law was in some sense bound up with the religious or philosophical tenets of the Nazarites which were known to Epiphanius and to John of Damascus. It appears therefore impossible to say more about them than that they did not accept the Pentateuch. The reason therefor must remain a mystery.

The Ebionites

Epiphanius mentions the Ebionites as also engaging in a form of Biblical criticism. Apparently the Ebionites of whom he wrote are those who are referred to by modern scholars as Pharisaic Ebionites. These differed among themselves in the views which they held of Jesus.⁴ The Fathers therefore looked upon them as being outside the true Christian tradition.⁵

In a passage in which he compares them to Clement of Rome, Epiphanius says that the latter reveres Elijah, David and Sampson and all the prophets, whereas the Ebionites detest them (βσελύττονται). In setting this forth more explicitly he goes on to say that beyond Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Moses, Aaron and Joshua, they revere none of the prophets. They reject David and Solomon, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Daniel, Ezekiel, Elijah and Elisha. Nor do they revere the deeds of these men. They do not consider the prophets to be of truth out of understanding. Nor do they accept the entire Pentateuch of Moses, but reject certain words. Thus they do not believe that Abraham provided food for the angels or that Noah ate or heard God saying, "Sacrifice and eat", or that Isaac and Jacob sacrificed to God, or that Moses was in the desert. There is no advantage in reading these things in the law, maintained the Ebionites, since the Gospel has come. So, concludes Epiphanius, they blaspheme the greater part of the Law and those things concerning Samson and David and Elijah and Samuel and Elisha and the others.⁶

The Clementine Homilies

The writings known as the Clementine Homilies consist of twenty such homilies, prefaced by two epistles addressed to James, the one supposedly having been written by Peter and the other by Clement.⁷ In the Homilies Peter is the principal speaker, and into his mouth are put doctrines which really represent Christianity as being merely a development from Judaism. It is a form of Ebionism, with similarities to Gnosticism that is found in these Homilies, and this fact will enable one to understand the basis of

some of the criticisms of the Bible which appears in these writings.

In explaining to Clement the true doctrine of the Scriptures and the errors of Simon Magus, Peter is set forth as asserting that by command of God Moses delivered the Law unto seventy chosen men, in order that they might instruct the people.⁸ However, after a time, the wicked one in seeking to accomplish some righteous purpose saw that certain falsehoods which were contrary to God's purpose and Law were added to the Scriptures.⁹ This was done, so the argument continues, in order to convict those who should give heed to the things which were written against God.¹⁰ Simon intends publicly to speak of these chapters which are added to the Scriptures in order to turn many from the love of God.¹¹

Peter himself would not publicly declare that such additions have been made to the Bible, lest by so doing he should perplex people.¹² Hence, he would expound these chapters only in private, but publicly must appear to give them his consent.¹³ In his private instruction to Clement, however, Peter is set forth as declaring that the Scriptures misrepresent God in many ways.¹⁴ He requests Clement to ask him with respect to any matter that he pleases, and Peter will then endeavor to explain to him how that is false, not only because it is contrary to God but because it is false as a matter of fact.¹⁵

Clement therefore requests that Peter expound to him how God truly knows even though the Scriptures declare that He is ignorant.¹⁶ To this Peter rejoins by asking whether the author of the Bible was a man or not. "He was a man", answers Clement. Then, was Peter's response, how could he possibly know that God did not possess foreknowledge? Since, therefore, God foreknows all things, it naturally follows that those Scriptures must be false

which allege that He is ignorant.¹⁷

In the Scriptures then, so Peter's argument continues, there are to be found both true and spurious sayings.¹⁸ Christ pointed out the cause of their error to those who went astray by declaring, "Ye do therefore err, not knowing the true things of the Scriptures."¹⁹ Peter further proceeded to expound his position by the declaration that he regarded as wicked devices anything against God or against just men. Thus, he denied that Adam was to be regarded as a transgressor, fashioned by God's hands, or that righteous Noah was ever found to be drunken. Nor did Abraham, who was considered worthy of a numerous seed, ever live with three wives at once; nor did Jacob, the father of the twelve tribes, associate with four; nor was Moses a murderer, who declared the Law of God to the world, nor did he learn from an idolatrous priest.²⁰

The rationalistic note is not lacking in this criticism which is placed in the mouth of Peter. The unknown writer has adopted a touchstone, and to the test of this touchstone he has applied the Scriptures. The Ebionism which the author held was not derived from the Bible, but rather was used as a criterion by which to pass judgment upon the Bible. Those things in the Scriptures which appear to discredit otherwise noble characters, must therefore be regarded as false. Hence, the account which sets forth Noah as drunken, for example, must be rejected as false. God must be all-knowing, and consequently, when the Old Testament seems to represent Him as being in ignorance, it is to be disqualified as a witness. It was this essentially rationalistic method which the author of the Homilies adopted in order to refute the cavils of the Gnostic Simon Magus.²¹

Peter refers to Simon as coming armed with the false chapters of

the Scriptures.²² Yet he rests in the confidence that Simon will not be able to deceive those who have received from the forefathers the mystery of the books which can deceive.²³ The falsehoods of the Bible, he would argue, are given to us as a test.

Peter proceeds to expand his argument, declaring that those who accept the Scriptures and yet believe things that are against God, should consider the fact that every man can support his own opinions by appeal to the Bible. Why then, he asks, should confidence be placed in them when they speak against God?²⁴ As further illustration of a Scripture which should be rejected, denial is made that Adam partook of the forbidden fruit, and those who think that a reasonless beast was more powerful than God are called senseless.²⁵

In particularly bald fashion Peter is made to set forth his principle of the acceptance or rejection of Scripture when he asserts, "Whatever sayings of the Scriptures are in harmony with the creation that was made by Him are true, but whatever are contrary to it are false."²⁶

Furthermore, Peter would have it noted that the account of Moses' death was not written by Moses. How could Moses write that he died? asked Peter.²⁷ About five hundred years after the time of Moses the Law was found in the Temple, and five hundred years later it was burned and destroyed at the time of Nebuchadnezzar. Thus is shown the foreknowledge of Moses who, because he foresaw that the Law would disappear, did not write it; but those who did write it, not foreseeing its disappearance, were not prophets.²⁸

(over)
(The hypothesis to which recourse is had in the Clementine Homilies for explaining difficult passages in the Bible is in reality that of interpolations made by the devil himself. These are the passages which deceive and)

The hypothesis to which recourse is had in the Clementine Homilies for explaining difficult passages in the Bible is in reality that of interpolations made by the devil himself. These are the passages which deceive and which lead astray. To avow this publicly is dangerous but it may be expounded in private to a young enquirer such as Clement. Since the criterion for deciding what is and what is not a disabological interpolation, what will and what will not lead astray, is a standard already set up by the individual, it is apparent that the criticism of the Clementine Homilies is really a form of philosophical rationalism.

This same type of criticism appears in the Epistle of Peter to James although in not quite as bald form as in the Homilies.²⁹ In this brief epistle it is again stated that Moses delivered his books to the seventy who succeeded to his chair. Peter then speaks of the countrymen of Moses correcting the incongruities of the Bible according to the rule which had been delivered to them so that no one should be confounded at the various utterances of the prophets.³⁰ At the same time Peter is represented as clearly stating that the Law was spoken by Moses.³¹

Groups of Minor Importance

Epiphanius mentions certain other groups which depreciated the Old Testament. Among them are the Ossenoï which he treats as the sixth Judaistic heresy in his list.³² Apparently the Ossenoï were not Essenes, but had some relation to the Elkasites.³³ About them very little can be said. John of Damascus relates that they rejected some of the prophets.³⁴

Mention is also made of the Valesii, who rejected both the Law and

the prophets.³⁵ It is difficult to ascertain their exact identity upon the basis of the meagre information available.

The instances mentioned in this chapter will serve to show that among various groups there was a certain antipathy to the Old Testament, and this antipathy is to be traced to the philosophical tenets of the group in question. No doubt there were other sects also, of which no information is extant, that likewise adopted a hostile attitude toward the Old Testament.

CHAPTER FOUR

Celsus and the True
Discourse

I. Introduction

It is due to the faithful labors of Origen that one of the strongest of the early assaults upon the Scriptures and the Christian religion has been preserved.¹ In the apologetic writing Contra Celsum an attempt was made to meet and to refute the criticism of the Scriptures and of Christianity which had been advanced by an antagonist of the name of Celsus.² To the accomplishment of this task Origen devoted eight books, and the resultant work constitutes a milestone in the history of Christian apologetics.³

Origen was induced to enter upon his labors by the efforts of one Ambrose, who, according to Eusebius, was one of his converts.⁴ It was Ambrose who sent Celsus' treatise to Origen and who urged him to undertake a reply.⁵ At first, however, he did not wish to engage in such an enterprise. The best refutation of the false charges of Celsus, he thought, was to be found in silence.⁶ Such a policy would be in accord with the example which Christ had set. At the same time, he did not wish to appear reluctant to attempt the task and so acceded to the requests of his friend.

In seeking to answer Celsus, Origen proposed to reply to each argument which his opponent had advanced.⁷ At first, it seemed the course of wisdom merely to indicate the principal objections and then to work up the discussion into a systematic treatment (*συσματοπολιησας*). However, circumstances dictated a change of procedure, and the extant work constitutes the apologetic as it was actually carried out.

An examination of the method which was finally adopted will naturally lead to the question whether Origen has faithfully preserved the words and arguments of his opponent. To this question various answers have been given,

yet on the whole the opinion seems to be fairly widely held that Celsus has indeed been faithfully and accurately represented. In fact, not a few have considered it possible to reconstruct this ancient polemic upon the basis of the fragments which appear in Origen's book.⁸

It is a strange fact that, although Celsus' writing, which he called the True Discourse constitutes an unusually powerful attack upon the Scriptures and the Christian religion, practically nothing is known about its author.⁹ His name was Celsus (ὁ Κέλσος), and that is one of the few definite things that can be said about him.

Origen himself was not sure about the identity of his opponent. He had heard that there were two men of this name, who were Epicureans, the first of whom lived at the time of Nero, and the other, whom Origen considered himself to be refuting, at the time of Hadrian and later.¹⁰ He does not, therefore, positively state that Celsus lived at the time of Hadrian, but merely that he has heard that such was the case. This opinion seems to be modified at a later point, when he asserts the possibility that his Celsus may possess the same name as the Epicurean. The reason for this apparent shift in position is that at this point Celsus appeared to be speaking as a Platonist rather than as an Epicurean. Origen also admits the possibilities that Celsus may be concealing his Epicurean views or that he may have substituted better opinions for them. Such lack of assurance, however, makes it manifest that he is none too well informed as to the identity of the one whose arguments he is seeking to refute.

Again, some uncertainty appears when Origen indicates that he is not sure whether his Celsus is the one who composed two other books against Christians.¹¹ The exact force of this passage is not as clear as could be

desired, and its meaning has been the subject of some discussion.¹² Apparently a man by the name of Celsus had composed two books against Christians and Origen did not know whether their author was his present opponent or not. We do not intend to enter upon an exegesis of the passage. Suffice it at this point to say that in these words there is to be found additional evidence of the fact that Origen knew little about the identity of Celsus.

According to Eusebius, Origen composed his eight treatises against Celsus during the reign of Philip the Arabian at a time when he was said to be over sixty years of age.¹³ It is generally thought that Philip resigned from 244 to 249.¹⁴ Hence, it would seem that an approximate date, at least, might be found for Contra Celsum. Apparently, Origen wrote before the outbreak of the Decian persecution in 249, for he makes no reference to persecution and inclines to believe that there is no immediate danger of such.¹⁵ Hence, the work was probably not composed later than 248 or early in the year 249. At the same time, since we are to understand Eusebius as in all likelihood meaning that Origen was over sixty years of age at the time, it would seem that the earliest date is 246. Quite possibly the time of composition, therefore, was 248-249, although this cannot be positively asserted.¹⁶

Celsus himself probably wrote his True Discourse sometime during the latter half of the second century. Quite possibly the date was, as some assert, 177 or 178, but this can by no means be proven.¹⁷ At any rate, his powerful attack upon Christianity saw the light of day at least some seventy years before Origen took up his pen in reply.

II. CELSUS' CRITICISM OF THE BIBLE.

The first group of criticisms of the Old Testament which Celsus offered concerned Judaism. He found fault with Judaism not only as to its religion, but also with respect to its origin, history and religious institutions.

The Origin of Judaism

The origin of the Jews was barbarous, he maintained, apparently out of a desire to point out that Judaism was the system of doctrine upon which Christianity depended.¹ His purpose thus was not necessarily to cast any discredit at this point upon the Jews, nor did he desire even to reproach Christianity because of such dependence. He admitted that Christianity could discover such doctrines for itself, but credited the Greeks with greater ability in dealing with the discoveries of barbarous nations.²

What was this alleged barbaric origin of Judaism? It consisted apparently in the view that the Jews were descended from the Egyptians.³ In 3:7 Origen seems to quote the exact words of Celsus, "...the Hebrews, being Egyptians, took their origin (i.e., as a separate nation) from (the time of) the rebellion."⁴ If we may trust Origen, his opponent held the view that the Jews despised the Egyptian customs of worship and so revolted and abandoned the land.⁵ In another passage Celsus actually spoke of the Jews as fugitives from Egypt.⁶ Apparently, upon leaving Egypt, they conceived a hatred of their mother tongue. It would seem that Celsus inferred that they then adopted the Hebrew language.⁷

In reply Origen accused his opponent of having been bewitched, as it were, by the traditions of the Egyptians, and consequently, of having

accepted their statements as true.⁸ This action shows, according to Origen, that Celsus had not investigated the facts in an impartial spirit.⁹ Celsus does not realize, so the argument continues, how impossible it would be for so many rebellious Egyptians to become a great nation and immediately to adopt a new language. Furthermore, asks Origen, why should this new language be Hebrew, rather than Syrian or Phoenician? Since Hebrew was the language of the ancestors of those who left Egypt, and since the Hebrew letters which Moses employed in writing the Pentateuch differed from the letters of the Egyptians, reason would seem to demonstrate against the position that those who came out from Egypt were originally Egyptian.¹⁰

Again, continues Origen, if those who left Egypt were Egyptians, we should have expected their names to be Egyptian. The names, however, are Hebrew, whence it is clear that the Egyptian account is false, which asserts that these were Egyptians who went forth with Moses from Egypt.¹¹

In thus attributing the commencement of the Hebrew nation to a revolt, Celsus was seeking to show that a revolt was also the origin of Christianity.¹² The Jews suffered from the Christians the same treatment that they themselves had once inflicted upon the Egyptians. Hence, the origin of both Judaism and Christianity was due to the same cause, namely, rebellion against the state.¹³

It must be borne in mind that in thus passing strictures upon the Jews Celsus was not primarily concerned with the treatment of the events of the Exodus from Egypt as such, but rather with an attack upon Christianity. He was seeking to establish the point that Christianity found its origin in a revolt. Only secondarily, therefore, did he concern himself with the Exodus.¹⁴

Upon the basis of these meagre fragments which Origen has seen fit to

preserve must be based on one's conclusions as to what was Celsus' attitude toward the book of Exodus. The fragments preserved are indeed few, but there seems to be little reason for assuming that Origen has at this point willfully misrepresented his opponent.

What Celsus says concerning the Exodus from Egypt does not imply that he had ever read our book of Exodus. All that he says might have been learned by word of mouth. Hence, for example, when he asserts the Egyptian origin of the Jews, he is simply misinformed. He did not arrive at this conclusion by a careful study of the book of Exodus and a rejection of the statements to be found therein. Rather, he spoke merely upon the basis of whatever information may have come to him. I find it very difficult to agree with Keim that Celsus actually knew our book of Exodus.¹⁵ Much nearer to the truth seems to be the position of Pelagaud, who says merely that Celsus may have known it.¹⁶ These statements concerning the origin of the Jews do not reveal Celsus as at this point having exercised true scholarly caution. It must therefore be concluded that there is no evidence to indicate that he had ever read the book of Exodus and that his pronouncements concerning the origin of the Jews are of no historical value whatsoever.¹⁷

There is one further statement concerning the origin of the Jews in which Origen apparently quotes the exact words of Celsus.¹⁸ This utterance is to the effect that the Jews sought to trace their origin to the first race of jugglers and deceivers. Origen believes that Celsus was endeavoring here to assail the book of Genesis but that he had probably spoken obscurely on purpose.¹⁹ Celsus does not seem to be attacking the actual facts of Jewish history so much as he is slandering the Jews. When he spoke of the patriarchs as jugglers and deceivers and when he spoke of

ambiguous and dark sayings which the Jews misinterpreted he was guilty, whether intentionally or not, of misrepresentation. Origen seems to be aware of this and feels that Celsus has not distinctly set forth the facts, for fear of being unable to answer the arguments which might be founded upon them.²⁰

It would seem that Origen's estimate of his opponent's procedure is at this point correct. For Celsus elsewhere shows that he does possess a certain amount of correct information of particular features of patriarchal history as that history is recorded in the book of Genesis.²¹ Celsus' main concern here seems rather to slander the Jews, and it appears that he is willing to sacrifice what he knows to be the truth in order to accomplish this.²² It is such procedure as this that leads one to agree with Neander when he says that in Celsus we find "...wit and acuteness, without earnest purpose or depth of research."²³

The Jewish Nation and Its History

Not only does the origin of Judaism come under the sharp censure of the author of the True Discourse, but its history is likewise subject to his criticism.

Celsus holds a very low opinion of the Jews as a nation.²⁴ Apparently he enumerates in his work the nations from which certain doctrines have come, but he does not include the Jews, stamping their history as false.²⁵ According to Origen, he is unwilling to call the Jews a learned nation as he does the Egyptians and certain other peoples of antiquity.²⁶ It is unfortunate that Celsus' own discussion of this subject is not given and that we are dependent solely upon Origen, for we do not have statements from

Celsus' own mouth as to why he has not placed the Jews among the learned nations of antiquity.

Again, Celsus has omitted the name of Moses from a list of great men who have benefited humanity and has assigned to Linus a foremost place. This is indeed strange. If Origen has correctly represented Celsus' action, it would then seem that in this instance Celsus has not shown himself to be impartial. Origen accuses his opponent of partiality and of not making these statements from a love of truth, but from a spirit of hatred, with the object of casting aspersion upon the origin of Christianity.²⁷ He appeals to the reader to consider whether or not it is due to "open malevolence" that Celsus has thus excluded Moses from his catalog of learned men.²⁸

Origen himself was of course biased, and it is possible that his condemnation of Celsus at this point was too strong. Nevertheless, if he is correct in reporting that Celsus has refused to recognize the Jews as an honored and ancient nation and that he has excluded the name of Moses from a list of human benefactors in which appear such names as Linus, Orphaeus and Musaeus, then surely Celsus is guilty at least of faulty judgment, and in this instance does not exhibit that breadth of knowledge for which he is sometimes credited.²⁹

Disparagement of the Jewish nation is also positively expressed by Celsus when he speaks of the Jews as "fugitives from Egypt, who had never done anything remarkable and were never held in repute or account."³⁰ Origen ventures the suggestion that his opponent speaks of the Jews as not being held in account or repute because the Greeks have not recorded any principal event of their history. He then proceeds to mention some of the distinguishing characteristics of the Jewish nation and so to indicate the fallacy of

Celsus' assertion.³¹

Criticism of the Jewish Religion

The Jewish religion also became the object of Celsus' attacks.³² Particularly did he oppose the doctrine of monotheism. The view that there is one god, he thought, was the product of the minds of herdsmen and shepherds which were deluded by vulgar deceits.³³ These deluded shepherds who followed Moses concluded that there was but one god, and that this god was named the Highest, or Adonai, or the Heavenly or Sabaoth. To Celsus, it mattered not how God be called, whether by the name of Zeus, or by a name that was current among the Indians or Egyptians.³⁴ Apparently, the author of the True Discourse was under the impression that the god whom the Jews worshipped was heaven itself. He appears surprised that they worship heaven and angels but not heaven's most venerable parts, such as the sun and the moon. For "if the whole is God, then certainly its parts should be divine also."³⁵

From these passages it becomes clear that Celsus did not understand the monotheism of the Old Testament or even of the Jews of his time. This misunderstanding was due not merely to the fact that his mind was imbued with Platonic philosophy but also because he was not well acquainted with the Old Testament doctrine. This is the opinion of Origen who speaks of his opponent as being confused. Such a judgment is probably correct. Celsus' failure to state correctly the position which he is attempting to refute is not due to deceit or to lack of ability, but to lack of understanding. Certainly, no matter how strongly one may oppose a viewpoint, he should be able to state that viewpoint accurately. Celsus did not do that, and his

criticism of the Old Testament doctrine of monotheism, therefore, must be regarded as an almost valueless contribution to the subject.

He further exhibits a lack of understanding of Jewish religion by the assertion that the Jews worship angels and practice sorcery.³⁶ In the face of such pronouncements it is difficult to believe that he had had first hand acquaintance with the Jewish religion or that he had read the Pentateuch with care.

It is interesting to notice the reaction of Celsus to the Mosaic account of creation. "Moreover", he says, "their cosmogony is extremely silly."³⁷ Likewise the narrative concerning the creation of man is declared to be "exceedingly silly".³⁸ Origen does not directly reply to this charge other than by referring the reader to his commentary on Genesis and by asserting that he believes his opponent to have no evidence capable of overthrowing the statement that man was made in the image of God.

It is difficult to ascertain a proper evaluation of Celsus' statement. Probably, however, we may find in the words "extremely silly" the reaction of Platonism to the doctrine of absolute creation. This doctrine is a conception which could not possibly be congenial to Platonic thought. The Genesis doctrine of absolute creation and the Platonic conception of the world are really deadly enemies.³⁹ They cannot exist side by side. One or the other must give way. The doctrine of absolute creation presents man as a creature and consequently derives the entirety of life's meaning from the Creator. Platonism on the other hand teaches that man exists in his own right; it does not in any true sense of the word look upon man as a creature.⁴⁰ Celsus speaks therefore at this point, as a Platonist. To him the Mosaic cosmogony is extremely silly.

At the same time, as Origen complains, he makes no effort to criticize the doctrine intelligently. It is not even apparent that he has grasped the implications of the doctrine, for this is surely the vital point at which he should have struck, if he would overthrow the religious teaching of the Old Testament. Yet he dismisses this important point without serious comment.

He himself is inclined to agree with those who hold that the world is uncreated.⁴¹ His argument is not as clear as could be desired. Apparently it is to the effect that the flood which is supposed to have taken place in the time of Deucalion is comparatively modern and that from eternity there have been many conflagrations and many floods, hence, things have existed as they are from eternity. But he does not attempt to defend his position, if it really be his, by means of philosophical argument. Origen intimates that his opponent is animated merely by a secret desire to discredit the Genesis account of creation. However, this is not necessarily the case. Rather, it appears that, being under the influence of Platonic philosophy and being well read in Platonism, Celsus more or less naturally assumed the eternity of the world without in any very critical fashion having examined the reasons for such belief.

Celsus seems not to have had a wide acquaintance with the institutions of the Jewish religion. He refers to circumcision and asserts that it was of Egyptian origin.⁴² He was, we believe, mistaken in asserting that the Jews derived this practice from Egypt, but he was not mistaken in declaring that the Egyptians did practice circumcision. In his reply, Origen mistakenly declares that according to Moses, Abraham was the first of men to practise this rite. A careful reading of the Genesis passage, however, will show

that such is not its actual import.⁴³

In another passage, however, Origen endeavors to point out that the reason for circumcision among the Jews is not the same as the reason for its practice among the Egyptians and hence it is not to be thought of as the same circumcision.⁴⁴

Celsus and Biblical Anthropomorphism

Celsus takes particular exception to the anthropomorphism of the Old Testament and gives evidence of not understanding anthropomorphic language. The language of Scripture regarding God, Origen maintains, is adapted to an anthropomorphic point of view.⁴⁵ This fact Celsus does not perceive. Hence, he ridicules the passages where words of anger are addressed to the ungodly or threatenings are directed against sinners. Origen's reply consists in a simple exposition of the purpose of anthropomorphic language in which he compares it to the language which a judicious parent would use in dealing with a child. Again, in another passage Celsus objects to the statement that "God repents"⁴⁶ and that God rests."⁴⁷

According to Celsus man was fashioned by the hand of God and inflated by breath being blown into him.⁴⁸ Origen points out that in Genesis no mention of the "hands" of God is made and accuses Celsus of not understanding the meaning of the Divine inbreathing as recorded in Genesis. He likewise speaks of those who do not understand anthropomorphic language as thinking that Christians attribute to God a form such as man possesses.⁴⁹

This criticism of Origen seems to imply to Celsus in his interpretation of the Biblical statement, "Let us make man in our image and likeness."⁵⁰ These words he takes to mean that mankind resembles God.⁵¹

In refuting this assertion Origen maintains that there is a difference between creation "in the image of God" and creation "after His likeness", and that a man was originally created only in the "image of God." In thus arguing he exhibits poor exegesis. For the words image and likeness appear to have practically the same meaning. At any rate he does not appear successfully to have refuted his opponent in this instance.⁵²

In a long quotation Origen sets forth the view of Celsus as to the manner in which the Jews received their information about the creation of man, the Divine inbreathing, the creation of woman, the serpent and the fall.⁵³ Because of its length the quotation is valuable as an example of Celsus' method in stating an argument. Celsus seems to think that the Jewish accounts are more recent than those composed by Hesiod and others, but Origen is quick to point out the chronological error of his opponent, and ironically refers to this "deeply read and learned Celsus".⁵⁴

A general criticism of the first chapter of Genesis is found in the statement that "God rested on the seventh day", where Celsus compares God to a very bad workman, who stands in need of rest.⁵⁵ Origen accuses his opponent of assuming that the expression "he rested" (ἀνεπαύσατο) is equivalent in meaning to "he ceased" (κατέπαυσεν).⁵⁶ This assertion he attributes to a misunderstanding of the text, assuming that Celsus knows nothing of the Sabbath and of God's rest, which he himself thinks lasts for the duration of the world. To the author of the True Discourse, however, it does not seem to be fitting that God should thus feel fatigue.⁵⁷ Involved in this criticism, therefore, may be discerned the influence of that Platonic philosophy which cannot comprehend anthropomorphism. Involved in it also is a misunderstanding or a lack of acquaintance with the exact statement of

Scripture upon the subject. If Celsus was familiar with the Septuagint, his interpretation of it was, as Origen points out, faulty.

Celsus' Criticism of Individual Biblical Statements

One penetrating criticism of Genesis which has been uttered many a time since the days of Celsus concerns the distribution of the work of creation over certain days, before such days actually came into existence.⁵⁸ Origen's reply to this charge is by no means satisfactory, when judged in the light of the requirements of a grammatico-historical exegesis. He asserts that he has already spoken of the matter in the foregoing pages as well as in his notes upon Genesis where he takes to task those who take the words of Genesis in their apparent signification, and, apparently, to cast light upon his own interpretation, quotes Genesis 2:4.⁵⁹ It must be confessed that from the standpoint of scientific interpretation, Celsus' exposition of the six days of creation is to be preferred rather than that of Origen.

Apparently Celsus also ridicules the Scripture statements regarding the deep sleep of Adam and the creation of woman, although he does not quote the language of the Bible in so doing.⁶⁰ He likewise rejects the account of the serpent, and, according to Origen, purposely omits mention of the garden of Eden.⁶¹ This serpent, Celsus argues in another place, opposed the commandments of God and gained a victory over them.⁶² The force of the Genesis account of the entrance of sin into the world, however, does not seem at all to be clear to Celsus. Indeed, it is questionable whether he had ever read the narrative, for, although he does speak of the serpent as having gained a victory over God's commandments, it would seem that

he is under the impression that Christians believe that God has Himself created evil.⁶³

The account of the deluge and of the ark is also subjected to his criticism.⁶⁴ He does not make explicit reference to the Scripture narrative as such, but introduces his discussion by presenting a quotation in which the Jewish position is given.⁶⁵ This account of the deluge, therefore, is, according to Celsus, a falsified version of the story of Deucalion. The raven of Genesis is called a crow by him. What is truly remarkable in the criticism is that Celsus, as Origen indicates, makes no mention of the exact size of the ark and of the supposed difficulty of its containing all the animals, but merely speaks of it as "monstrous". Indeed, the indefinite manner in which the criticism is introduced seems to indicate that Celsus was not acquainted with the dimensions of the ark, else he would not have passed over the objection that the ark was not large enough to hold all the animals which it was supposed to contain.⁶⁶

It is not perfectly clear what was Celsus' reaction to the account of the Tower of Babel. Apparently he believed that Moses, in writing about the tower and the confusion of tongues had perverted the story of the sons of Alocus.⁶⁷ It would seem, too, that he believed that the event took place like the flood for the purpose of purifying the earth. This interpretation puzzled Origen, who did not see how there could be such a purifactory process unless, possibly, it were to consist in the confusion of tongues itself.

The account of the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah is compared by Celsus to the story of Phaeton. But Origen replies that to impartial hearers Moses appears to be older than Homer, whom he believes to be the first to mention the story of the sons of Alocus.⁶⁸ And those who relate

the story of Phaeton are even more recent than Homer. All these statements, thinks Origen, result from one blunder, "his not considering the greater antiquity of Moses."⁶⁹

Celsus also directs his shafts against the patriarchal narratives. The account of the begetting of children, which according to the author of Contra Celsum refers to the history of Abraham and Sarah, is "altogether absurd and out of season."⁷⁰ He also objects to the "conspiracies of the brothers", by which Origen thinks he means either the plotting of Cain against Abel or that of Esau against Jacob. He also speaks of a father's sorrow, by which his opponent understands him to refer to the sorrow of Isaac over the absence of Jacob and possibly also to that of Jacob over Joseph's having been sold into Egypt. Again he mentions the "crafty actions of mothers" by which Origen supposes that he refers to the conduct of Rebekah. Furthermore, the great apologist accuses Celsus of ridiculing Jacob's acquisition of property while living with Laban, which is attributed to his not understanding the reference of the words "And those which had no spots were Laban's, and those which were spotted were Jacob's."⁷¹ Again, Celsus asserts that "God presented his (i.e. Jacob's) sons with asses, and sheep and camels" to which Origen replies by interpreting the passage allegorically.⁷²

Origen likewise takes strong exception to the charge of his opponent that "God gave wells also to the righteous".⁷³ The righteous, he replies, do not construct cisterns but dig wells, receiving in a figurative sense the command, "Drink waters from your own vessels, and from your own wells of fresh water."⁷⁴ This narrative about the wells, he reasons, is in order to present to view more important truths. He then proceeds to indicate, by an appeal to the wells which in his own day were shown at

Ascalon, that wells actually were constructed in the land of the Philistines, as related by Genesis. The exact nature of Celsus' objections to the story of the wells, due to the meagre amount of information which has been given by his opponent, is, therefore, not perfectly clear.

The story of Lot is thought by Celsus to be worse than the crimes of Thyestes.⁷⁵ But, according to Origen, this narrative may have a figurative meaning. Furthermore, by an appeal to the teachings of the Stoics, he seeks to indicate that the act itself, if performed with a worthy intention, is not necessarily reprehensible. Again, Celsus is reported as sneering at Esau's hatred of Jacob and as not clearly stating the story of Simeon and Levi. Celsus then refers evidently to the Joseph story by means of such phrases as "brothers selling one another", "a brother sold" and "a father deceived".⁷⁶

Several references to events narrated in the book of Exodus are also referred to, but it is not perfectly clear why Celsus mentions these.⁷⁷ One statement in particular is striking. With reference to Joseph it is said, "By whom (Joseph namely) the illustrious and divine nation of the Jews, after growing up in Egypt to be a multitude of people, was comanded to sojourn somewhere beyond the limits of the kingdom, and to pasture their flocks in districts of no repute."⁷⁸ This passage stands in strange contrast to other assertions of Celsus regarding the Jews in Egypt.⁷⁹ Origen also notes that his opponent refers to the exodus as a flight, charging him with not having remembered what was written in the book of Exodus concerning the departure from Egypt.

In reality the Scripture is also attacked when Celsus assails the view that all things were made for man.⁸⁰ Rather, so his argument proceeds, did they come into existence as well for the sake of the irrational animals.

Even if one should grant that thunders and rains are the works of God, which Celsus himself refuses to do, it cannot be maintained that these are of more benefit to man than to plants and trees, herbs and thorns.⁸¹ Nor can it be held that plants and trees grow for the sake of man more than for the beasts. Again, man must struggle and labor while the animals have all things without either ploughing or sowing.⁸² Nor do sun and night serve man more than they do the ants and flies.⁸³ If one say that we are lords of the animal creation because we hunt animals and live upon their flesh, it should be replied that we were created rather for them because they hunt and devour us.⁸⁴ We even need the help of nets and weapons and the assistance of other persons and of dogs when engaged in the chase, but the animals have their own weapons. Before cities were built and arts were invented men were generally caught and devoured by beasts, but wild beasts were seldom caught by men.⁸⁵ At first man actually was subjected by God to the wild beasts.⁸⁶

It might appear, Celsus continues, that because men build cities and have governments that they are superior to animals, but even ants and bees do the same.⁸⁷ Nor can man boast because he possesses the power of sorcery, for even in this respect serpents and eagles are his superiors.⁸⁸ Some animals even can grasp the idea of God as men have, for what is more divine than the power of foreknowing and predicting future events?⁸⁹ Men really acquire this art from other animals and especially from birds, for it would seem that they are in closer relationship to God and more beloved by him.⁹⁰ No animals look upon an oath as more sacred than do the elephants, nor do any show greater devotion to divine things.⁹¹ The stork also, because of its filial affection is more pious than man, and the phoenix is known also for its filial love.⁹²

Such are the arguments which Celsus adduces to arrive at the conclusion that all things were not made primarily for man. In thus reasoning he shows himself to be a child of his time and a believer in what appears to the modern man as unfounded superstition. - Nor does Origen at this point rise much above him, but follows his argument step by step in an effort to vindicate the Scriptural teaching that man is the crown of God's creation.⁹³

Prophecy and the Messianic hope are likewise subjected to Celsus' criticisms. Christians value the words of Jewish prophecies which are like those practiced today in Phoenicia and Palestine, he asserts, but they reject the Grecian oracles.⁹⁴ The essence of this criticism, therefore, so far as it concerns the Old Testament, is that the prophecies of the Bible are upon a level with those which are practised elsewhere. There are many forms of prophecy, asserts Celsus, and many can assume the gestures of inspired persons.⁹⁵ He then proceeds to characterize prophecy as he knows it, but what he is describing may possibly apply to prophecy as he had seen it in Phoenicia but it does not begin to do justice to the phenomenon presented in the Bible. Apparently, Celsus believed that in the prophetic writings God was represented as doing that which was bad, shameful and impure. He does not give specific instances, however, "but contents himself with loudly asserting the false charge that these things are to be found in Scripture."⁹⁶ Nor, he continues, is there any Messianic hope, for "no God or son of a god either came or will come down (to earth)."⁹⁷

It is instructive to note that Celsus objects to an allegorical interpretation of the Mosaic narrative.⁹⁸ To him allegorical and tropical interpretation seem to be a refuge for the more modest of the Jewish and Christian writers, because they are ashamed of those things.⁹⁹ These

allegorical interpretations however, are more shameful than the fables which they allegorize. Such is his objection, and by this last statement Origen thinks that Celsus has reference to the works of Philo and that he has never read them.¹⁰⁰

Celsus and the Mosaic Authorship of the Pentateuch

One further subject remains to be discussed, namely, what was the attitude of Celsus toward the question of the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch? It has been asserted that he actually denied such authorship to Moses.¹⁰¹ While discussing Genesis, he does as a matter of fact actually employ the plural in the following sentence, "So they undertook to construct genealogies, etc."¹⁰² Again, Origen, in criticizing his opponent for accusing Moses of having corrupted the story of Deucalion says, "Unless, indeed, he does not believe the writing to be the work of Moses, but of several persons."¹⁰³

It is very questionable, however, that by his use of the plural in the above mentioned instance Celsus intended to indicate a plurality of authors of the Pentateuch. It would seem to be more likely that he was merely indulging in a contemptuous reference to the Jews.¹⁰⁴ When therefore, he says, "they endeavored to construct genealogies," he merely means that this was a Jewish undertaking and not that there were actually several authors of the genealogies.

Two arguments primarily seem to support this interpretation. In the first place, if Origen had really been under the impression that Celsus denied the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch, he would certainly have engaged in controversy with him upon this point, for Origen himself firmly

believed that Moses did write the Pentateuch.¹⁰⁵ His entire apologetic gives evidence of the fact that he was convinced that it was his duty to refute whatever of serious error appeared in the writings of his opponent, and therefore, had he discovered Celsus denying a matter which would have been of such great importance, it is difficult to believe that he would have kept silence.¹⁰⁶

Secondly, an examination of other passages makes it clear that Celsus as a matter of fact did not deny the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch. Indeed, he even appears to affirm such authorship. Moses wrote the account of the tower, he thinks, and perverted the story of the sons of Aloveus.¹⁰⁷ In one instance he refers to the "Mosaic narrative" as representing God in a state of weakness.¹⁰⁸ Moses and the prophets, he says, again, have left to us our books.¹⁰⁹ On this point he and Origen seem to have had no quarrel. Throughout the entire work the discussion in every relevant place is carried on upon the assumption that Moses did write the Pentateuch. There is really nothing to indicate that Celsus questioned this point at all.

III. The Importance of Celsus and His Work

Summary

It must be obvious, even to the most cursory reader of Contra Celsum, that the one whom Origen was seeking to refute, was indeed a gifted and learned man. The storehouse of his knowledge seems indeed to have been vast, and the skill with which he drew upon that storehouse for assistance in his argument was indeed remarkable. Skillful also was the ability with which he was able to detect weak points in the position which he was attacking.¹

It is the extensive range of his knowledge and erudition that compels astonishment.² Indeed, it seems to have been almost encyclopaedic. Mention is made of many of the Greek philosophers and writers.³ Celsus seems to have been acquainted with the religions and customs of many lands, so much so, indeed, that he almost appears as one of the first exponents of the study of comparative religions.⁴ So great was his knowledge of sects and cults that even Origen could learn from him.⁵ Mosheim has even inclined to believe that Celsus was at one time an adherent of one of these sects but that later apostatized therefrom.⁶ About the erudition of Celsus, there seems to be little doubt. Despite the superficiality and childishness of some of his criticisms, despite his hallowness and ridicule, it must be confessed that he was truly a man of genuine learning.⁷

What, then, was the object which this learned antagonist of Christianity was endeavoring to accomplish? What were the causes which led him to marshal such a wide array of arguments to his support in the composition

of the True Discourse? To these questions various answers have been given. According to some, Celsus looked upon Christianity as a social peril and opposed it as such. His arguments against its doctrines, therefore, were more or less secondary.⁸ Yet another answer is that he did not fear that Christianity would destroy paganism. The Christians, however, were disobedient to the laws, and consequently were deserving of attack. Hence, his main purpose was to attack Christianity.⁹ Again, it has been held that the True Discourse was written to shame Christians into giving up their religion and to convert them.¹⁰

It does seem apparent that Celsus was concerned about the growth of the Christian religion.¹¹ This he does not explicitly admit, but he lays stress upon the charge that Christians meet in secret and so are acting contrary to law.¹² He accuses them of proselytizing those who are easy to influence.¹³ Indeed, the very fact of his writing in such detail is sufficient evidence that he faced a powerful movement which he believed must be checked.

Whether or not, however, it can be definitely proven that he was alarmed over the growth of Christianity, this much at least can be positively affirmed; he was determined, as much as in him lay, to refute the claims of the Christian religion.¹⁴ Despite the ridicule, mockery, derision and even sarcasm with which he sometimes advanced his arguments, we may note that he plunged into his task with seriousness.¹⁵ This, then, was his grand purpose, the refutation of Christianity.¹⁶ He was not primarily concerned to persecute Christians nor to attack his enemy in one respect over above another. Nor, it would seem, was his principal desire to oppose Christianity as a political rather than as a religious force. Nor, indeed,

might the reverse even be said to be correct. It was that phenomenon which Celsus knew as Christianity -- Christianity together with all its implications, which must be refuted. Hence, in the work which Origen has left we behold a life and death struggle between the Graeco-Roman paganism and the nascent Christian Faith. If Christianity could survive this attack, its future might well seem to be insured.¹⁷

The assault of Celsus upon Christianity was unlike any previous attack or opposition of which we have knowledge. It was not written to meet the needs of some local situation or of a passing moment.¹⁸ It did not concentrate upon one particular phase of the new religion nor did it merely deny this or that individual doctrine. Rather, it struck at the center as well as at the periphery. The Christian doctrines of God and salvation were assailed as well as the opinion that Christians met in secret or that they were divided into numberless sects. Herein lies the importance of the True Discourse. It represents the old order standing in opposition to the new. It is not so much Celsus the philosopher who speaks -- but rather, Celsus the man, the citizen of the ancient Graeco-Roman world, the representative of an existence which sees itself in peril.¹⁹ To serve him in his attempt to refute the Christian religion he calls upon philosophy -- any philosophy, it would seem, which would serve his purpose -- but he calls upon other aids also, ridicule, recollections of various customs, knowledge derived from different sources.²⁰

In this fact, it may be said, lies the explanation why Celsus also attacked the Old Testament. Just as he did not approach Christianity dispassionately in order to make a calm, scientific investigation of it, but

rather to refute it, so also he drew near to the Old Testament in the same spirit. It is because he was fully aware of the dependence of Christianity upon the Old Testament that he would criticize it. If the foundation could be destroyed, then surely the superstructure itself would fall to the ground.²¹ Hence, if Judaism and the Scriptures can be refuted, the task of refuting Christianity becomes that much simpler.

The criticisms of the Old Testament which appear in the True Discourse are therefore not based upon patient research and investigation. They represent, rather, the products of a prejudiced mind.²² They are colored by the philosophy of Celsus and in this light they must be judged. Scientific Biblical criticism is not to be discovered in the discussions of Origen's opponent as they are preserved for us in Contra Celsum.

CONCLUSION

Conclusion

The meagre material which is extant concerning Biblical criticism in the first two Christian centuries is however, sufficient to enable certain observations to be made.

1. There is no recorded instance of Biblical criticism among the Church Fathers nor in the orthodox church itself. Both the Apostolic Fathers and the subsequent Ante-Nicene Fathers hold a very high view of the contents of the Old Testament. To them it is authoritative, and they are willing to be guided by its words. They believe, in so far as expression is given to the subject, that Moses was the author of the Pentateuch. To them the Old Testament was truly a divine book.

At first sight there might appear to be an exception to the above statement in the case of the Nazarenes. However, very little is known about this group, and although they may not at all times have held views which were considered to be heretical, yet those authors who deal with them, such as Epiphanius, do classify them as Heretics. It seems safe to say that they were so regarded by the church itself.

2. Such instances of Biblical criticism as are extant from the first two Christian centuries proceed either from groups which were looked upon as being heretical or from the pagan world outside the church. Apparently there were many sects and cults which were on the fringe or borderline of Christianity, among which hostility to the Old Testament and to its teachings might be discovered. The pagan world through the voices of learned representatives, such as Celsus, also uttered its protest against the Bible.

3. The criticism of the Old Testament which comes from the first two Christian centuries was for the most part of an unscientific character. It was the result of certain philosophical presuppositions, as may clearly be seen in the case of the Gnostics, Marcion and Celsus. Almost nothing appears that may legitimately be called textual or literary-historical criticism. Probably the closest approach to such is to be found in the epistle of Ptolemy to Flora. Ptolemy did make a serious effort to solve the problem which he believed had been created by the appearance of diverse laws in the Pentateuch. Valentinus also appears to have considered these matters carefully, although the information about such critical activity on his part is meagre and scanty indeed. For the most part, however, scientific criticism is lacking in the first two Christian centuries.

NOTES TO INTRODUCTION

1. For fuller discussion of the nature and function of textual criticism see Buhl, Kanon und Text des Alten Testaments, Leipzig, 1891, pp. 82-262; Bleek-Wellhausen, Einleitung in das Alte Testament,⁵ Berlin, 1893, pp. 523-595; Sellin, Einleitung in das Alte Testament,² Leipzig, 1914, pp. 5-13; Eissfeldt, Einleitung in das Alte Testament, pp. 693-719; Pfeiffer, Introduction to the Old Testament, pp. 71-103.
2. For further discussion of the nature of literary-historical criticism see, Holzenger, Einleitung in den Hexateuch; Driver, An Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament,⁸ Edinburgh, 1909, pp. lll-xxi, 1-159; Gray, Old Testament Criticism Its Rise and Progress; Cornill, Einleitung in die Kanonischen Bücher des Alten Testaments,⁶ Tübingen, 1908; Eissfeldt, op. cit., pp. 172-276; Orr, The Problem of the Old Testament, 1906.
3. Jean Astruc, Conjectures sur les memoires originaux dont il paroît que Moyse s'est servi pour composer le Livre de la Genese, Bruxelles, 1753. As a matter of fact he was preceded by Spinoza, in his Tractatus Theologico - Politicus.
4. Cf. J. Wellhausen, Prolegomena zur Geschichte Israels,⁶ Berlin, 1905, pp. 363-424; W. Robertson Smith, The Old Testament in the Jewish Church, New York, 1883, pp. 241-304.
5. Jeremiah 31:31-34.
6. e.g. Isaiah 1:10-17, Amos 5:21-27, Hosea 6:6, Jeremiah 7:21,22.
7. cf. Pfeiffer, op. cit., p. 582, "Amos, however, did not, as has been maintained, advocate the abolition of sacrifices: he did not oppose the institution but its misuse, and did not introduce a new order of service. He moralized religion but did not substitute morality for religion."
8. The sources for Aristobulus are Clement of Alexandria, Stromata, I:15: 71:4 I:21: 150:27 V:14: 97:14ff. VI:3: 32:5. ed. Stählin in Die Griechischen Christlichen Schriftsteller der Ersten Drei Jahrhunderte II, 46, 92, 390, 447. II Maccabees 1:10 (ed. Charles, I, 132); Eusebius, Historia Ecclesiastica, ed. Migne, Patrologiae Graecae, xx, 549, 729, ed. Lawlor and Oulton, I, 188,249; Praeparatio Evangelica, ed. Migne, XXI, 347,635-642,694,1098-1103; ed. Gifford, III, 323d, 375d. 410d, 663d, 324a, 376a.

9. ἀνὴρ λόγιος μὲν ἄλλως Eusebius, Praep. Ev. ed. Migne, XXI, 587-598. Cf. also 756ff., 626-635, 738.
10. Ἀλεξάνδρῳ τῷ βασιλεῖ συνακμάσας Josephus, Contra Apionem, I:183, ed. Niese, pp.27,28. Cf. also I:214, II:43; Eusebius, Praep. Ev. ed. Migne, XXI, 687-691. Clement of Alexandria, Stromata, ed. Stählin, II:184:14 II:402:17, Origen, Contra Celsum, I:15 ed. Schwartz, 67. The reference here is to Ἐκαταίου δὲ τοῦ ἱστορικοῦ
11. Stromata, ed. Stählin, II:402:18 κατ' Ἀβραμὸν καὶ τοὺς Ἀιγυπτίους.
12. idem, II:46:18 Clement speaks of Ἀριστόβουλος ὁ Περιπατήτικος καὶ ἄλλοι πλείους.
13. idem, II:93:3 διηρμήνευται δὲ πρὸ Δημητρίου ἕφ' ἑτέρων

Clement, II:87:17 speaks of a certain Demetrius who had composed a work περὶ τῶν ἐν τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ βασιλέων and who differed in his list of kings from that given by Philo.

14. For Jeremiah cf. e.g. Workman, The Text of Jeremiah, and for a general characterization of the Septuagint, Swete, An Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek.

15. The Hebrew text of Amos 9:11,12 is as follows:

אֲרָא יְהוָה בְּיָמַי וְיָבִיאוּ יְהוָה אֶת-הַיְרֵדָה וְיִבְנוּ בְּהֵרֵדָה וְיִבְנוּ בְּהֵרֵדָה-נְּאֻם יְהוָה אֲרָא יְהוָה בְּיָמַי וְיָבִיאוּ יְהוָה אֶת-הַיְרֵדָה וְיִבְנוּ בְּהֵרֵדָה וְיִבְנוּ בְּהֵרֵדָה-נְּאֻם יְהוָה אֲרָא יְהוָה בְּיָמַי וְיָבִיאוּ יְהוָה אֶת-הַיְרֵדָה וְיִבְנוּ בְּהֵרֵדָה וְיִבְנוּ בְּהֵרֵדָה-נְּאֻם יְהוָה

The Septuagint of the same passage reads: ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ ἀναστήσω τὴν σκηνὴν Δαυεὶδ τὴν πεπτωκυῖαν, καὶ ἀνοικοδομήσω τὰ πεπτωκότα αὐτῆς, καὶ τὰ κατεσκαρμμένα αὐτῆς ἀναστήσω, καὶ ἀνοικοδομήσω αὐτὴν καθὼς αἱ ἡμέραι τοῦ αἰῶνος, ὅπως ἐκζητήσωσιν οἱ κατάλοιποι τῶν ἀνθρώπων, καὶ πάντα τὰ ἔθνη ἕφ' οὓς ἐπικέκληται τὸ ὄνομά μου ἐπ' αὐτούς; λέγει Κύριος ὁ ποιῶν ταῦτα.

The words of James in Acts 15:16, 17 are: μετὰ ταῦτα ἀναστρέψω καὶ ἀνοικοδομήσω τὴν σκηνὴν Δαυεὶδ τὴν πεπτωκυῖαν, καὶ τὰ κατεστραμμένα αὐτῆς ἀνοικοδομήσω καὶ ἀνορθώσω αὐτὴν, ὅπως ἐν ἐκζητήσωσιν οἱ κατάλοιποι τῶν ἀνθρώπων τὸν Κύριον, καὶ πάντα τὰ ἔθνη ἕφ' οὓς ἐπικέκληται τὸ ὄνομά μου ἐπ' αὐτούς; λέγει Κύριος ποιῶν ταῦτα γνωστὰ ἀπ' αἰῶνος.

In this quotation James seems to have in mind Jeremiah 12:15 as well as Amos 9:11,12. This would probably account for his use of the word *μετά* and the insertion of *ἀναστρέφω*. The Septuagint of Jeremiah 12:15a is *καὶ ἔσται μετὰ τὸ ἐκβαλεῖν με αὐτοὺς ἐπιστρέφω καὶ ἐλεήσω αὐτοὺς κ.τ.λ.*

16. Matthew 5:17,18., cf. Zeitlin, Who Crucified Jesus? New York, 1942, pp. 114,115.
17. Romans 7:7,12,14 Galatians 3:21 5:14
18. Hebrews 7-10
19. Cf. Gehler, Corporis Haereseologici, Tomus Primus, pp. 271-279. "...Dositheum inquam Samaritanum, qui primus ausus est prophetas quasi non in spiritu sancto locutos repudiare." Cf. also the similar language of Jerome, "...quod Dositheus Samaritanorum principis prophetas repudiavit". Adversus Luciferianos (ed. Migne, XXIII, 187) Jerome regards Dositheus as one who can be included in the following words, "Taceo de Iudaismi haereticis qui ante adventum Christi legem traditam dissiparunt." According to the Clementine Homilies II:3 (ed. Migne vol. II col. 92,96). Dositheus was a disciple of John the Baptist who regarded himself as a Divine manifestation. According to Origen he claimed to be the Son of God, Contra Celsum I:57 VI:11. The Samaritans generally accepted only the Pentateuch. See Cowley's article "Samaritans" in the Encyclopaedia Britannica, 14th Edition, XIX, 918f; Montgomery, The Samaritans, pp. 225,265.
20. Epiphanius, Adversus Haereses, I:I ed. Migne xli,257.
21. Pseudo-Hieronymi, Indiculus De Haeresibus, ed. Gehler, p. 283, Meristae, quoniam separant scripturas, non credentes omnibus prophetis, dicentes aliis et aliis spiritibus illos prophetasse. Harnack, Geschichte der altchristlichen Litteratur bis Eusebius, I, 144.

NOTES TO CHAPTER ONE

Notes to Chapter One

1. F. C. Burkitt, Church and Gnosis A Study of Christian thought and speculation in the Second Century, Burkitt says that the "traditional view" of the Gnostics is that they "come before us historically as Christians" (p.9). However, this does not seem to have been the position of the Church Fathers. For example, Tertullian derived Gnosticism largely from Platonism, *de Anima*, c. XXIII, ed. Migne, II, 729. "Doleo bona fide, Platonem omnium haeticorum condimentarium factum." Likewise, Hippolytus, ed. Wendland, III, 148. ἔστι μὲν οὖν ἡ Ἰουδαίου αἵρεσις Πυθαγορικὴν ἔχουσα καὶ Πλατωνικὴν τὴν ὑπόθεσιν.
p. 191 δοκεῖ νῦν τὰ βασιλείδου μὴ σιωπᾶν (ὄν)τα Ἀριστοτέλους τοῦ Σταγειρίτου δόγματα, οὐ Χριστοῦ.
p. 210 ἔτι μὴ Χριστοῦ τυγχάνοι μαθητῆς ἀλλ' Ἐρπεδοκλέους πολὺ αὐτοῦ προγενεστέρου τυγχάνοντος, ταῦτα εἰσὶν εἰδωμένα εἰς δύο εἶναι τὰ τοῦ παντὸς αἷτια, νεῖκος καὶ φιλίαν.

Möhler (Schriften u. Aufsätze, I, 403) as referred to by Gieseler, A Text-Book of Church History, translated by Samuel Davidson, I, 130, derives Gnosticism entirely from Christianity.

2. Cf. Kidd, A History of the Church to A.D. 461, I, 190-226; Lietzmann, Geschichte der Alten Kirche, I Die Anfänge, pp. 282-317; Reintzenstein, Die Hellenistischen Mysterienreligionen nach ihren Grundgedanken und Wirkungen, pp. 284-333; Bousset, Kyrios Christos, pp. 183-215; Leisegang, article "Gnosis" in Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart,³ Tübingen, 1928, II:272ff. The Hellenistic character of Gnosticism is stressed by Harnack, Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte,⁵ Tübingen, 1931, I, 243-291. See also Bardenhewer, Geschichte der Altkirchlichen Literatur,⁴ Freiburg, 1913, I, 343-376. Cf. also Bousset, article "Gnosis" and "Gnostiker" in the Pauly-Wissowa Real-Encyclopädie der Classischen Altertumswissenschaft, VII, 1503-1533, 1534-1547.
3. Cf. e.g. Kidd, op. cit., p. 222.
4. "It (i.e. creation) was accounted for on the theory of Dualism, for Dualism was an ultimate element in the system of Valentinus as well as a primary one with the Syrian school and with Marcion." Kidd, op. cit., p. 222.
5. Since the captivity of Israel in the eighth century Samaria had been the home of mixed populations. Cf. 2 Kings 17:24-41, Esra 4:2,10.

6. Acts 8:10b οὗτός ἐστιν ἡ δύναμις τοῦ θεοῦ ἡ καλουμένη Μεγάλη. Whether this Simon is actually the Simon Magus of the Church Fathers or not cannot be proven.
7. Eriphanus, op. cit., ed. Migne, xli, 292. μὴ εἶναι δὲ τὸν νόμον θεοῦ, ἀλλ' ἀριστερᾶς δυνάμεως ἔφασκε· μήτε προφήτας ἐξ ἀγαθοῦ θεοῦ ὑπάρχειν, ἀλλ' ἑτέρας καὶ ἑτέρας δυνάμεως. Καὶ ὡς βούλεται ἑκάστῳ ὀρίσεται τὸν μὲν νόμον τινὸς, Δαυεὶδ δὲ ἄλλης, Ἡσαΐαν ἑτέρας, Ἰεζεκιήλ πάλιν ἑτέρας, καὶ ἑκαστὸν τινα τῶν προφητῶν μιᾷ ἀρχῇ ἀνατίθεται. εἶναι δὲ πούτους ἅπαντας ἐκ τῆς ἀριστερᾶς δυνάμεως, καὶ ἐξω τοῦ πληρώματος. Πάντα δὲ τὸν πιστεύοντα τῇ Παλαιᾷ Διαθήκῃ θάνατον ὑπέχειν.

8. The Clementine Homilies III:39 ed. Migne, II, 436.

9. idem, ὁμοίως τε καὶ ὁ πλάσας αὐτὸν, ἐπεὶ μὴ πανταχόθεν βλέπει, ἐπὶ τῇ Σοδόμων καταστροφῇ λέγει· Δεῦτε καὶ καταβάντες ἴδωμεν, εἰ κατὰ τὴν κραυγὴν αὐτῶν τὴν ἐρχομένην πρὸς με συντελοῦνται· εἰ δὲ μὴ, ἵνα γινῶ, καὶ ἀγνοῦντα ἑαυτὸν δείκνυσιν.

The Massoretic Hebrew exhibits the singular $\text{קַטְבָּתְךָ} \text{קָטְבְךָ}$; similarly the Septuagint uses the singular $\text{καταβάς} \text{αὐτὸν} \text{ὄψομαι}$. Undoubtedly Simon's use of δεῦτε is due to faulty memory and is based upon Genesis 11:7 which reads $\text{Δεῦτε καὶ καταβάτε}$.

10. idem, τῷ δὲ εἰπεῖν περὶ τοῦ Ἀδάμ· ἐκβάλωμεν αὐτὸν, μήπως ἐκτείνας τὴν χεῖρα αὐτοῦ ἄψηται τοῦ ξύλου τῆς ζωῆς καὶ φάγη καὶ ζήσεται εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα· τῷ εἰπεῖν μήπως, ἀγνοεῖ.

Again, the quotation of Scripture is faulty. The LXX of Genesis III:22 does not contain the words ἐκβάλωμεν αὐτόν . In Genesis 2:23 it is said καὶ ἐξαπέστειλεν .

11. idem, τῷ δὲ ἐπαγαγεῖν, μή πως φαγὼν ζήσεται εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα, καὶ φθονεῖ.
12. idem, καὶ τῷ γεγράφαι· ὅτι ἐνεθυμήθη ὁ θεὸς, ὅτι ἐποίησε τὸν ἄνθρωπον, καὶ μετανοεῖ καὶ ἀγνοεῖ
13. idem, καὶ τὸ γεγράφαι· καὶ ὡσφράνθη Κύριος ὄσμήν· εὐωδίας, ἐν δεοῦς ἔστιν, καὶ τὸ ἐπὶ κνίσσῃ σαρκῶν ἠσθῆναι, οὐκ ἀγαθοῦ. τὸ δὲ πειράζειν, ὡς γέγραπται, καὶ ἐπείρασε Κύριος τὸν Ἀβραάμ, κακοῦ καὶ τὸ τέλος τῆς ὑπομονῆς ἀγνοῦντος.

14. The groups which are sometimes regarded as precursors of the larger Gnostic schools were the Nicolitans (cf. Revelation 2:6,15,20 - the identity with the Nicolaitans of Revelation cannot be proven, but is probable) Ophites, Cainites and Sethites. The name, Ophite, is derived from ὁ ὄφις = the serpent. Sometimes the group is referred to as the Naasenes, from the Hebrew נַאֲסֵנִי, and the Serpentarians.
15. The Ophites are considered first in a list of pre-Christian heresies in the Catalog of Philaster, ed. Oehler, I, 5. Mosheim says that the leader of the sect was a certain Euphrates, (Institutionum Historiae Ecclesiasticae, Helmstadt, 1764, p. 95.). Discussions of the Ophites may be found in Harnach, Die altchristliche Litteratur, I, 163-174; Neander, Allegemeine Geschichte der christlichen Religion,⁺ Gotha, 1863, II, 140-146, presents a full account of the philosophical views of the Ophites; Duchesne, Early History of the Christian Church, London, 1925, I, 118-119.
16. Lipsius, "Ueber das ophitische System", in Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie, 1863-64. Cf. also Neander, op. cit., I, 447.
17. Irenaeus, Adversus Haereses, I:30, ed. Migne, VII, 694-704; Pseudo-Tertullian, Adversus Omnes Haereses, cap. VI, ed. Oehler, I, 273; Epiphanius, Adversus Haereses, 37, ed. Migne, xli, 641ff; Hippolytus, Refutatio, V:6-11. ed. Wendland, II, 77,100,104,268.
18. cf. Epiphanius, op. cit., ὀφίται δὲ καλοῦνται δι' ὃν δοξάζουσιν ὄφιν.
So also Hippolytus, op. cit., V:9:12. ed. Wendland, p. 100. κακείνω μόνω τῷ νόθῳ ἀνακεῖσθαι πᾶν ἱερόν καὶ πᾶσαν τελετήν καὶ πᾶν μυστήριον.
19. cf. Pseudo-Tertullian, in loc. "Nam serpentem magnificent in tantum, ut illum etiam ipsi Christo praeferant. Ipse enim, inquit, scientiae nobis boni et mali originem dedit."
20. cf. Schaff, History of the Christian Church, New York, 1927, p.489. Kidd, op. cit., I, 196, Neander, op. cit., II:141f.
21. Schaff, op. cit. II, 489 explains the name Ialdabaoth as being derived from אֵל־בְּאֵתָא = product of chaos. Coxe, The Ante-Nicene Fathers, I, 355 says that the word probably means Lord God of the Fathers.
22. Irenaeus, op. cit., I:30:6. Unde exsultantem Ialdabaoth, in omnibus his quae sub eo essent gloriatum, et dixisse: Ego Pater et Deus, et super me memo.

23. idem. "Audientem autem matrem clamasse adversus eum: Noli mentiri, Ialdabaoth: est enim super te Pater omnium primus Anthropus, et Anthropus filius Anthropi."
24. Gen. 1:24. Idem: "Conturbatis autem omnibus ad novam vocem, et inopinabili nuncupatione, et quaerentibus unde Iamor; ad advocandos eos, et ad se seducendum, dixisse Ialdabaoth dicunt: Venite, faciamus hominem ad imaginem nostram."
25. Idem - "...et statim gratias agere eum primo homini, relistis fabricatoribus. Zelantem autem Ialdabaoth, etc."
26. I:30:7. "- et de sua Enthymesi eduxisse feminam, quam illa Purnicos suscipiens invisibiliter evacuavit a virtute."
27. Idem. Mater autem impsorum argumentata est per serpentem seducere Evam et Adam, supergredi praeceptum Ialdabaoth. Irenaeus merely indicates that it was by means of the serpent that Sophia sought to carry out her scheme. Pseudo-Tertullian, however, claims that the Ophites believed that it was the serpent who gave to mankind the origin of good and evil. See note 19 above. According to Hippolytus, op. cit., V:9:13, the serpent was a moist substance, without which nothing could exist. *εἶναι δὲ τὸν ὄφιν λέγουσιν οὗτοι τὴν ὑγρὰν οὐσίαν, καθάπερ καὶ θαλῆς ὁ Μιλήσιος, καὶ μηδὲν δύνασθαι τῶν ὄντων ὅλως, ἀθανάτων ἢ θνητῶν, ἐμψόχων ἢ ἀψύχων συνεστηκέναι χωρὶς αὐτοῦ.*
28. Idem. Manducates autem eos cognovisse eam, quae est super omnia, virtutem dicunt, et abscesisse ab his, qui fecerant eos. Note the language of Pseudo-Tertullian, op. cit. VI, — et haec fuisse virtutem in paradiso, id est istum fuisse serpentem cui Evan quasi filio deo crediderat. Decerpsit, inquiunt, de fructu arboris, atque ideo generi humano scientiam bornorum et nalorum contribuit". It is difficult to ascertain precisely what the Ophites meant by Paradise. According to Hippolytus, V:9:12, Edem is the brain. *Ἐδὲμ δὲ εἶναι λέγουσι τὸν ἐγκέφαλον, οἷον εἶδε δεδεμένον καὶ κατεσφιγμένον ἐν τοῖς περικειμένοις χιτῶσιν ὡσπερ οὐρανοῖς. παράδεισον εἶναι νομίζουσι τὸν μέγρι μόνης τῆς κεφαλῆς ἀνθρώπου. ἐδερχόμενον οὖν τοῦτον τὸν ποταμὸν εἰς Ἐδὲμ, τούτέστιν ἀπὸ τοῦ ἐγκεφάλου, ἀφορίζεσθαι εἰς ἀρχὰς τέσσαρας, καλεῖσθαι δὲ τὸ ὄνομα*

τοῦ πρώτου ποταμοῦ φεῖσών, — οὗτος, φησὶν, ὀφθαλμός, the
second river ἄκρη; the third ὀφφρηοῖς; the fourth στόμα.

29. I:30:8. "Ialdabaoth autem propter eam, quae circa eum erat oblivionem, ne quidem intendentem ad haec, proiecisse Adam et Evam de paradiso, quoniam transgressi erant praeceptum eius."
30. idem: translation by Roberts and Donaldson, in The Ante-Nicene Fathers, Voluisse enim filios ei ex Eva generari, et non adeptum esse, quoniam mater sua in omnibus contraireret ei, et latentur evacuaus Adam et Evam ab humectatione luminis, uti neque maledictionem participaret, neque opprobrium, is qui esset a principalitate Spiritus.
31. I:30:9. Adam autem et Evam prius quidem habuisse levia et clara, et velut spiritalia corpora, quemadmodum et plasmati sunt; venientes autem huc, demutasse in obscurius, et pinguius, et pigrius.
32. I:30:10. Iratum autem Ialdabaoth hominibus, quoniam eum non colebant, neque honorificabant quasi Patrem et Deum, diluvium eis induxisse, ut omnes simul perderet.
33. idem; — ex quibus quemdam Abraham elegisse ipsum Ialdabaoth, et testamentum posuisse ad eum, si perseveravrit semen eius serviens ei, dare ei haereditatem terrae. Post per Moysen eduxisse eos ex Aegypto, qui ab Abraham essent, et dedisse eis hegum, et fecisse eos Judaeos.
34. idem: — ex quibus elegisse septem dies, quos et sanctam hebodamadam vocant, et unusquisque eorum suum praeconem ad semet gloriandum et Deum annuntiandum: uti et reliqui audientes glorias, servirent et ipsi his, qui a prophetis annuntiarentur dii.
35. I:30:11. Sic autem prophetas distribuunt: huius quidem Ialdabaoth Moysen fuisse, et Jesum Nave, et Amos et Abacuc; illius autem Iao, Samuel, et Nathan, et Janam, et Michaeam; illius autem Sabaoth, Heliam et Joel, et Zachariam; illius autem Adonei, Esaiam, et Ezechiel, et Jeremiam et Daniel; illius autem Eloei, Tobiam, et Aggaeum; illius autem Horei, Michaeam, et Nahum; illius autem Astaphaei, Hesdram et Saphoniam.
36. Idem. Horum igitur unusquisque glorificaus suum patrem et Deu, Sophiam et ipsam per eos multa locutam esse de primo homine.

37. I:30:15. Quidam enim ipsam Sophiam serpentem factam dicunt; quapropter et contrariam exstitisse factori Adae, et agnitronem hominibus immisisse, et propter hoc dictum serpentem omnium sapientiore. Sed et propter positionem intestinorum nostrorum, per quae esca infertus, eo quod talem figuram habeant, ostendentem absconsam generatricem serpentis figurae substantiam in nobis.
38. Schaff, e.g. op. cit., I, 489 speaks of their "violent opposition to the Old Testament."
39. The name is apparently derived from *περάω* "to go beyond." Schaff, op. cit., II, 489 speaks of the Peratae as Transcendentalists. The principal source is Hippolytus, op. cit., V:7,8-13; VI; X, who gives an explanation of their tritheistic system. Cf. also Harnack, Die Altchristliche Literatur, I, 168; Clement of Alexandria, Stromata, VII, mentions οἱ Περαιτικοί, by which he possibly has reference to this group. Irenaeus, Tertullian and even Epiphanius are silent on the Peratae.
40. Hippolytus, op. cit., V:12. οὐδεὶς οὖν, φησί, δύναται σωθῆναι δίχα τοῦ υἱοῦ οὐδὲ ἀνελεῖν ὅς ἐστιν ὁ εἰς.
41. Hippolytus, op. cit., V:11 cf. ἐπὶ τούτῳ, φησί, ὁ ἐλπίσας ὑπὸ τῶν ὄφρων τῆς ἐρήμου οὐ διαφθείρεται, τούτεστι τῶν θεῶν τῆς γενέσεως γέγραπται, φησί, ἐν βίβλῳ Μωσέως.
42. The sources are Irenaeus, Adversus Haereses, I:31, Epiphanius Adversus Haereses, 38; Tertullian, Liber de Praescriptionibus, c. 33; Pseudo-Tertullian, Adversus omnes haereses, c. VII. Augustine, De Haeresibus Liber, XVIII, ed. Oehler, p. 200. Philastes, De haeresibus liber, II, ed. Oehler, p. 6; Praedestinati, De Haeresibus, XVIII, ed. Oehler, p. 238, who assigns their origin to Mesopotamia. "Hos ortos Mesopotamiae ecclesiarum Syriae sacerdotes ad ceteros suos coepiscopos conscripserunt." Pseudo-Hieronymi, Indiculus de Haeresibus, VIII, ed. Oehler, p. 290.

43. Epiphanius, op. cit. I:3:38, ed. Migne xli, 656. σεμνύνονται γὰρ συγγενεῖς εἶναι τοῦ Κάιν, καὶ τῶν Σοδομιτῶν, καὶ Ἡσαῦ, καὶ Κορέ: καὶ οὗτοι, φασὶν, εἰσὶ τῆς τελείας καὶ ἄνωθεν γνώσεως.

cf. Pseudo-Hieronymus, op. cit. VIII. "Caiani et Indaeii sunt qui Cain sanctificant, dicentes illum de caelesti substantia esse profectum, quae est ad dexteram, Abel autem de sinistra, et ideo illum esse occisum.

44. Epiphanius, op. cit., ed. Migne, xli, 656, καὶ ἄλλα-τινὰ συγγράμματα ὡσαύτως πλάττονται κατὰ τῆς ἑστέρας· ἢν ἑστέραν τὸν ποιητὴν τοῦ παντὸς τούτου τοῦ κύτους, εὐρανοῦ τε καὶ γῆς, καλοῦσι.

45. Jude 11. οὐαὶ αὐτοῖς, ὅτι τῇ ὁδοῦ τοῦ Κάιν ἐπορεύθησαν, καὶ τῇ πλάνῃ τοῦ Βαλαὰρ μισθοῦ ἐδεχύθησαν, καὶ τῇ ἀντιλογίᾳ τοῦ Κορέ ἀπώλοντο.

46. John of Damascus, op. cit., ed. Migne, xciv, 701. καὶ Παλαιὰν Διαθήκην ἀποβάλλουσι. Κέχρηται δὲ Παλαιᾶ καὶ Νεᾶ Διαθήκη, ἐκάστην λέξιν πρὸς τὸν ἑαυτῶν νοῦν μεθοδεύοντες.

Epiphanius, op. cit., I:III, 40 ed. Migne, xli, 580, 677-692. καὶ Παλαιὰν Διαθήκην διαβάλλουσι. Κέχρηται δὲ καὶ Παλαιᾶ καὶ Νεᾶ Διαθήκη, ἐκάστην λέξιν εἰς τὸν ἑαυτῶν νοῦν μεθοδεύοντες.

The exact relationship between the Sethites and the Archontici is difficult to determine. A brief discussion of the Archontici may be found in Harnack, Geschichte der Altchristlichen Literatur bis Eusebius, I, 165f. The sect as Epiphanius knew it probably flourished later than the second century. However, its origin appears to have been much earlier, and for that reason it is included in this treatise. Some of the beliefs of the Archontici were also held by the Severiani,

whom Epiphanius discusses after the followers of Apelles. See chapter three, note 50.

47. Epiphanius, op. cit., I:III:40, ed. Migne, xli, 580.
οὗτοι πάλιν εἰς πολλοὺς ἄρχοντας τὰ πᾶν ἀναφέρουσι.

It is from this fact that the name appears to be derived.

48. idem, 40:1. οὐκ ἐν πολλοῖς δὲ τόποις αὕτη φαίνεται, ἢ μόνον ἐν τῇ Παλαιστίνῳ ἐπαρχίᾳ. Μετήνεγκαν δὲ τὸν ἴον ἠὲν που καὶ εἰς τὴν μεγάλην Ἀρμενίαν.

49. idem, 40:2. καὶ οὗτοι δὲ ὅμως βίβλους ἑαυτοῖς ἐπλαστογράφησάν τινας ἀποκρύφους, ὧν τὰ ὀνόματα ἐστὶ ταῦτα. Τὸ μὲν γὰρ Συμφωνίαν, μικρὸν δὴ ἔστι βιβλίον καλοῦσι, τὸ δὲ μέγα Συμφωνίαν. Ἄλλα καὶ ἄλλα τινὰ βιβλία ἑαυτοῖς ἐπισηρεύουσιν, οἷς ἐὰν συντύχῃσιν, ἵνα δόξωσι τὴν ἑαυτῶν πλάνην διὰ πολλῶν βεβαίωσιν ἐπισυνεισφέρεσθαι. Ἡὲν δὲ καὶ τοῖς Ἀλλογενέσι καλούμενοι κέχρηται· βίβλοι γὰρ εἰσὶν οὕτω καλούμεναι. Λαμβάνουσι δὲ λαβὰς ἀπὸ τοῦ Ἀναβατικῆς Ἡσαίου· ἐτι εἰ καὶ ἄλλων τινῶν ἀποκρύφων.

50. Its leading representatives are Saturnilus, Tatian and Bardaisanes.

51. The name is sometimes given as Satorⁿminus. Cf. Irenaeus, Aversus Haereses, 1:24, ed. Migne, vii, 675. ff.; Pseudo-Tertullian, III, ed. Oehler, p. 272; Epiphanius, Adversus haereses, ed. Migne, xli, 297ff; Hippolytus, Refutatio, VII:16. ed. Wendland, pp. 190, 208-210; Eusebius, Ecclesiastical History, IV:7, ed. Migne, xx, 316ff; Cf. the discussions in Kidd, op. cit. I, 197ff; Duchesne, op. cit., 117ff.; Neander, op. cit., II, 155ff; Harnack, op. cit., I, 157.

52. Epiphanius, op. cit., ed. Migne, xli, 300. φάσκει γὰρ οὗτος τοὺς ἀγγέλους λέγων, καὶ τὸν θεὸν τῶν Ἰουδαίων ἓνα ἐξ αὐτῶν εἶναι

col. 301; καὶ αὐτὸν δὲ τὸν Σατανᾶν ἄγγελον φάσκει ἀντιπράττοντα τοῖς κοσμοποιῶσι ἀγγέλοις, μάλιστα δὲ τῷ θεῷ τῶν Ἰουδαίων.

53. Irenaeus, op. cit. I:24. Prophetias autem quasdam quidem ab iis Angelis, qui numdum fabricaverint, dictas; quasdam autem a Satana.

54. Irenaeus, op. cit., I:28; Pseudo-Tertullian, op. cit., 7; Hippolytus, op. cit., VIII:9; Epiphanius, op. cit., ed. Migne, xli, 836ff; Tatian's conversion to Christianity was probably due to the influence of Justin Martyr. In the Oratio ad Graecos, 18, ed. Migne, VI, 848. Tatian speaks of Justin as ὁ θαυμασιώτατος Ἰουστίνος. Ryland, in The Ante-Nicene Fathers, II, 73 characterizes these words as "the language of an affectionate pupil." In 19, Tatian mentions Justin and himself in close connection, ὡς καὶ Ἰουστίνου, καθάπερ καὶ ἐμέ.

According to Kidd, Tatian was born c. 110. Tatian claims to have been born in the land of the Assyrians, ed. Migne, col. 888. ταῦτα ὑμῖν, ὦ ἄνδρες Ἕλληνες, ὁ κατὰ βαρβάρους φιλοσοφῶν Τατιανὸς συνέταξα, γεννηθεὶς μὲν ἐν τῇ τῶν Ἀσσυρίων γῆ.

Cf. also Kidd, op. cit., I, 199ff; Neander, op. cit., II, 157ff; Schaff. op. cit., I, 493-495.

55. Oratio ad Graecos, 29 ed. Migne, VI, 868.

56. Harnack believes that Tatian made a second journey to Rome and there adopted heretical opinions. Cf. Harnack, Die Chronologie der Altchristlichen Literatur bis Eusebius, I, 284-289.

57. Clement of Alexandria, Stromata, III:12 ed. Migne, VIII, 1184. καταλύων τὸν νόμον ὡς ἄλλου θεοῦ.

58. Kidd, op. cit., I, 200-201.

59. Pseudo-Tertullian, XX, "Adam nec salutem consequi posse." Irenaeus, op. cit., I:28. ἀναγορεύσας τῇ δὲ τοῦ Ἀδάμ σωτηρίᾳ παρ' ἑαυτοῦ τὴν αἰτιολογίαν ποιησάμενος.
60. See note 51.
61. Translation by Ryland, The Ante-Nicene Fathers, II, 77. περινοοῦντι δέ μοι σπουδαῖα συνέβη γραφαῖς τισιν ἐν τυχεῖν βαρβαρικαῖς, πρεσβυτέροις μὲν ὡς πρὸς τὴν ἐκείνων πλάνην. Καί μοι πεισθῆναι ταύταις συνέβη διὰ τε τῶν λέξεων τὸ ἀτυφόν, καὶ τῶν εἰπόντων τὸ ἀνεπιτάδευτον, καὶ τῆς τοῦ παντός ποιήσεως τὸ εὐκατάληπτον, καὶ τῶν μελλόντων τὸ προγνωστικόν, καὶ τῶν παραγγελμάτων τὸ ἐσαΐσιον, καὶ τῶν ὄλων τὸ μοναρχικόν.
62. This seems to be apparent from the comparatively casual manner in which Tatian's attitude toward the Old Testament is presented by his opponents.
63. It was his system of Gnosis, as represented by Ptolemy, that led Irenaeus to the writing of his great work, Against Heresies. The principal sources are Irenaeus, Adversus Haereses, I:1-21; Pseudo-Tertullian, IV; Tertullian, De Praescriptione, 7,30,33; Epiphanius, Adversus Haereses, XXXI, ed. Migne, xli, col. 473ff., Hippolytus, Refutatio, VI:21ff.
64. Epiphanius, op. cit., 31, ed. Migne, xli, 476; ἔφασαν γὰρ αὐτὸν τινες γεγευῆσθαι φρεβωνίτην τῆς Αἰγύπτου παραλιώτην· ἐν Ἀλεξανδρείᾳ δὲ πεπαιδευθῆναι τὴν τῶν Ἑλλήνων παιδείαν.
65. Pseudo-Tertullian, op. cit., ed. Oehler, I, 276. "...sed alterius legis et prophetarum quaedam probat, id est omnia improbat, dum quaedam reprobat."

66. Tertullian, Liber De Praescriptionibus, ed. Migne, II, 50, "Valentinus, aliter exponeus, et sine dubio emendaus, hoc omnino quidquid emendat, ut mendosum retro, anterieus fuisse demonstrat."
67. Irenaeus, op. cit., ed. Migne, VII, 523. "... τὴν μὲν τάξιν καὶ τὸν εἶρημὸν τῶν Γραφῶν ὑπερβαίνοντες, καὶ ὅσον ἔφ' ἑαυτοῖς, λύοντες τὰ μέλη τῆς ἀληθείας· μεταφέρουσι δὲ καὶ μεταπλάττουσι, καὶ ἄλλο ἐξ ἄλλου ποιοῦντες ἔδαπατῶσι πολλοὺς, τῇ τῶν ἐφαρμοδωμένων κυριακῶν λογίων κακοσυνθέτῳ σοφίᾳ.
68. A good exposition of this system may be found, e.g., in Kidd, op.cit., I, 206-210. Cf. also Lietzmann, op. cit., I, 309-315.
69. op. cit., ed. Migne, xli, 284. παλαιὰν Διαθήκην ἀθετοῦσι καὶ προφήτας.

So also John of Damascus, De Haeresibus Liber, ed. Migne, XCIV, 697. παλαιὰν δὲ ἀθετοῦσι Διαθήκην, καὶ προφήτας ἀταγινώσκοντες.

70. The epistle is preserved in Epiphanius, op. cit., 33:3-7, ed. Migne, xli, 557-568; ed. Holl, I; 216-222. Harnack, Chronologie, p. 294 points out that Irenaeus speaks about the disciples of Ptolemy but not about Ptolemy himself. Ptolemy, therefore, reasons Harnack, must have lived earlier, and Harnack would place the period of Ptolemy's activity between 145 and 180.
71. Cf. Irenaeus, op. cit., Proem. 2. λέγω δὲ τῶν περὶ Πτολεμαίου ἀπάνθισμα οὖσαν τῆς Ὀυαλετίνου σχολῆς.
- Cf. the discussions in Kidd, op. cit., I, 210-212 and in the other standard church histories.

72. Eriphanus, op. cit., 33:3. οἱ μὲν γὰρ ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ Πατρὸς νόμοθετῆσθαι τούτοις λέγουσιν.
73. idem. ἕτεροι δὲ τούτοις τὴν ἐναντίαν ὁδὸν τραπέντες, ὑπὸ τοῦ ἀντικειμένου φθοροποιοῦ διαβόλου τεθείσθαι τούτων ἰσχυρίζονται ὡς καὶ τὴν τοῦ κόσμου προσάπτουσιν αὐτῷ δημιουργίαν, Πατέρα καὶ Πιοιητὴν τούτων λέγοντες εἶναι.
74. idem. τοῦτο δὲ τοῦ παντὸς διέπταισαν οὗτοι διαβόντες ἀλλήλοις, καὶ ἑκάτεροι αὐτῶν διαμαρτόντες παρὰ σφίσιν αὐτοῖς τῆς τοῦ προκειμένου ἀληθείας. οὔτε γὰρ ὑπὸ τοῦ τελείου Θεοῦ καὶ Πατρὸς φαίνεται τούτων τεθείσθαι. ἐπόμενος γὰρ ἔστιν ἀτελῆ τε ὄντι, καὶ τοῦ σφετέρου πληρωθῆναι ἐνδεῆ, ἔχοντά τε προστάξεις ἀνοικείας τῇ τοῦ τοιοῦτου Θεοῦ φύσει τε καὶ γνώμῃ.
75. idem. οὗτ' αὖ πάλιν τῇ τοῦ ἀντικειμένου ἀδικίᾳ νόμον προσάπτειν ἀδικεῖν αἰρουέντος, τῶν τε ἔξῃς τί μὴ συνορῶστων τὰ ὑπὸ τοῦ Σωτῆρος εἰρημένα. οἰκία γὰρ ἢ πόλις μερισθεῖσα ἐφ' ἑαυτήν, ὅτι μὴ δύναται στήναι, ὁ Σωτὴρ ἡμῶν ἀπεφάνετο.
76. 33:4 πρῶτον οὖν μαθητέον, ὅτι ὁ σύμματος ἐκεῖνος νόμος ὁ περιεχόμενος τῇ Μωυσέως Πεντατεύχῳ

οὐ πρὸς ἑνὸς τινος νενομοθέτηται, λέγω δὲ, οὐχ ὑπὸ μόνου Θεοῦ, ἀλλ' εἰσὶ τινες αὐτῶν. προστάσεις καὶ ὑπ' ἀνθρώπων τεθεῖσαι, καὶ τριχῆ τούτου διαιρεῖσθαι οἱ τοῦ Σωτῆρος λόγοι διδάσκουσιν ἡμᾶς. Εἰς τε γὰρ αὐτὸν τὸν Θεόν, καὶ τὴν τούτου νομοθεσίαν. διαιρεῖται δὲ καὶ εἰς τὸν Μωσέα, οὐ καθ' αὐτὸ δι' αὐτοῦ νομοθετεῖ ὁ Θεός, ἀλλὰ καθὰ ἀπὸ τῆς ἰδίας ἐννοίας ὁρμώμενος καὶ ὁ Μωσῆς ἐνομοθέτησέ τινα· καὶ εἰς τοὺς πρεσβυτέρους τοῦ λαοῦ διαιρεῖται, καὶ πρῶτοι εὐρίσκονται ἐντολὰς τινὰς ἐνθέντες ἰδίας.

77. idem. πῶς οὖν τοῦτο οὕτως ἔχον ἐκ τῶν τοῦ Σωτῆρος δείκνυται λόγων, μάθοις δ' ἂν ἤδη. Διαλεγόμενός· που ὁ Σωτὴρ πρὸς τοὺς περὶ τοῦ ἀπεστασίου συζητοῦντας αὐτῶν, ὃ δὲ ἀποστάσιον ἐξεῖναι ἐνενομαθέτητο, ἔφη αὐτοῖς, ὅτι Μωσῆς πρὸς τὴν σκληροκαρδίαν ὑμῶν ἐπέτρεψε τὸ ἀπολύειν τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ· ἀπ' ἀρχῆς γὰρ οὕτως γέγονεν οὕτως. Ἐπεὶ γὰρ, φησὶ, συνέβυθε ταύτην τὴν συζυγίαν καὶ ὁ συνέβυθεν ὁ κύριος, ἄνθρωπος μὴ χωριζέτω, ἔφη. ἐνταῦθα ἕτερον μὲν τοῦ Θεοῦ δείκνυσι νόμον, τὸν κωλύοντα χωρίζεσθαι γυναῖκα ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀνδρὸς αὐτῆς, ἕτερον δὲ τὸν τοῦ Μωυσέως, τὸν διὰ τὴν σκληροκαρδίαν ἐπιτρέποντα χωρίζεσθαι τοῦτο τὸ ζεῦγος.

78. Matthew 15:4-6. Mark 7:10,11.

79. Eriphanius, op. cit., 33:34. τοῖς πρεσβυτέροις λέγων· Δῶρον τῷ Θεῷ ὃ ἐστὶν ὠφέληθῆς ἐξ ἐμοῦ.

80. Isaiah 29:13

81. Eriphanius, op. cit. 33:4. Σαφῶς οὖν ἐκ τούτων εἰς τρία διαιρούμενος ὁ σύμπασις ἐκείνος δείκνυται νόμος. Μωϋσείως τε γὰρ αὐτοῦ, καὶ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων, καὶ αὐτοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ εὐρομεν νομοθεσίαν ἐν αὐτῷ. Αὕτη μὲν οὖν ἢ διαίρεσις τοῦ σύμπαντος ἐκείνου νόμου ἔδε ἡμῶν διαίρεσις τὸ ἐν αὐτῷ ἀληθῆς ἀναπέφαυκεν.

82. idem. 33:5 πάλιν δὲ ἢ τὸ ἐν μέρος, ὁ αὐτοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ νόμος, διαιρεῖται εἰς τρία τινά.

83. idem. εἰς τε τὴν καθαρὰν νομοθεσίαν, τὴν ἀσύμπλοκον τῷ κακῷ, ὅς καὶ κυρίως νόμος λέγεται, ὃν οὐκ ἔλαθε καταλῦσαι ὁ Σωτὴρ, ἀλλὰ πληρῶσαι· οὐ γὰρ ἦν ἀλλότριος αὐτοῦ ὃν ἐπλήρωσεν· οὐ γὰρ εἶχε τὸ τέλειον.

84. idem. καὶ εἰς τὸ συμπληγμένον τῷ χείρονι, καὶ τὴν ἀδικίαν, ἣν ἀνεῖλεν ὁ Σωτὴρ, ἀνοίκειον ὄντα τῇ ἑαυτοῦ φύσει.

85. idem. διαιρεῖται δὲ καὶ εἰς τὸ τυπικόν, καὶ συμβολικόν τὸ κατ' εἰκόνα τῶν διαφερόντων νομοθετηθέν· ὃ μετέθηκεν ὁ Σωτὴρ ἀπὸ αἰσθητοῦ καὶ φαινομένου ἐπὶ τὸ πνευματικόν καὶ ἀόρατον.

86. *idem.* καὶ ἔστι μὲν ὁ τοῦ Θεοῦ νόμος ὁ καθαρὸς καὶ ἀσύμπλοκος τῶν χειρῶν αὐτῆ ἢ Δεκάλογος, οἱ δέκα λόγοι ἐκεῖνοι, οἱ ἐν ταῖς δυαδὶ πλαδὶ δεδιχασμένοι.

Nete Ptolemy's phrase μὴ ἔχοντες δὲ τὸ τέλειον, ἐδέοντο τῆς παρὰ τοῦ Σιτηῆρος πληρώσεως

as evidence that he regarded the Old Testament age as incomplete.

87. Leviticus 24:20, ἐ δὲ ἔστι συμπληγμένος τῇ ἀδικίᾳ, οὗτος ὁ κατὰ τὴν ἀμύραν καὶ ἀνταπόδοσιν τῶν πρὸς ἀδικησάντων κείμενος, ἔφθαλμὸν ἀντὶ ἔφθαλμοῦ, καὶ ὀδόντα ἀντὶ ὀδόντος ἐκκόπτεσθαι κελεύων, καὶ ἴσον ἀντὶ φόνου ἀμύνασθαι.

88. *idem.* διὸ δὴ ὁ ἀπ' ἐκεῖνου παραγενόμενος ἵκεις τοῦτο τὸ μέρος τοῦ νόμου ἀνήρηκεν.

89. *idem.* τὸ δὲ ἔστι μέρος αὐτοῦ τυπικόν, τὸ κατ' εἰκόνα τῶν πνευματικῶν, καὶ διαφερόντως κείμενον, τὸ ἐν προσφοραῖς, λέγω, καὶ περιτομῇ, καὶ Σαββάτῳ, καὶ νηστεία, καὶ Πάσχα, καὶ ἁδύμοις, καὶ τοῖς τοιούτοις νομοθετηθέντα.

90. *idem.* πάντα γὰρ ταῦτα εἰκόνας καὶ σύμβολα ὄντα, τῆς ἀληθείας φανερωθείσης, μετέτεθη. — καὶ τὸ Πάσχα δὲ ὁμοίως, καὶ τὰ ἁδύμα, ὅτι εἰκόνας ἦσαν, ἐηλοὶ καὶ Παῦλος ὁ ἀπόστολος.

91. idem. 33:7 περιλείπεται δὲ ἡμῖν τί ποτέ ἐστίν οὗτος ὁ Θεὸς ὁ τὸν νόμον θέμενος.

92. idem. οὗτος δὲ δημιουργὸς καὶ ποιητὴς τοῦδε τοῦ παντός ἐστὶ κόσμον, καὶ τῶν ἐν αὐτῷ, ἕτερος ὢν παρὰ τὰς τούτων οὐσίας, μέσος τούτων καθεστῶς ἐνδίκως, καὶ τὸ τῆς μεσότητος ὄνομα ἀποφέρειτο αὐν.

93. eg. in 33:4 ὁ σύμπας ἐκεῖνος νόμος ὁ περιεχόμενος τῇ Μωσέως Πεντατεύχῃ. 33:3 τὸν διὰ Μωυσέως τεθέντα νόμον.

94. In his Conjectures Jean Astruc stoutly defended the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch and particularly of the book of Genesis. However, he believed that Moses had compiled the present book of Genesis by combining various ancient written documents which lay before him. Thus, to Astruc, Moses was the compiler, but not the original author of Genesis.

NOTES TO CHAPTER TWO

Notes to Chapter Two

1. Pseudo-Tertullian XVII, "Post hunc discipulus ipsius (i.e. Cerdo) emersit Marcion quidam nomine, Ponticus genere, episcopi filius, propter stuprum cuiusdam virginis ab ecclesiae communicatione abiectus." The reason here given for Marcion's expulsion from the church does not seem to be in keeping with what is known elsewhere of Marcion's character. Epiphanius, op. cit., XLIII:1 οὗτος τὸ γένος Ποντικὸς ὑπῆρξεν, Ἐλενοπόντου δὲ φημι, Σινώπης δὲ πόλεως, ὡς πολλὸς περὶ αὐτοῦ ἄδεται λόγος.

Cf. also Justin

Martyr, Apology, I:26,68., Dialogue with Trypho, 35; Irenaeus, Adversus Haereses, I:27, III:3,12, ed. Migne, VII, 687-689,752ff., 898, 906; Tertullian, De praescriptionibus, chapters, 7,30,33,34. Adversus Marcionem, De Carne Christi, Adversus Hermogenem; Hippolytus, Refutatio VII:29-31. ed. Wendland, vol. II, pp. 210-217; Eusebius, Ecclesiastical History, IV:11, V:13, ed. Migne, XX, 328-332,460-461.

2. cf. the discussion in Kidd, op. cit., I, p.214; Harnack, Marcion Das Evangelium vom Fremden Gott, pp. 21-30 gives a sketch of Marcion's life. Cf. also Neander, op. cit., II, 170-180; Seeberg, Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte, I, 312-320; Bardenheuer, Geschichte der Altkirchlichen Literatur, I, 371ff.; Patrologie, pp. 70f.
3. cf. Pseudo-Tertullian, ed. cit., p. 277. "Hic introducit initia duo, id est duos deos, unum bonum et alterum saevum, bonum superiorem, salvum hunc nundi creatorem. Hic prophetias et legem repudiat, deo creatori renuntiat. The primary source for Cerdo is Irenaeus, Adversus Haereses I:27;1; III:4:3; Tertullian, op. cit., I:2; Hippolytus, Philos. VIII:10; Eusebius, Ecclesiastical History, IV:11:2; Epiphanius, Haereses, xli. ed. Migne, xli, 691-696. Cf. Harnack's discussion of the relation between Cerdo and Marcion, op. cit., pp. 34-39. Cf. also Harnack, Dogmengeschichte, I, 292-309, Die Altchristliche Literatur, I, 191. Seeberg, op. cit., I, 312-320.
4. Tertullian, Contra Marcionem, I:6, Alioquin certi Marcionem dispare deos constituere, alterum iudicem, ferum, belli potentem; alterum mitem, placidum, et tantummodo bonum atque optimum.
5. idem I:2 quem negare non potuit, id est Creatorem, id est nostrum, et quem probare non poterit, id est suum.

6. idem I:2. Languens enim (quod et nunc multi, et maxime haeretici) circa mali quaestionem "unde malum?" et obtusis sensibus ipsa enormitate curiositatis, inveniens Creatorem pronuntiantem Ego sum qui condo mala; quanto ipsum praesumpserat mali auctorem, et ex aliis argumentis, quae ita persuadent perverso cuique, tanto in Creatorem interpretatus malam arborem malos fructus condentem, scilicet mala; alium deum praesumpsit esse debere in partem bonae arboris bonos fructus. Hippolytus thinks that these ideas were derived from Empedocles, Refutatio, XVIII:17.
7. idem I:2. Et ita in Christo quasi aliam invenies dispositionem, solius et purae benignitatis.
8. Although Marcion is not considered in this thesis as a Gnostic, nevertheless his position bears many similarities to that of Gnosticism.
9. idem I:19. Nam haec sunt antitheses Marcionis, id est contrariae oppositiones; quae conantur discordiam Evangelii cum Lege committere, ut ex diversitate sententiarum utriusque instrumenti, diversitatem quoque argumententur deorum.
10. idem. I:19. Separatio Legis et Evangelii, proprium et principale opus est Marcionis.
11. idem I:19, -- qui instituit separationem adversus Evangeliiis Legisque pacem.
12. idem. I:19 Antitheses Marcionis, id est, contrariae oppositiones, quae conantur discordiam Evangelii cum Lege committere. Harnack, Marcion, pp. 74-92, 256-313 presents a full discussion of the Antitheses.
13. idem II:5, Si Deus hominis et praescius futuri, et avertendi mali potens, cur hominem, et quidem imaginem et similitudinem suam, imo et substantiam suam, per animae scilicet censum, passus est labi, de obsequio legis in mortem, circumventum a diabolo?
14. idem II:5, Si enim et bonus qui evenire tale quid nollet, et praescius qui eventurum non ignoraret, et potens qui depellere valeret, nullo modo evenisset, quod sub his tribus conditionibus divinae majestatis evenire non posset.
15. idem II:5, -- siquidem in quantum nihil tale evenisset, si talis Deus,

id est bonus, et praescius, et potens, in tantum ideo evenit, quia non talis Deus.

16. idem II:5 Opera Creatoris utrumque testantur et bonitatem eius, qua bona, sicut ostendimus; et potentiam qua tanta; et quidem ex nihilo.
17. idem II:5. De praescientia vero quid dicam? quae tantos habet testes, quantos fecit prophetas. Quamquam quis praescientiae titulus in omnium auctore, qua universa utique disponendo praesciit, et praesciando disposuit, certe ipsam transgressionem; quam nisi praescisset, nec cantionem eius delegasset sub metu mortis.
18. idem II:25 Tertullian devotes this entire section to a discussion of the Scriptural account of God's dealings with Adam and with Cain in the light of objections which Marcion had made.
19. idem II:25. Inclamat Deus: Adam, ubi es? scilicet ignorans ubi esset?
20. idem II:25. — an de arbore gustasset interrogat, scilicet incertus?
21. idem II:25. Concerning Marcion's interpretation of this passage, Tertullian remarks, Stulte, qui tantum argumentum divinae majestatis, et humanae instructionis, naso agis.
22. idem II:25 — sicut de Cain sciscitatur, ubinam frater eius; quasi non iam vociferatum a terra sanguinem Abelis audisset.
23. idem II:25 Et hic, videlicet, ex ignorantia incertus et scire cupidus? an his sonus pronuntiationis necessarius, non dubitativum, sed comminativum exprimeus sensum sub sciscitationis obtentu?
24. Exodus 32:10
25. Contra Marcionem II:26. Non facies enim, inquit, istud, aut et me una cum eis impende. This is an allusion to Exodus 32:32. Marcion appears to have held an extremely low view of the Law. The following words of Tertullian (op. cit., V:5) no doubt reflect the attitude of Marcion to the Law. "Quid stultius, quid infirmius, quam sacrificorum cruentorum, et holocaustorum nidorosorum a Deo exactio? Quid infirmius, quam vasculorum et grabatorum purgatio? Quid inhonestius, quam carnis, jam erubescens alia dedecoratio? Quid tam humile, quam talionis indictio?"

Quid tam contemptibile, quam ciborum exceptio? Totum, quod sciam, Vetus Testamentum omnis haereticus irridet."

According to Origen, Marcion misinterprets Romans in condemning the Law as being responsible for sin abounding."—volentes accusare legem ex his Apostoli verbis Marcion et caeteri haeretici occasionem capere viderentur, tquam haec fuerit causa datae legis, ut peccatum, quod ante legem non fuerat, abundaret." Origen, Ad Romanos, V:6, ed. Migne, XIV, 1032.

26. Exodus 21:24.
27. Contra Marcionem II:18 Non enim iniuriae mutuo exercendae licentiam sapit, sed in totum cohibendae violentiae prospicit.
28. idem II:18. — interim commissio iniuriae metu vicis statim occursurae repastinaretur, et licentia retributionis prohibitio esset provocationis.
29. Were this not the case Tertullian's defence of these laws would be without much point.
30. idem II:18 cf. also Exodus 32:6.
31. idem II:18 — sed illam (i.e. the sacrifices) Dei industriam sentiat, qua populum, pronum in idolatriam et transgressionem, eiusmodi officiis religioni suae voluit astringere, quibus superstitio saeculi agebatur, ut ab ea avocaret illos, sibi iubens fieri quasi desideranti, ne simulacris faciendis delinqueret.
32. idem II:20 — obicientia Creatori vel maxime fraudem illam et rapinam auri et argenti, mandatam ab illo Hebraeis in Aegyptios. Cf. also Irenaeus, Adversus Haereses IV:30.
33. idem II:20 — non paucis lancibus et scyphis, pauciorum utique divitum ubique, sed totis et ipsorum facultatibus, et popularium omnium collationibus satisfaciendum Hebraeis pronuntiasses.
34. idem II:20 Igitur si bona Hebraeorum causa, bona iam et causa, id est mandatum Creatoris, qui et Aegyptios gratos fecit nescientes, et suum populum, in tempore expeditionis augusto, aliquo solatio tacitae compositionis expunxit.

35. Irenaeus, Adversus Haereses, IV:29. Sed induravit, inquit illi, Deus cor Pharaonis et famulorum eius.
36. idem, II:21. Sic et in caeteris contrariedades praecceptorum ei exprobas, ut mobili et instabili.
37. This argument is developed in II:21.
38. idem II:23. Si vero etiam circa personas levem vultis intellegi, cum reprobat aliquando probatos: aut improvidum, cum probat quodogue reprobandos.
39. idem II:24 Sic et poenitentiam apud illum prave interpretaris, quasi proinde mobilitate vel improvidentia, imo iam ex delicti recordatione poeniteat.
40. Irenaeus, op. cit., I:27:3. -- Abel autem, et Enoch, et Noe, et reliquos iustos, et eos qui sunt erga Abraham patriarcham. cum omnibus prophetis, et his qui placuerunt Deo, non participasse salutem, qui in Marcione fuit serpens praeconavit. Cf. also IV:8.
41. Tertullian, Contra Marcionem V:18. "Marcion allegorias non vult in prophetis habuisse formas." Cf. also II:21, III:5, 14, IV:20 and the discussion in Harnack, Marcion, p. 260.*
42. Origen, In Matthaeum, XV:3, ed. Migne, Vol. XIII, col. 1261.
φάσκων μὴ δεῖν ἀλληγορεῖν τὴν Γραφήν.
43. Tertullian, op. cit., IV:33. Creator proprius deus Iudaicae gentis. Cf. also IV:6.
44. idem, V:16. Deus Marcionis naturaliter ignotus nec usquam nisi in evangelio revelatus, non omnibus scibilis. Cf. also I:9.
45. idem I:15 Dehinc, mundum ex aliqua materia subiacente molitus est, innata, et infecta, et contemporali Deo, quemadmodum et de Creatore Marcion sentit, Cf. also V:19, Clement of Alexandria, Stromata,

III:3:12; Chrysostom, Homilia II in Genesin I, ed. Migne, LIII., 29,30

Κὰν γὰρ Μανιχαῖος προσέλθῃ λέγων τὴν
ἕλῃν προὔπαρχειν, κὰν Μαρκίωv, κὰν Ἰουαλεντίνος,
κὰν Ἑλλήνων παῖδες, λέγε πρὸς αὐτοὺς· ἐν ἀρχῇ
ἐποίησεν ὁ Θεὸς τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ τὴν γῆν.

46. Tertullian, op. cit., IV:28. Ecce plane diversum exemplum Moysi et Christi. Moyses rixantibus fratribus ultro intercedit, iniurium increpat: quid proximum tuum percutis? et reicitur ab illo: quis te constituit magistrum aut indicem super nos? Christus vero postulatus a quodam, ut inter illum et fratrem ipsius de dividenda haereditate componeret, operam suam, et quidem tam probae causae, denegavit.
47. Tertullian IV:36. Aliquando David in recuperatione Sionis offenderant caeci, resistentes quomodo admitterentur; ideo Christus ex diverso caeco subvenit, ut hinc se ostenderet non esse filium David, ut ex animi diversitate bonus caecis, quos ille insserat caedi.
48. Chrysostom, In Matthaeum, Homilia XXVI:6 ed. Migne, LVII, 341.
Ἐκεῖνοι μὲν γὰρ λέγουσιν, ἔτι ἐφόνευσε καὶ ἐμοίχευσεν.
49. Tertullian, op. cit., IV:23. Repraesentat creator ignium plagam Helia postulante in illo pseudopropheta.
50. idem, IV:23. Ecce Christus diligit parvulos, tales docens esse debere qui semper maiores velint esse, creator autem ursos pueris immisit, ulciscens Heliseum propheten convicia ab eis passum.
51. idem, IV:9. Si autem Elisaeus, prophetae Creatoris, unicum leprosum Naaman syrum ex tot leprosis israelitis emendavit, nec hoc ad diversitatem facit Christi, quasi hoc modo melioris, dum Israelitem leprosum emundavit extraneus, quem sirus dominus eumundare non valuerat.
52. idem, IV:9. — Nam et hoc opponit Marcion, Helisaeum quidem materia equisse, aquam adhibuisse, et eam septies; Christum vero verbo solo, et

hoc semel factum, curationem statim repraesentasse. IV:35 —
numerus faciet ad differentiam deorum; in destructionem Creatoris,
unum remediatio, et praelationem eius qui decem enumerat. Quis
enim dubitabit plures potuisse curari ab eo, qui unum curasset, quam
ab illo decem, qui nunquam retro unum?

53. Deuteronomy 21:23 and Galatians 2:12.
54. Tertullian, op. cit., V:3. "Neque quia creator pronuntiavit:
'Maledictus omnis ligno suspensus', ideo videbitur alterius dei
esse Christus et idcirco a creatore iam tunc in lege maledictus."
55. idem IV:26, V:15.
56. Clement of Alexandria, Stromata, III:3:12, ed. Stählin, II, 200 --
ἀλλ' οἱ μὲν ἀπὸ Μαρκίωνος φύσιν κακῆν ἐκ τε
ύλης κακῆς καὶ ἐκ δίκαιου γενομένην δημιουργοῦ.
ὡς δὲ λόγῳ, ἢ βουλόμενοι τὸν κόσμον τὸν ὑπὸ
τοῦ δημιουργοῦ γερόμενον συμπληροῦν, ἀπέχεσθαι.
γάρου βούδονται.
57. Tertullian IV:11. -- coniunctos non admittit, neminem tingit nisi
caelibem aut spadonem, morti aut repudio baptisma servat.
58. idem IV:12. Nec enim disputaretur cur destrueret Sabbatum, si destruere
deberet. Cf. the entire passage.
59. idem IV:11, Publicanum allectum a Domino in argumentum deducit, quasi
ab adversario legis allectum, extraneum Legis et Iudaismi profanum.
60. idem IV:34. Christus divortium inhibet --. Moyses vero permittit
repudium in Deuteronomio—. Vides diversitatem Legis et Evangelii,
Moysi et Christi? Cf. also V:7.
61. idem IV:20. Lex a contactu sanguinantis feminae summovet, Christus
vero idcirco gestivit non tantum contactum eius admittere, sed etiam
sanitatem donare.

62. idem, III:24. Caeterum, vester Christus pristinum statum Judaeis pollicetur, ex restitutione terrae et post decursum vitae apud inferos in sinu Abrahae refrigerium-- -- Quia non de terrena, sed de coelesti promissione sit quaestro. Cf. also IV:14. Nam etsi putas Creatoris quidem terrenas promissiones fuisse, Christi vero collestes.
63. idem I:27:3 Quoniam enim sciebant, inquit, Deum suum semper tentantem eos; et tunc tentare eum suspicati, non accurrerunt Jesu, neque erediderunt anuntiationi eius; et propterea remansisse animas eorum apud inferos dixit.
64. idem, I:27:4 Sed huic quidem; quoniam et solus manifeste ausus est circumcidere Scripturas.
65. Tertullian, Contra Marcionem, IV:7, 11.
66. Cf., e.g., Tertullian, Contra Marcionem, II:25. Cf. also Harnack, Marcion, pp. 284-285.
67. Kidd, op. cit., I, 220 speaks of Marcion approaching the Scripture with a praeiudicium. Cf. Harnack, Marcion, pp. 30-35.
68. The principal sources are Pseudo-Tertullian, XI, X; Hippolytus, Refutatio VII:26, X:16, ed. Wendland. II, 190,224,280; Tertullian, De Praescriptionibus, cc. vi, xxx, xxxiii, xxxiv; ed. Migne, II; Epiphanius, Adversus omnes Haereses, xlv, ed. Migne, xli, 821-832; Eusebius, Ecclesiastical History, quoting Rhodon, v, xiii; Harnack, Marcion, discusses the life and influence of Apelles, pp. 117-196 and gives the complete sources with pertinent quotations, pp. 404-420. Pseudo-Tertullian gives the fundamental doctrine of Apelles as follows, Hic introducitur unum deum infinitis superioribus partibus.
69. Pseudo-Tertullian, Adversus Omnes Haereses. 19. Legem et prophetas repudiat. Habet praeterea suos libros quos inscripsit Syllogismorum, in quibus probare vult quod omnia quaecunque Moyses de deo scripserit vera non sint, sed falsa sint.
70. Hippolytus, Refutatio Omnium Haeresium X:16 οὗτος κατὰ τοῦ νόμου καὶ τῶν προφητῶν συντάγματα ἐποίησε, καταλύειν αὐτοῦς ἐπιχειρῶν ὡς ψευδῆ λεληθηκότας καὶ Θεὸν μὴ ἐγνωκότας.

Eusebius, Historiae Ecclesiasticae, V:13. ὁ γέτοί Ἀπελλῆς οὗτος, μαρία κατὰ τοῦ Μωϋσέως ἠσέβησε νόμου, διὰ πλειόνων συγγραμμάτων τοὺς Θείους βλασφημίας λόγους, εἰς ἔλεγχόν τε, ὡς γε δὴ ἔδοκει, καὶ ἀνατροπὴν αὐτῶν οὐ μικρὰν πεποιημένος σπουδῆν.

71. Hippolytus, op. cit., VII:26 νόμον δὲ καὶ προφήτας δυσφημεῖ, ἀνθρώπινα καὶ ψευδῆ φάσκων εἶναι τὰ γεγραμμένα.
72. Epiphanius, op. cit., τούτοις καθέδῃς ἐπιταλ ἦτοι σύγχρονος, ἦτοι παρὰ τὸν χρόνον. οὐκ ἔχω γὰρ περὶ τοῦ χρόνου αὐτῶν ἀσφαλῶς λέγειν, πλην σύνεγγυς ἀλλήλων ἦσαν. ὡς δὲ τὰ εἰς ἡμᾶς ἐλθόντα διηγήσομαι.
73. op. cit., — καθέδῃς συνεπόμενος τῷ πεισισημένῳ Ἀπελλῆτιανῷ.

cf. Harnack, Die Altchristliche Literatur, I, 204. On p. 165 Harnack says, "In h. 45 (Severianer) schildert Epiphanius unzweifelhaft ebenfalls ein ophitisches System (c. 2 constatirt er selbst die Verwandtschaft mit den gleich zu nennenden Archontikern), dessen Vertreter höchst wahrscheinlich mit den von Eusebius geschilderten Severianern nichts zu tun haben." However, Epiphanius does not identify the Severiani and the Archontici, as Harnack alleges. Epiphanius' language is φάσκουσι δὲ καὶ τὴν γυναῖκα εἶναι ἔργον τοῦ Σατανᾶ, καθάπερ καὶ οἱ Ἀρχοντικοὶ τοῦτο ἔφασαν.

74. op. cit., Τὸν δὲ διάβολον οὖν εἶναι φάσκει τοῦ μεγάλου ἀρχοντος τῆς τῶν ἔδουσιῶν τάξεως, ᾧ ἔνομα τίθεται πῆ μὲν Ἰαλδαβαῶθ, πῆ δὲ Σαβαῶθ. τοῦτον δὲ γεννηθέντα ἐξ αὐτοῦ εἶναι ὄφιν.

75. *op. cit.*, φάσκουσι δὲ καὶ τὴν γυναῖκα εἶναι ἔργον τοῦ Σατανᾶ.
76. *op. cit.*, ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου τὸ μὲν ἥμισυ εἶναι τοῦ Θεοῦ, τὸ δὲ ἥμισυ τοῦ διαβόλου. ἀπ' ὀμφαλοῦ γὰρ καὶ ἀνωτάτω εἶναι τῆς τοῦ Θεοῦ δυνάμεως λέγει τὴν πλάσιν. ἀπὸ δὲ ὀμφαλοῦ καὶ κατωτάτω, τῆς πονηρᾶς ἐξουσίας τὴν πλάσιν.
77. Eriphanius, *op. cit.*, ed. Migne, cli, 832, κέχρηται ἔτι οἱ τοιοῦτοι καὶ ἀπεκρύφτοις τισὶν, ὡς ἀκηκόαμεν· ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐν μέρει ταῖς ῥηταῖς βιβλοῦ, λεξιθηρῶντες ἐκεῖνα μόνον, ἅτινα κατὰ τὸν νοῦν αὐτῶν παραπλέκοντες ἑτέρως μεταχειρίζονται.

Eriphanius, *op. cit.*, — ἀθετεῖ καὶ Παλαιὰν Διαθήκην.

Cf., also John of Damascus, De Haeresibus Liber, ed. Migne, vol. xciv, col. 705.

NOTES TO CHAPTER THREE

Notes to Chapter Three

1. Epiphanius, Adversus Haereses I:18, ed. Migne, xli, 257, discusses the Ναζαραιῶται, which he distinguishes from the Ναζωραῖοι. John of Damascus, De Haeresibus Liber, 19, ed. Migne, xciv, 688-9, spells the name of the former group mentioned by Epiphanius as ναζωραῖοι and also treats them separately from the ναζωραῖοι. In so doing it appears that he has merely followed Epiphanius. It is difficult to ascertain the precise relationship of the two groups.

Were the Ναζαραιῶται a purely Jewish sect which existed in the regions of Galaaditis and Basamitis, that is, near Pella, as Epiphanius indicates, and so to be distinguished from the Jewish-Christian Nazarenes? Lietzmann, Geschichte der Alten Kirche, I, 190 seems to follow Epiphanius in this identification. Michel, in Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart, IV, 473, raises the question as to whether Epiphanius possessed a source which described certain Jewish Christians as though they were a purely Jewish group.

Harnack describes Epiphanius' assumption of a pre-Christian, Jewish sect known as Nazarites as "die grösste Confusion die Epiphanius gemacht hat." He asks, "Ist es nicht wahrscheinlicher, das Epiphanius, der übrigens nur von einer zu ihm gekommenen, Kunde, entweder gnostische Judenchristen, über die er unvollständig unterrichtet war, für vorchristlich gehalten oder eine vorchristliche jüdische Sekte, die wie die Judenchristen im Ostjordanland lebte, irrtümlich Nazaräer (Nazaräer) genannt hat? Oder liegt nicht doch eine Verwechslung mit Nasiräeren vor?" Die Mission und Ausbreitung des Christenthums, Leipzig, 1923, I, 414.

The sources concerning this sect are meagre indeed. Quite possibly there was an original pre-Christian Jewish group which came later, through the influence of Jewish Christians in Pella, to bear the name Ναζαραιῶται. However, the fact that the sect, as Epiphanius describes it, possesses the name Ναζωραῖοι, that it rejects the Law, sacrifices and the eating of flesh, would appear to indicate that it was a Jewish-Christian group. Note Epiphanius' language ἡ τῆς τὰ πάντα ἰουδαίσει which would appear to imply that the group was seeking to live as Jews. For further discussion of the general subject of the Nazarenes see Harnack, Lehrbuch der Dogmenschichte, Tübingen, 1931, I, 310-334; Seeberg, I, 260-262; Kidd, *op. cit.*, I, 92ff.

At any rate, the critical position which Epiphanius attributes to the Ναζαραιῶται of Pella was evidently not characteristic of all who were called Nazarenes. Gray, Old Testament Criticism Its Rise and Progress, p. 20 and Pfeiffer, Introduction to the Old Testament, p. 135 appear to have ignored this consideration.

2. Epiphanius, op. cit., I:19 καὶ πατέρας μὲν ἐδέχετο τοὺς ἐν τῇ Πεντατεύχῳ ἀπὸ τοῦ Ἀδὰμ μέχρι Μωϋσέως, τοὺς ἐν ἀριστεία Θεοσεβείας διαφανεῖς ὑπάρξαντας· φησὶ δὲ Ἀδὰμ, καὶ Σήθ, καὶ Ἐνῶχ, καὶ Μαθουσάλα, καὶ Νῶε, καὶ Ἀβραὰμ, καὶ Ἰσαάκ, καὶ Ἰακώβ, Λευὴν τε καὶ Ἠαρὼν, καὶ Ἰησοῦν τὸν τοῦ Ἰναυῆ αὐτὴν δὲ οὐ παρέδέχετο τὴν Πεντατεύχον, ἀλλὰ ὡμολόγει μὲν τὸν Μωϋσέα, καὶ ὅτε ἐδέξατο νομοθεσίαν, ἐπίστευεν· οὐ ταύτην δὲ φησὶν, ἀλλ' ἑτέραν.

3. John of Damascus, op. cit., 19 Νασσαραῖοι, ἑρμηνευόμενοι ἀφηνιασταί· οἱ πᾶσαν σαρκοφαγίαν ἀπαγορεύουσιν· ἐμφύχων δὲ οὐδ' ὄλως μεταλαμβάνουσιν. Ἄχρι δὲ Μωϋσέως καὶ Ἰησοῦ τοῦ Ἰναυῆ τοῖς ἐν Πεντατεύχῳ ἁγίοις ὀνόμασι πατριάρχων κεχρημένοι καὶ πιστεύοντες· φησὶ δὲ Ἀβραὰμ, Ἰσαάκ, καὶ Ἰακώβ, καὶ τῶν ἄνωτάτω, καὶ αὐτοῦ Μωϋσέως, καὶ Ἠαρὼν καὶ Ἰησοῦ. τὰς δὲ τῆς Πεντατεύχου Γραφὰς οὐκ εἶναι Μωϋσέως δογματίζουσιν· ἀλλὰς δὲ παρ' αὐτὰς διαβεβαιούνται.

4. Epiphanius, op. cit., I:2 ed. Migne, xli, 405-473 apparently has attempted to give a survey of the various groups which bear the name Ebionite. For fuller discussions of the Ebionites see Kidd, op. cit., I, 94-97; Harnack, op. cit., I, 329ff; Seeberg, op. cit., I, 262-264.

5. This is shown by the fact that they are included by the fathers in their writings against heresies.

6. Eriphanus, op. cit., I:II:30 ed. Migne, xli, 436. Ἀβραὰμ δὲ ὁμολογοῦσι καὶ Ἰσαὰκ, καὶ Ἰακώβ. Μωϋσῆν τε καὶ Ἀαρών, Ἰησοῦν τε τὸν τοῦ Ναυῆ, ἀπλῶς διαδεδόμενον Μωϋσῆα, οὐδὲν δὲ ὄντα. μετὰ τούτους δὲ οὐκέτι ὁμολογοῦσὶ τίνα τῶν προφητῶν, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀναθεματίζουσι καὶ χλευάζουσι, Δαβὶδ τε καὶ τὸν Σαλομῶνα, ὁμοίως δὲ τοὺς περὶ Ἡσαΐαν καὶ Ἱερεμίαν καὶ Δανιὴλ καὶ Ἰεζεκιήλ. Ἡλίαν τε καὶ Ἐλισσαῖον ἀθετοῦσιν. οὐ γὰρ συντίθενται, βλασφημοῦντες τὰς αὐτῶν προφητείας· ἀλλὰ μόνον τὸ Ἐυαγγέλιον δέχονται. — τοὺς δὲ προφήτας λέγουσι συνέσει εἶναι προφήτας, καὶ οὐκ ἀληθείας, — οὔτε γὰρ δέχονται τὴν Πεντάτευχον Μωϋσέως ἔλθην, ἀλλὰ τίνα ῥήματα ἀποβάλλουσιν. ἔταν ἐπὶ αὐτοῖς εἶπης περὶ ἐμφύλων ὀκνήσεως· Πῶς οὖν Ἀβραὰμ παρέθετο τοῖς ἀγγέλοις τὸν μύσχον καὶ τὸ γάλα, ἢ πῶς ἔφαγε Μωϋσῆς, καὶ ἤκουσεν ἀπὸ Θεοῦ λέγοντος, θεῶν καὶ φαγῶν, πῶς δὲ Ἰσαὰκ καὶ Ἰακώβ ἔθυσαν τῷ Θεῷ, ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ Μωϋσῆς ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ; ἐκείνοις μὲν ἀπιστεῖ, καὶ φησὶ: τίς χρεῖα με ἀναγινώσκειν τὰ ἐν τῷ νόμῳ, ἐλθόντες τοῦ Ἐυαγγελίου; πόθεν σοι τοίνον τὰ περὶ Μωϋσέως καὶ Ἀβραὰμ εἰδέναι; εἶδα γὰρ, ὡς ὁμολογεῖτε αὐτοὺς εἶναι δικαίους, καὶ πατέρας ἑαυτῶν ἐπιγράφεσθε. εἶτα ἀποκρίνεται, καὶ λέγει, ὅτι Χριστὸς μοι ἀπεκάλυψε· καὶ βλασφημεῖ τὰ πλείω τῆς νομοθεσίας, καὶ τοὺς περὶ Σαρψῶν καὶ Δαβὶδ καὶ Ἡλίαν καὶ Σαμουὴλ καὶ Ἐλισσαῖον καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους.

7. The exact date of the Homilies is difficult to determine. A thorough discussion of the question may be found in Harnack, Chronologie, II, 518-540. Cf. also Harnack's, Dogmengeschichte, I, 331-334, in which he points out that the Homilies, as we now possess them, do not come from the second century. Kidd, op. cit., I, 138 thinks that in substance, though not in form, the Homilies may be of the second or early third century. Seeberg, op. cit., I, 256 endeavors to trace in some detail their literary history. Whatever may be the date of

the Homilies in their present form, it would appear that the theme of the preaching of Peter against Simon Magus was an early one. Hence the Homilies doubtless represent attitudes which were representative of the second century, and for that reason are included in this thesis.

The Homilies in their present form appear to represent a form of Judaistic Christianity, probably of a syncretistic nature. If they passed through a Catholic redaction, it is difficult to see why statements derogatory to the Old Testament were retained, unless the word catholic be used in a very loose sense, such as "nicht im Sinne einer strengen theologischen Orthodoxie" (Harnack, Dogmengeschichte, I, 332). The text of the Homilies is given in Migne, II. An English translation appears in The Ante-Nicene Fathers, VIII.

8. Homilies, II:38, πολλὰ γὰρ ψευδῆ κατὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ προσέλαβον αἱ Γραφαὶ λόγῳ τούτῳ· τοῦ προφήτου Μωυσέως γνώμη τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐκλεκτοῖς τισὶν ἐβδόμηκοντα τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ τὰς ἐπιλύσεις παραδείκνυκός πρὸς τὸ καὶ αὐτοὺς ἐφοσιᾶσθαι τοῦ λαοῦ τοὺς βουλομένους.

9. idem, II:38. μέτ' οὐ πολὺν γραφεῖς ὁ νόμος προσέλαβεν τινα καὶ ψευδῆ κατὰ τοῦ μόνου Θεοῦ, τοῦ τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ τὴν γῆν καὶ πάντα τὰ ἐν αὐτοῖς δημιουργήσαντος, τοῦτο τοῦ πονηροῦ δικαίῳ τινὶ λόγῳ ἐνεργῆσαι τετολημικότος.

10. idem, II:38. καὶ τοῦτο γέγονε λόγῳ καὶ κρίσει, ὅπως ἐλεγχθῶσι, τίνες τολμῶσι τὰ κατὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ γραφέντα φιληκόως ἔχειν, τίνες τε στοργῇ τῇ πρὸς αὐτὸν τὰ κατ' αὐτοῦ λεγόμενα μὴ μόνον ἀπιστεῖν, ἀλλὰ μηδὲ τὴν ἀρχὴν ἀκούειν ἀνέχεσθαι, κἂν ἀληθῆ τυγχάνη, πολλῶν κρίναντες ἀσφαλέστερον περὶ εὐφήμου πίστεως.

κινδυνεύειν, ἢ ἐπὶ βλασφημίαις λόγοις δυσσυνειδήτως βιοῦν.

11. idem II:39 εὖ οὖν Σίμων τὰς κατὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐν ταῖς Γραφαῖς πειρασμοῦ χάρι προσκειμένας περικοπὰς αὐτὰς, ὡς μανθάνω, βούλεται, ἐλθὼν εἰς μέσον, λέγειν, ὅπως τῆς πρὸς τὸν Θεὸν στοργῆς ὅσους δύναται ταλαιπώρους ἀποστήσαι δυναθῆ.

12. idem, II:39 Δηροσία γὰρ αὐτὰς λέγειν προσκεῖσθαι ταῖς βίβλοις τὸ βουλόμεθα, ἐπεὶ πύραυτοι ἀραβεῖς ὄλους τοῦ πονηροῦ Σίμωνος τὸ θέλημα ποιοῦμεν.

13. idem, II:39. Διὰ ἀνάγκην ἔχομεν, συγκατατιθέμενοι ταῖς ψευδέσι περικοπαῖς, περὶ αὐτῶν ἀντιπυθανόμενοι, εἰς ἀπορίαν αὐτὸν μὲν φέρειν, τοῖς δὲ εὐγνωμονοῦσι τῶν κατὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ ῥηθειῶν περικοπῶν, μετὰ πείραν πίστεως, ἰδία παρέχειν τὴν ἐπίλυσιν, ἣτις μίαν καὶ σύντημον ἔχει τὴν ἑδὸν. Ἔστι δὲ ἡδε:

14. idem, II. 41. πλὴν ἄκουσον, πῶς αὐτοῦ πολλὰ καταψεύδονται αἱ Γραφαί, ὡς εἴση ἐτυυχάνων αὐταῖς.

15. idem, II:48. ἐπειδὴ πολλὰ ἔστι τὰ ὑπὸ τῶν Γραφῶν εἰρημένα κατὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ, πρὸς τὸ ἐπειγόν τῆς ὥρας διὰ τὴν ἐσπέραν, ἕνα ὄν βούλη λόγον πύθου καὶ ἐπιλύσομαι, δεῖξας αὐτὸν ψευδῆ: οὐχ ὅτι μόνον κατὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ εἴρηται, ἀλλ' ὅτι ὄντως ψευδῆς ἔστιν.

16. **idem, II:48.** καὶ γὰρ ἀπεκρινάμεν μαθεῖν θέλω πῶς τῶν γραφῶν ἀγνοεῖν τὸν θεὸν λεγούσων, σὺ γινώσκοντα αὐτὸν ἀποδείξαι δύνασαι.

17. **idem, II:49.** ὁ δὲ πυνθάνομαι σου, πρῶτον ἀποκρίναί μοι· ὁ τὰς βίβλους γράφας καὶ εἰπὼν πῶς ὁ κόσμος ἐκτίσθη καὶ ὅτι οὐ προγινώσκει ὁ θεὸς, ἄνθρωπος ἦν, ἢ οὐ; καὶ ἔφη· Ἄνθρωπος. καὶ ὁ Πέτρος ἀπεκρίνατο· Ἄνθρώπῳ οὐν ἄντι, πόθεν δυνατόν ἦν εἶδέναι ἀψευδῶς, πῶς ὁ κόσμος ἐκτίσθη, καὶ ὅτι ὁ θεὸς οὐ προγινώσκει;

18. **idem, II. 50.** ἀνάγκη πᾶσα, τὰς λεγούσας αὐτὸν Γραφὰς ἀγνοεῖν ψεύδουθαι, τὰς δὲ γινώσκειν αὐτὸν λεγούσας ἄληθεύειν.

19. **idem. II:51.** καὶ τοῖς ἀπὸ τῶν ψευδῶν Γραφῶν πλανημένοις οἰκειῶς τῆς πλάνης ἐσέφηνε τῆν αἰτίαν λέγων· Διὰ τοῦτο πλανᾶσθε, μὴ εἰδέτεσθε τὰ ἀληθῆ τῶν Γραφῶν.

This is an incorrect quotation of Matthew 22:29. Mark 12:24.

20. **idem, II:52.** οὐκοῦν εὐλόγως οὔτε κατὰ τοῦ θεοῦ πιστεύω, οὔτε κατὰ τῶν ἐν τῷ νόμῳ ἀναγραφέντων δικαίων, ἀσεβῶς φρονεῖν προλαμβάνων. ὡς γὰρ πέπεισμαι, οὔτε Ἄδαρ παραβάτης ἦν, ὁ ἐπὶ τῶν τοῦ

Θεοῦ χειρῶν κρυφαί θείαι· οὔτε Ἰνῶε μέθυστος ἦν, ἔ-
σπερ πάντα τὸν κόσμον δίκαιος εὐρέθεις· οὔτε δὲ
Ἀβραὰμ τρεῖς ἅμα συνῆει γυναῖδιν, ὁ δὲ διὰ σωφροσύνην
πολυτεκνίας καταξιώθεις· οὔτε Ἰακώβ τετράσιν ἐκοινῶνει, ὧν
δύο καὶ ἀδελφαὶ ἐτέγχανον, ὅς δεκαδύο φυλῶν ὑπάρξας
πατὴρ καὶ τὴν τοῦ Διδασκάλου ἡμεῶν παρουσίαν ἐσήμανεν
ἐλθεῖν· οὗ Μωϋσῆς φονεὺς ἦν καὶ παρὰ ἱερέως εἰδώλων κρίνειν
ἐμάνθανεν, ὁ παντὶ τῷ αἰῶνι τὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ νόμον προφητεύσας
καὶ δι' ὀρθὴν φρόνησιν πιστὸς οἰκονόμος μαρτυρηθείς.

21. *idem.* II:39.

22. *idem,* III:3. ταύτης δὲ τῆς τόλμης ἕνεκα ὁ Σίμων ταῦτα
ψευδέσι τῶν Γραφῶν περικοπιῖς ὑπλισμένου πολυμῆν ἡμῖν
προσέροχεται. καὶ τὸ δεινότερον, ὅτι ἀφ' ὧν οὐ πεπίστευκε
προφητῶν τοιαῦτα δογματίσειν κατὰ τοῦ ὄντως Θεοῦ
οὐ πεφόβηται.

23. *idem* III:4. καὶ ἡμῖν μὲν τοῖς ἐκ προγόνων παρεληφόσι τὸν
τὰ πάντα κτίσαντα σέβειν Θεόν, ἔτι δὲ καὶ τῶν
ἁπατῶν δυναμένων βιβλῶν τὸ μυστήριον, οὐδὲν ἀνησεται.

24. *idem,* III:9. Ἐἰ δὲ ὡς Γραφαῖς τεθαρρήκως κατὰ τοῦ
Θεοῦ τολμᾷ τις ἡμῶν ἀκούειν, πρῶτον ἐκεῖνό μοι
συνενθυμείτω, ὅτι, ἂν τις εὐλόγον ἑαυτῷ δόγμα ὡς
ρούλεται ἀναπλάσῃ, ἔπειτα αὐταῖς ἐγκύψῃ, δυνατὸς ἔσται
πολλὰς ὑπὲρ οὗ ἐπλάσατο δόγματος ἀπ' αὐτῶν
μαρτυρίας φέρειν· πῶς οὖν ἐπὶ ταύταις κατὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ
θαρρῆειν ἴσθιν, ἐν αἷς ἡ πάντων βουλή εἰςευρίσκειται;

25. **idem, III:21** Διὸ πῶς ἔτι φυτοῦ χρεΐαν εἶχε
 προσλαβεῖν, ἵνα τί ποτέ ἐστὶν ἤδη καλὸν ἢ κακόν,
 εἰ ἐνετέλλετο μὴ φαγεῖν; Ἀλλὰ ταῦτα πιστεύουσιν
 οἱ ἄκριτοι, οἱ ἄλογον θηρίον θεοῦ τοῦ κτίσαντός αὐτοῦ
 τε καὶ τὰ πάντα ἐνεργητικώτερον γεγενῆσθαι
 οἶηθέντες.

26. **idem, III:42, Translation as given by Rev. Thomas Smith in The Ante
 Nicene Fathers, VIII.,** καὶ ἔ Πέτρος - "Ὅσαι τῶν
 Γραφῶν φωναὶ συμφωνοῦσι τῇ ὑπ' αὐτοῦ γενομένῃ
 κτίσει, ἀληθεῖς εἰσὶν. ὅσαι δὲ ἐναντία, ψευδεῖς
 τυγχάνουσιν.

27. **idem, III:47.** Μετὰ δὲ τὴν Μωϋσείως ἀνάληψιν ἐγράφη
 ὑπὲρ τινος, οὐ μὴν ὑπὸ Μωϋσείως. Ἐν αὐτῷ γὰρ τῇ
 νόμῳ γέγραπται· καὶ ἀπέθανε Μωϋσῆς, καὶ ἔθαψαν
 αὐτὸν ἑγγύς οἴκου φύγορ, καὶ οὐδεὶς εἶδε τὴν ταφὴν
 αὐτοῦ ἕως τῆς σήμερον. Οἷόν τε ἦν ἀποθανόντα
 Μωϋσῆν γράφειν, ἀπέθανε Μωϋσῆς;

28. **idem, III:47** Ἰπεί ἐν τῷ μετὰ Μωϋσεία χρόνῳ, ὡς γὰρ ἔτι πού
 πεντακόσια ἢ καὶ πρὸς, ἐν τῷ κτισθέντι ναῷ κείμενος
 εὑρίσκειται, καὶ μεθ' ἑτέρα πού πεντακόσια ἔτη φέρεται, καὶ
 ἐπὶ τοῦ Μαβουχοδονόσορ οὕτως ἐμπρησθεῖς ἀπόλλυται. Καὶ
 ὅπως μετὰ Μωϋσῆν γραφεῖς καὶ πολλάκις ἀπολωλὼς τὴν
 τοῦ Μωϋσείως πρόγνωσιν καὶ οὗτος ἠκολούγησεν, ἔτι τὸν
 ἀφανισμὸν αὐτοῦ προειδὼς οὐκ ἔγραψεν· οἱ δὲ γράψαντες
 τῷ τὸν ἀφανισμὸν μὴ προεγνωκέναι ἐπ' ἀγνοίας
 ἐλεγχθέντες, προφήται οὐκ ἦσαν.

29. Text in Migne, vol. II, English translation in The Ante Nicene Fathers, VIII. This epistle is later than the Homilies, for it speaks of them, e.g. 1:1. Cf. Uhlhorn in Hauck-Herzog, Realencyclopädie für protestantische Theologie und Kirche, IV, 172, and the discussions of the Pseudo-Clementines in the literature mentioned in note 7 above.

30. Epistle of Peter to James, 1, ed. Migne, II, 25. -- καθ' ἣν καὶ τοῖς Ἑβραϊκόντα ἔ Μωϋσῆς παρέδωκε τοῖς τὴν καθέσθραν αὐτοῦ παρεληφόσιν. — Κατὰ γὰρ τὸν παραδοθέντα αὐτοῖς κακὸνα τὰ τῶν γραφῶν ἀσύμφωνα πειρῶνται μεταρθευθίσειν, εἰ δὴ τις τυχὸν μὴ εἰδὼς τὰ παραδόσεις νερκῆ πρὸς τὰς τῶν προφητῶν πελοσήμους φωνάσ.

31. idem, 2. Τὸ γὰρ τοιοῦτο ἀντιπράσσειν ἐστὶ τῷ τοῦ θεοῦ νόμῳ τῷ διὰ Μωϋσεως ᾗ τέντι.

32. Epiphanius, Adversus Haereses, I:1:14, ed. Migne, xli, 260-269; John of Damascus, De Haeresibus Liber, 18, ed. Migne, xciv, 688.

33. It is not possible to ascertain the precise identity of the Ossenes. Lietzmann, op. cit., I, 190 thinks that they must be closely related to the Nazarites of Epiphanius. He also, following Epiphanius, refers to them as the "Sampsäer im Moabiter- und Nabatäerland." Harnack, op. cit., I, 326, note 1, remarks "Aus den confusen Namen (Nazaräer, Ebioniten, Sampsäer, Ossenes, u.s.w.) und Angaben des Epiphanius kann man schliessen, dass die Judenchristen in manchen Gegenden der Propaganda der elkesaitischen Lehre unterlegen sind." Epiphanius says that the heresy of the Ossenes is found in the land of the Nabataens, in Perea and Moab, and that they are now called Sampsenes (Σαμψέοι). His brief description shows them to have been a Jewish-Christian group. Concerning their attitude to the Bible he remarks, τοὺς δὲ πλείους τῶν μετέπειτα προφητῶν ἀπεβάλλοντες.

He also relates that they migrated to the Elkasites. αὕτη γούν

ἢ αἵρεσις ἢ τῶν Ὀσσηνῶν ἄνω προειρημένη, ἢ πολιτευομένη μὲν τὴν τῶν Ἰουδαίων πολιτείαν, κατὰ τὸ σαββατίζειν τε καὶ περιτέμνεσθαι, καὶ τοῦ νόμου ποιεῖν τὰ πάντα, μόνον ἐξ ἀπαγορεύειν τὰς βίβλους ὁμοίως τοῖς Ἰναδαραῖσις.

34. John of Damascus, op. cit., ed. Migne, xciv, 687 Ἐχρῶντο δὲ γραφαῖς ἑτέροις μετὰ τὸν νόμον· τοὺς δὲ πλείους τῶν μετέπειτα προφητῶν ἀπεβάλλοντο.

35. Epiphanius, op. cit., II:1, ed Migne, vol. xli, col. 849, 1009-1017. ἀσφανίσοντες τοῦ νόμου καὶ τῶν προφητῶν.

John of Damascus, op. cit., ed. Migne, xciv, col. 713. ἀφηνιάζοντες τοῦ νόμου καὶ τῶν προφητῶν.

Epiphanius says concerning them, οὗτοι, καθὼς ὑπειλήφαμεν, τὴν Βακάθον κατοικοῦντες, μητροκωμίαν Ἀραβίας τῆς Φιλαδελφίας, οἱ τοὺς περατυγχάνοντας ἀποτέμνοντες. Πλείους ἐξ αὐτῶν εὐνοῦχοι ὑπάρχουσιν ἀποτετμημένοι. Με εἶδες ἐν τῷ sag 57:1 περὶ Ὀυαλησίων ἀκούσαμεν πολλάκις, οὗ μόντοι ἔγνωμεν ποῦ, τίς ἢ πόθεν ὤρματο, ἢ τί λέγων, ἢ νοουθετῶν, ἢ φθεγγόμενος ὁ Ὀυάλης οὗτος. Τὸ μὲν ὄνομα, Ἀραβικὸν ὑπάρχον, τινὰ ὑπόνοιαν ἤμιν δίδωσιν διανοηθῆναι τοῦτον, καὶ τὴν αὐτοῦ αἵρεσιν εἰσέτι δεῦρο φέρεσθαι, ὡς ἐν ὑπονοίᾳ, καθάπερ ἔφην τινὰς ὄντας, ἐν Βακάθοις τῆς Φιλαδελφικῆς χώρας πέραν τοῦ Ἰορδάνου. Καὶ οἱ μὲν ἐπιχώριοι τούτους Γνωστικοὺς βούλονται λέγειν. εὐκ εἰσὶ δὲ τῶν Γνωστικῶν. ἕτερα γὰρ τούτων τὰ φρονήματα.

Cf. also Harnack, Die Altchristliche Literatur, I, 170.

NOTES TO CHAPTER FOUR

Notes to Chapter Four

1. Lives of Origen may be found in the standard church histories., Cf. also Eugene de Faye, Origène Sa Vie, Son Oeuvre, Sa Pensée, A fairly full bibliography on Origen is given by E. Preuschen in his article "Origenes" in the Herzog-Hauck Realencyklopädie für protestantische Theologie und Kirche, XIV.
2. This is the avowed purpose of Origen, as repeatedly stated both in the preface and body of Contra Celsum. Cf., e.g., Praef. 3,4,6, 2:1, 3:1, 4:1, 5:1, 6:1, 7:1, 8:1. The text of Contra Celsum has been edited by Koetschau in Die Griechischen Christlichen Schriftsteller der Ersten Drei Jahrhunderte, Origenes, This edition has been used in the present thesis. Cf. also, ed. Migne, xi. An English translation appears in The Ante-Nicene Fathers, IV.
3. The character of Contra Celsum, particularly considered as an apologetic, has been largely praised and rightly so. For example, Patrick gives to his work The Apology of Origen in Reply to Celsus, the sub-title A Chapter in the History of Apologetics. A. B. Bruce in his Apologetics of Christianity Defensively Stated, pp. 9-16, devotes a special section to Contra Celsum. E. J. Goodspeed, A History of Early Christian Literature, Chicago, 1942, p. 249, speaks of Origen's work as "...the peak of early Christian apologetic," and E. O. James, In the Fulness of Time, London, 1935, pp. 124-125 says, "...his defence of Christianity against the pagan Celsus is one of the most profound apologies for the Faith in ancient times." Lardner, Works, Vol. 7, London, 1838, says "...that Origen's eight books against Celsus are an invaluable treasure:"
4. Eusebius, Ecclesiastical History, V:18. ἐν τούτῳ καὶ Ἀμβρόσιος τὰ τῆς Ὀυαλεντίνου φρονῶν αἰρέσεως, πρὸς τῆς ὑπὸ Ὀριγένους πρεσβευσμένης ἀληθείας ἐλεγχεῖς καὶ ὡς ἂν ὑπὸ φωτὸς καταύρασεῖς τῆν διάνοιαν. τῷ τῆς ἐκκλησιαστικῆς ὀρθοδοξίας προτίθεται λόγῳ.

ed. Schwartz in Die Griechischen Christlichen Schriftsteller der Ersten Drei Jahrhunderte, Eusebius, II, 556. Cf. also Migne, XX, 559. An English translation may be found in Lawlor and Oulton, Eusebius, Ecclesiastical History, in which there appears a brief sketch of the

life of Ambrose, II, 213. A brief account of Ambrose' life is also given by Mosheim, Origenes Vorstehers der Christlichen Schule zu Alexandrien und Aeltestens Acht Bücher von der Wahrheit der Christlichen Religion wider den Weltweisen Celsus, Hamburg, 1745.

5. Contra Celsum, Praef. 1, 3. From this point on it should be noted that references will be to Contra Celsum unless otherwise indicated.

6. Praef. 1,2.

7. Praef. 3. πεπειράμεθα ὑπικυροῦσαι κατὰ τὴν παροῦσαν δύναμιν πρὸς ἕκαστον τῶν ὑπὸ Κέλσου γεγραμμένων κ. τ. λ.

8. Possibly the most noteworthy of such attempts is that of Theodor Keim, Celsus' Wahres Wort, Aelteste Streitschrift antiker Weltanschauung gegen das Christenthum vom Jahr 178 N. Chr., Zürich, 1873. Keim analyzes the True Discourse into an Introduction and four main parts. Less pretentious analyses have been attempted by others who have sought to indicate the continuity of Celsus' arguments. Mention may be made of E. Pélagaud, Étude sur Celse et la première escarmouche entre la Philosophie antique et le Christianisme naissant, Lyon, 1878, p. 249ff. W. J. Bindemann, "Ueber Celsus and seine Schrift gegen die Christen" in Zeitschrift für die historische Theologie, Leipzig, 1842, 2 Heft, pp. 58-146. Patrick, op. cit., B. Aubé, Histoire des Persécutions de l'Eglise.

Origen himself claims to have preserved most of his opponent's work. III:1

ἐν δὲ τῷ δευτέρῳ πρὸς ὅλα, ὡς εἶοι τ' ἦμεν, ἀπαντήσαντες τὰ τῆς πρὸς ἡμᾶς, τοὺς διὰ χριστοῦ πιστεύοντας τῇ θεῷ, δημηγορίας τοῦ παρ' αὐτῷ Ἰουδαίου, τρίτον τοῦτον ἐνίσταμεθα λόγον, ἐν ᾧ πρόκειται ἀγωνίσασθαι πρὸς ἃ ἐκτίθεται ὡς ἀπὸ ἰδίου προσώπου.

Cf. also ἐν τρισὶ τοῖς πρὸς τούτων, διεδεληθόντες βιβλίοις τὰ πρὸς τὸ Κέλσου σύγγραμμα νοηθέντα ἡμῶν κ. τ. λ.

and καὶ μηδὲν ὅση δύναμις ἀβασάνιστον καὶ ἀνεσέταστον

ἑαυόντες μηδέ παρεθρόντες, πρὸς ὃ ὡς οἶόν τε ἡμῶν
ἀπηντήσαμεν. κ.τ.λ.

Cf. also 1:41, 5:1, 2:20. It should be noted, however, that Origen candidly admits that there have been some omissions. For example, when Celsus repeats a charge, Origen answers it but once. Cf., e.g., 2:5.

μετὰ ταῦτα εἰ καὶ ταυτολογεῖ ὁ Κέλσος περὶ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ, δεύτερον ἤδη λέγων πλημμελήσαντα αὐτὸν ἐξέωκέναι παρὰ Ἰουδαίοις εἰκην, ἀλλ' ἡμεῖς οὐκ ἐπαναληψόμεθα τὴν ἀπολογίαν, ἀρκούμενοι τῇ προειρημένῃ.

Cf. also 2:32, 6:39, etc.

Historians generally have agreed with this position of Origen. Renan, foreexample, believes it possible to reconstruct the True Discourse "avec les citations et les analyses qu'en a donnees Origene," Marc-Aurèle et la Fin du monde antique, p. 352. Tzschirner, Der Fall des Heidenthums, I, 324, says "...so hat sich doch in der Widerlegungsschrift des Origenes so viel und zwar meist mit des Verfassers eigenen Worten ausgedrückt erhalten, dass man nicht nur ihren Inhalt und Zweck, sondern auch ihren Ton und ihre Farbe hinreichend erkennen und beurtheilen kann." Worthy of note also is the statement of Keim, op. cit., p. 199, "Um so mehr aber muss man ihm für eine zweite Leistung dankbar sein, nämlich dafür, dass er die Schrift des Celsus besonders auf den Punkten ganz wörtlich erhalten hat, wo Celsus selbst seinen Plan und seine Gliederung verräth." It would not be difficult to multiply such quotations.

9. In the Contra Celsum the title of Celsus' work is given usually as ἀληθῆς λόγος, which may be translated True Word or True Discourse. Pélagaud translates the title Le Livre de Verite, Keim as Wahres Wort. Kellner, Hellenismus und Christenthum oder die geistige Reaktion des antiken Heidenthums gegen das Christenthum, Köln, 1866, p. 26, translates the title as das Wort der Wahrheit. Tzschirner, op. cit., p. 324 gives wahrheitliebende Rede. Keim's interpretation of this title appears to be too strong and not borne out by the contents of the True Discourse itself, when he says, op. cit., p. 190, "...bekennt er als seine Absicht in erster Linie nicht irgend welcher feindseliger Schnürung gegen das Christenthum, sondern Objectivität, impartische Untersuchung, Herstellung des richt Thatbestandes, wie er denn auch gelegentlich gegen den Verdacht der Ausspionierung protestiert (1,12) oder sach betont, er wolle nicht unbillig sein, er gebe nur die Wahrheit (3,59)." Baur, The Church History of the First Three Centuries,

translated from the German by the Rev. Allan Menzies, London, 1879, II, 141, seems to be on safer ground in his interpretation, "he (i.e. Celsus) doubtless meant to indicate the love of truth which had induced him to enter upon this refutation." Mosheim, op. cit., p. 7 says that Claudius Caponnier interpreted the word λόγος as Geschichte, but he himself says that Celsus is writing not a history but "eine heftige und spitzige Strafrede." Cf. also B. J. Kidd, A History of the Church to A.D. 461, I, 117 who renders The True Account.

10. 1:8 εὐα δὲ παρελήφαμεν Κέλσους γεγόνεαι
Ἐπικουρείου, τὸν μὲν πρότερον κατὰ Νέρωα
τοῦτον δὲ κατὰ Ἀδριάνον καὶ κατωτέρω.

The name itself was not particularly rare. Pélagaud has discovered at least twelve occurrences in Roman history, op. cit., p. 152. Cf., Aube, op. cit., p. 165. "Origène ne sait pas bien quel est ce Celse, de quel pays il est, ni a quelle école philosophique il appartient." E. Stein, De Celso Platónico Philonis Alexandrini Imitatore in Eos, xxxiv, Paris, 1932-33 and Alttestamentliche Bibelkritik in der Späthellenistischen Literatur, Lwow, 1935. Stein holds that Celsus was a Platonic philosopher of Alexandria who had been acquainted with Philo's writings and who took over Philo's criticisms while rejecting his allegorical interpretations. This position may possibly be correct, but it cannot be definitely proven. As Stein shows, there are certain resemblances in the language of the two writers, but Celsus and Philo differed in their purpose and aim. Celsus was a critic of the Bible who sought to show that its teachings were foolishness. Philo, however, was not, strictly speaking, such a critic. Rather, he was a defender of and believer in the Bible. What Philo criticized was not the Bible itself nor its teachings but rather what he believed to be a false interpretation of the Bible and its teaching, namely, the method of literal interpretation. In presenting an allegorical exposition Philo was really defending the Bible by setting forth what he believed to be its true teaching. Hence, it does not seem to be correct to say, for example, as does Stein, (Alttestamentliche Bibelkritik, p. 15) "Sowohl Philo als Celsus beanstanden diesen Bericht, nach dem die Welt in der Zeit geschaffen wurde." This may apply to Celsus, but not to Philo. Philo criticized what he believed to be a false interpretation of the Mosaic account. Cf. The Works of Philo, with English translation by F. H. Colson and S. H. Whitaker (The Loeb Classical Library) I, Legum Allegoria. εὐηθεῖς πάντοτε οἰεσθαι εἰς ἡμέρας ἢ καθόλου χρόνῳ γεγόνεαι τὸν κόσμον.

βούλεται οὖν τὰ τε ἑθνητὰ γένη καὶ πάλιν αὖ τὰ
 ἄφθαρτα κατὰ τοὺς οἰκείους ἐπιθεῖναι συστάτα ἀριθμοῦς,
 τὰ μὲν ἑθνητὰ ὡς ἔφην παραμετρῶν ἑξάδι, τὰ δὲ
 μακάσια καὶ εὐδαίμονα ἑβδόμηδι.

Note Philo's use of the word βούλεται. Origen himself was of the opinion that Celsus had not read Philo's writings 4:51. Keim, considers Celsus to have been a Roman, op. cit., p. 275. "Den Celsus geradezu als Geburtsrömer zu betrachten, ist durch den Namen, den Wohnort, den Patriotismus und durch die Anzeichen einer Benützung lateinischer Literatur empfohlen, andererseits durch die Vorliebe des Mannes für die Hellenen, welche er den Römern ausdrücklich voranstellt, durchaus nicht ausgeschlossen." Pélagaud, op. cit., p. 167; Renan thinks that the book was written at Rome, op. cit., p. 361.

According to Pélagaud, op. cit., p. 166, it was thought by Jachmann that Celsus lived in Persia. The remarks of Achille Coen are to the point: "...e neppure ci fermeremo a disputare se Celso fu un greco, o un romano, sebbene ci sembri che alle ragioni abbastanza ingegnose esposte dal Pelagaud per provare che Celso era romano potrebbero opporsi argomenti non meno validi i quali condurrebbero all' altra conclusione; queste ed altre simiglianti quistioni sono state il tema di discussioni interminabili e minuziose fra i critici, i quali non sono ancora rieschiti a porsi d'accordo rispetto ad esse." Cf. "Il Più Antico Libro Pagano di Polemica Religiosa Contro Il Cristianesimo" in Rassegna Settimanale di Politica, Scienze, Lettere ed Arti, Roma 1880, No. 120, 279. Cf. S. Zeitlin, Josephus on Jesus, p. 381 who expresses uncertainty as to whether such a person as Celsus had actually lived.

11. 4:36 εἰ γε οὗτός ἐστι καὶ ὁ κατὰ Χριστιανῶν
 ἄλλα δύο βιβλία συντάξας, τάχα ἡμῖν φιλονεικῶν
 οὓς μὴ ἐφρόνει ἐνθέους ὠνόμασεν.

12. Neander, Allgemeine Geschichte der christlichen Religion und Kirche, I, 202, believes that the phrase ἄλλα δύο βιβλία refers to the work which Origen attempted to refute. Could the Epicurean Celsus who had written books in which his Epicureanism was not concealed, also be the one who had written two other books (the True Discourse) against Christians? This, according to Neander, was the point at issue. Baur, op. cit., p. 142, suggests that if the reference is actually to the True Discourse, why should the work be spoken of as ἄλλα δύο βιβλία? Neander merely says that Celsus had written a work in two books, entitled the True Doctrine, but he does not enlarge upon this analysis. Aubé, op. cit., p. 168 thinks that the reference is to two books other than the True Discourse which Celsus composed against Christians. But the

passage is difficult, and Origen's meaning is not clear by any means. The words merely constitute a further indication of the uncertainty which prevailed in Origen's own mind.

But cf. Fenger, De Celso, Christianorum adversario, Epicureo, 1828, who appears to think that Origen's testimony is clear and should be trusted. Hē concludes, p. 107 "...usquedum plura et fortiora proponantur argumenta contra sententiam Origenis, longe probabilius esse testimonio ejus confidere, quam idem rejicere." Origen's language is as follows: 1:8

εὐρίσκειται μὲν γὰρ ἐς ἄλλων συγγραμμάτων
 Ἐπικούρειος ὢν· ἐνταῦθα δὲ φιά τὸ δοκεῖν
 εὐλογώτερον κατηγορεῖν τοῦ λόγου μὴ ὁμολογῶν τὰ
 Ἐπικούρου προσποιεῖται κρείττον τι τοῦ γήϊνου εἶναι
 ἐν ἀνθρώποις σύγγενες θεοῦ καὶ φησιν κ.τ.λ.

In these words, therefore, while Origen does admit that Celsus was an Epicurean, he nevertheless believed that his opponent had concealed his true convictions. In 1:10 and 1:21 Celsus is plainly identified as an Epicurean. Cf. also 1:32, 3:22, 35, 80, 4:4, 54, 5:3. In 8:15 Origen admits that he cannot discover from what sect Celsus has taken certain opinions, but he also acknowledges that Celsus himself may have made up these opinions. In any case, the passage is evidence of Origen's candor. It does not necessarily prove the wide erudition of Celsus, as Pélagaud, op. cit., p. 391 thinks. Cf. also 5:62-64.

Mosheim, op. cit., dissues the question of Celsus' philosophical position in his Vorrede. Op. cit., p. 40ff. Mosheim gives an excellent summary of Celsus' doctrine of God and the world. "Er spricht zwar in seinem ganzen Buche von der Welt eben so, wie Plato in seinem so genannten Timaeus." The comment of Frid. Adolph Philippi should be noted, De Celsi, Adversarii Christianorum, Philosophandi Genere, Berlin, 1836, 27, "Huic Origenis de adversario suo iudicio (i.e. that Celsus was a disguised Epicurean) inter veteres nemo contradixit, recentioribus temporibus Baronius, Spencerus, Monsius, Basnagius, Valesius, Dodwellus, Fabricius, Buddeus, omnes fere viri docti ante Moshemium, qui modo accuratius rem tractarunt, assensi sunt. Moshemius primus ausus est hanc Origenis sententiam funditus subvertere. Wesselingium (i.e. Peter Wesseling, Liber Probabilium, cap. 23, as given by Bindemann, op. cit., p. 68) qui in Probabilibus, quamvis paulo ante Moshemium, tamen non tam multis et firmis usus argumentis et dubitantius contradixit, jure nostro hic praeterimus."

Probably the most learned defence of the position that Celsus was an Epicurean is to be found in Fenger, op. cit.; Philippi, op. cit., also adopts this position in the main, although disagreeing with Fenger's method of procedure. He says, p. 112, "Sed Fengeri libro illa certe laud vindicanda est, quod recto in universum sensu ductus, quamvis non rectis maximam partem argumentis nixus, primus certissima suasionem

Monshemio contradixerit, qui auctoritate sua speciosisque rationibus doctorum virorum hac de re iudicia aliquantum turbasse videtur." Kellner is possibly the latest to write in defence of this position, op. cit., p. 26ff, "Er war von Haus aus Epikuräischer Philosoph." Lardner speaks of Celsus, op. cit., p. 264 as "this learned Epicurean." (Mosheim, op. cit., p. 264 as "~~this learned Epicurean.~~") Mosheim, op. cit., p. 30 discusses a work of Dodwell in which Dodwell taught that Celsus was an Epicurean in the school but not when he was outside the classroom. In the True Discourse, therefore, he was not speaking as an Epicurean. The following passages are those which are sometimes considered as evidences of Epicureanism: 2:41,42,60, 3:35,80, 4:75,86, Cf. Pélagaud's discussion of Fenger's position, op. cit., p. 219ff. Cf. also Kayser, op. cit., p. 29 says, "Le philosophe avec lequel je le comparerai de preference, c'est Plutarque." Denis, Du Discours de Celse contre les Chrétiens intitulé Le Discours Veritable, p. 451, "Il s'y montera de Plutarque, qu'un epicurien décidé, a la façon de Lucien." The real reason why all such attempts to classify Celsus are not satisfactory is that the data given by Origen are too meagre.

13. Op. cit., VI:36:1,2. Cf. A. Harnack, Die Chronologie der altchristlichen Litteratur bis Eusebius, II, 35ff.
14. Cf. The Cambridge Ancient History, 87-95 for a survey of Philip's reign.
15. 3:15.
16. This date has found fairly widespread acceptance. Cf. e.g., DeFaye, op. cit., p. 162. Pelagaud, op. cit., p. 190. Koetschau, op. cit., p. xxii, Lardner, op. cit., p. 211 suggests either 246 or 249, Keim, op. cit., p. 263.
17. I do not understand how De Faye, op. cit., I, 141 can write "En ce qui concerne la date du Discours Veritable, l'unanimité s'est faite parmi les critiques. Celse l'a composé entre les années 178 et 180." The following do not place the date between 178 and 180: Denis, op. cit., p. 452, places the date in the first year of Antoninus Pius; Kayser, op. cit., p. 3 says that the date cannot be earlier than 150; Kellner, op. cit., p. 25, places the date at about 150. So also Tollinton; Guericke, Manual of Church History, translated by W. G. T. Shedd, p. 100; Goodspeed, op. cit., p. 138, gives 150 (on p. 57 however he gives 177-178); Turner, Studies in Early Church History, p. 17 says "...we do not know when he wrote." Coen, op. cit., p. 280 places the date between 175 and 180. Lardner, op. cit., p. 211 gives 176; Stein, Alttestamentliche Bibelkritik, p. 10 gives 180. Gwatkin, Early Church History, to A.D. 313, I, 183 sets the date at about 178 and gives a useful note on the subject. Krüger, History of Early Christian Literature, translated by Rev. Charles

R. Gillett, New York, 1897, p. 198 gives 177-180 A.D. The following place the writing during the reign of Marcus Aurelius: Bindemann, op. cit., p. 61; Neander, op. cit., pp. 201ff.; Tzschirner, op. cit., p. 325; Bruce, op. cit., p. 9, gives the "latter half" of the second century.

II. Celsus' Criticism of the Bible

1. Contra Gelsum, 1:2 ἔξῃς βάρβαρόν φησιν ἄνωθεν εἶναι τὸ δόγμα, δηλονότι τὸν Ἰουδαϊσμόν, ὃς Χριστιανισμὸς ἦρται.
2. 1:2 ὡς ἱκανοὺς εὐρεῖν δόγματα τοὺς βαρβάρους προστίθησι δὲ τούτοις ὅτι κρῖναι καὶ βεβαιώσασθαι καὶ ἀσκησαὶ πρὸς ἀρετὴν τὰ ὑπὸ βαρβάρων ἡδυσθεύοντα ἀμείνονές εἰσιν Ἕλληνας. — Αἰγυπτίους ὄντας ἀπὸ στάσεως τὴν ἀρχὴν εἰληφέναι τοὺς Ἑβραίους κ.τ.λ.
3. 3:5 Ἐξῃς δὲ τούτοις ὁ Κέλσος οἰόμενος τοὺς Ἰουδαίους, Αἰγυπτίους τῷ γένει τυγχάνουρας κ.τ.λ.
4. 3:7 Αἰγυπτίους ὄντας ἀπὸ στάσεως τὴν ἀρχὴν εἰληφέναι τοὺς Ἑβραίους κ.τ.λ.
5. 3:5 καταλελοιπέναι τὴν Αἴγυπτον, στασιάσαντας πρὸς τὸ κοινὸν τῶν Αἰγυπτίων καὶ τὸ ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ σύνηθος· περὶ τὰς ἑρησκείας ὑπερφρονήσαντας.
6. 4:31 Ἰουδαίους ἀπ' Αἰγύπτου ἐραπέτας γεγονέναι.

7. 3:6 ἔστω δὲ καθ' ὑπόθεσιν καταλιπόντας αὐτοὺς τὴν Αἴγυπτον μεμισσημένοι καὶ τὴν σύντροφον φωνήν.
8. 3:6 ἀλλὰ προκαταλείφθεις ὡς ὑπὸ φίλτερων τῶν Αἴγυπτίων, τότε μὲν ἀδικήσασιν τοὺς δέονους συγκατέθετο ὡς ἀληθείαι.
9. 3:6 ἔ τοίνυν Κέλσος, οὗ γενόμενος δίκαιος ἐξεταστὴς τῶν λεγομένων παρ' Αἴγυπτίοις ἑτέρως καὶ παρ' Ἑβραίοις ἄλλως.
10. 3:6
11. 3:8
12. 3:8 ταῦτα μὲν πρὸς τὰ ὑπὸ Κέλσου εἰρημένα περὶ τοῦ στάσιν γεγονέναι τὴν ἀρχὴν πάλαι μὲν τοῦ συστήναι Ἰουδαίους, ὕστερον δὲ τοῦ τοὺς Χριστιανούς γενέσθαι.
13. 3:5 τὸ στασιάζειν πρὸς τὸ καινόν.

14. This argument is developed in 3:5-8.
15. Op. cit., p. 223. "Vom alten Testament kennt er hauptsächlich das erste und zweite Buch Mose." So also De Faye, op. cit., I, 143. "Il a étudié la Genèse et l'Exode."
16. Op. cit., p. 424 "...peut-être l'Exode et d'autres livres de l'Ancien Testament."
17. In Contra Apionem II:28 (The Loeb Classical Library, p. 302) Josephus says concerning Apion καὶ τί γε δεῖ θαυμάζειν εἰ περὶ τῶν ἡμετέρων ψεύδεται προγόνων, λέγων αὐτοὺς εἶναι τὸ γένος Αἰγυπτίους.

This Egyptian tradition, which is reflected by Apion, was probably the basis of Celsus' statements. This does not mean that Celsus was necessarily acquainted with Apion's works; probably he came into contact with the tradition through word of mouth, and in his accusations against the origin of the Jewish nation was merely dependent upon "hearsay" evidence. At this point as elsewhere when treating of the Jewish nation and the Old Testament Celsus does not appear to possess very accurate knowledge of that which he is endeavoring to refute.

18. 4:33 ἄρα ἐπεχείρησαν γενεαλογεῖν αὐτοὺς ἀπὸ πρώτης σπορὰς γοήτων καὶ πλάνων ἀνθρώπων, ἀμύδρως καὶ ἀμφιβόλους φωνὰς ἐν σκότῳ που κρυφίους ἐπιμαρτυρούμενοι καὶ τοῖς ἀμαθέσι καὶ ἀνοήτοις παρεξηγούμενοι, καὶ ταῦτα μηδὲ πώποτ' ἐν πολλῷ τῷ πρὸς θεὸν χρόνῳ τοῦ τοιοῦδε μήδ' ἀμφισβητηθέντος.
19. The entire argument is developed in 4:33-35.
20. 4:33
21. Cf. e.g., 4:43,44,45,46. However, it seems that whatever information Celsus did receive, he did not acquire by means of a careful study of Genesis, Mosheim, op. cit., p. 697 remarks regarding Celsus' treatment

of the Creation, "Der Heide greifet die Geschichte der Schöpfung, die uns Moses erzählet, sehr ungeschicht an. Man kann bey nahe schweren, dass er sie nicht gelesen; zum wenigstens, dass er sie nicht erwäget habe." The language of Celsus does not seem to bear out the following statement of Patrick, op. cit., p. 86. "He shows a detailed knowledge of the Book of Genesis from the first chapter to the last, and from his minute and verbal criticism of the Mosaic cosmogony it is plain that he has read the Septuagint. The references which Patrick cites to support his first proposition are the following. Gen. 1,2 with C.C. 1:19, 4:23, 5:50,51,59, 6:29,47,50,51,50,61,63, 7:62, Gen. 3 with C.C. 6:28,42, 4:36, Gen.7,8 with C.C. 1:19, 4:21,41, Gen. 11 with C.C. 4:1, Gen. 17,27 with C.C. 4:32, Gen. 30,31,36 with C.C. 4:44, Gen. 19 with C.C. 4:45, Gen. 27,34,37 with C.C. 4:46, Gen. 40;41,47 with C.C. 4:47.

22. An endeavor will later be made to show to what extent Celsus may have been acquainted with patriarchal history.
23. Op. cit., I, 163, So also J. R. Mozley in A Dictionary of Christian Biography, I, 435, "In vital insight Celsus was deficient. As an opponent of Christianity the chief characteristic of Celsus is a strong, narrow, intolerant common sense."
24. 5:50
25. 1:14
26. 1:14 καὶ οὐκ ἐβουλήθη ἔθνος σοφώτατον εἰπεῖν
κἂν παραπλησίως καὶ Αἰγυπτίοις καὶ Ἀσσυρίοις
καὶ Ἰνδοῖς καὶ Πέρσαις καὶ Ὀερούταις καὶ Σαρδοταῖς
καὶ Ἐλευσινίοις τοὺς Ἰουδαίους.
- Origen's discussion of Celsus' argument is found in 1:14-16.
27. 3:16
28. Elsewhere also Celsus appears to have a low view of the importance of Moses. In 1:21 he says that Moses learned his doctrine from wise men and so obtained a reputation of divinity (ὄνομα δαιμόνιον)

Again in 4:31 he accuses Moses of perverting (παραφθείροντα) the story of the sons of Aeoüs.

29. E.g. De Faye, op. cit., I, 243 "De toutes les religions de l'époque, ce sont le judaïsme et le christianisme qui ont principalement fixé son attention. Il a voulu les connaître a fond." But Celsus does not appear to have possessed a profound knowledge of Judaism nor did he have a sympathetic understanding of Christianity.

30. 4:31 Ἰουδαίους ἀπ' Αἰγύπτου δραπετάς γεγονέναι μηδὲν πωποτε ἀξιόλογον πράξαντας, οὔτ' ἐν λόγῳ οὔτ' ἐν ἀριθμῷ αὐτοῦς ποτε γεγενημένους.

31. Origen's argument is developed in 4:31,32.

32. Since the religion of Judaism was based upon the Old Testament, Celsus' strictures upon the Jewish religion in reality amount to an assault upon the Scriptures.

33. 1:23 Ἐξῆς τούτοις φησὶν ὁ Κέλσος ὅτι ἡγησαμένῳ σφῶν ἐπόμενοι Μωϋσεῖ αἰπόλοι καὶ ποιμένες, ἀγροίκοις ἀπάταις ψυχᾶγωγῆθέντες ἕνα ἐνόμισαν εἶναι Θεόν.

34. 1:24

35. 1:24. ὡς ἐνδεχόμενον τὸ μὲν ὅλον εἶναι Θεόν, τὰ δὲ μέρη αὐτοῦ μὴ Θεῖα.

36. 1:26, 5:6, Cf. G. F. Moore, Judaism, I, 401-413, "...they were not subjects of veneration, much less of adoration; and in orthodox Judaism they were not intermediaries between God and man," (p. 441).
37. 6:49
ἔτι γε μὴν καὶ ἡ κοσμογένεια μάλα εὐηθική.
Cf. also 4:36.
38. 6:49 ἀπεφάνητο δὲ μάλα εὐηθικὴν εἶναι καὶ τὴν
περὶ ἀνθρώπων γενέσεως γραφήν.
39. This thought has been developed in a mimeographed syllabus, Apologetics, C. Van Til, Philadelphia, 1941.
40. Discussions of Plato and his teachings may be found in Cornford, Plato's Theory of Knowledge; Ritter, The Essence of Plato's Philosophy, translated by Adams, London, 1933; Taylor, Plato The Man and His Work; More, The Religion of Plato, Expositions of the doctrine of absolute creation may be found in St. Thomas Aquinas, Summa Theologica, Paris, 1880, I, 510-562; H. Bavinck, Gereformeerde Dogmatiek, Kampen, 1928, II, 370-403, The doctrine is discussed from the point of view of the dialectical theology by Barth, Die Kirchliche Dogmatik, München, 1932, I, 404-411.
41. 1:19 Cf. however, 6:52 ἐγὼ δὲ περὶ μὲν γενέσεως κόσμου καὶ φθορᾶς, ἢ ὡς ἀγέννητος καὶ ἀφθαρτος, ἢ ὡς γέννητος μὲν ἀφθαρτος δὲ, ἢ ὡς τὸ ἔρπαλιν, οὐδὲν περὶ τοῦδε νυνὶ λέγω.
42. 1:22
43. Genesis 17:10ff.
44. 5:47,48
45. 4:45

46. 4:46

47. 4:47

48. 4:37 ἀγέγραφέν ὅτι συνέθεσαν ἄνθρωπον ὑπὸ
χειρῶν θεοῦ πλασσομένον (καὶ ἐμφυσώμενον) ἵνα τὸ
ἐμφυσώμενον κ.τ.λ.

The context shows that the force of Celsus' argument implies the
insertion of καὶ ἐμφυσώμενον after πλασσομένον.
Cf. also 4:36

49. 4:37

50. Genesis 1:26

51. 4:30 ἔσμεν αὐτῷ ὅμοιοι.

52. It is not perfectly clear what Origen means by insisting that we are
created "in the image" of God but not "after His likeness".

53. 4:36 Ἰουδαῖοι ἐν γνώσει που τῆς Παλαιστίνης συγκύψαντες,
παντελῶς ἀπαίδευτοι καὶ εὖ προκακηκοῦτες πάλαι ταῦτα
Ἡσιόδῳ καὶ ἄλλοις μύθοις ἀνέρασιν ἐνθόοις ὑμνημένα,
συνέθεσαν ἀθανάτα, ἄνθρωπον τινα ὑπὸ χειρῶν θεοῦ
πλασσομένον τε καὶ ἐμφυσώμενον καὶ γυναῖον ἐκ τῆς
πλευρᾶς καὶ παραγγέλματα τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ ἔφιν τούτοις
ἀντιπράσσοντα καὶ περιγινόμενα τῶν θεοῦ προσταγμάτων
τὸν ἔφιν, μῦθόν τινα ὡς γραυσί. διηγούμενοι καὶ ποιοῦντες
ἀνοσιώτατα τὸν θεόν, εὐθὺς ἀπ' ἀρχῆς ἀσθενοῦντα
καὶ μὴδ' ἐν' ἄνθρωπον, ὃν αὐτὸς ἔπλασε, πείσαι
δυνάμενον.

54. idem

55. 6:61 μετὰ τοῦτο μὴν ὡς περ τις ἀτεχνῶς πονηρὸς
χειροτέχνης ἐκκαρῶν καὶ πρὸς ἀνάπαυσιν ἀργίας
δεηθεῖς.

56. The LXX of Genesis 2:2 reads καὶ κατέπαυσεν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ
ἑβδόμῃ ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν ἔργων αὐτοῦ ἃν ἐποίησεν.

It would appear that if Celsus had read the Septuagint, he did not read it with care. More likely, however, he received this information by word of mouth and did not study the Septuagint to ascertain what its actual meaning was.

57. 6:61 εἰ θεμῖς τὸν πρῶτον θεὸν κάμνειν οὔτε
χειροποιεῖν οὔτε κελεύειν.

This is given by Origen as a direct quotation of Celsus. What is meant by the "first" God is not perfectly clear, although possibly the reference is to God as the Creator as distinguished from the Logos. There may be in this phrase a reference to Trinitarian teaching which Celsus had heard in the mouths of Christians. By his use of κάμνειν (to be weary due to long continued work) whether intentionally or not, Celsus does not accurately represent the κατέπαυσεν of Genesis 2:2. This would seem to constitute further evidence that he was not acquainted with the LXX. Likewise, the use of χειροποιεῖν and κελεύειν is not a correct representation of what the Scripture actually teaches.

58. 6:60 μακρῶ δ'εὐηθέστερον τὸ καὶ ἡμέρας τινὰς
ἐπιδιανεῖραι τῇ κοσμογενίᾳ, πρὶν εἶναι ἡμέρας οὐρανοῦ
γὰρ αὐτῶ γεγονότος οὔδε γῆς πῶ ἐρητισμένης οὔδ'
ἡλίου πῶ τῆδε φερομένου, πῶς ἡμέραι ἦσαν;

59. idem κατὰ τὸ δυνατόν ἡμῖν ἐν τοῖς πραγματευθεῖσιν εἰς
τὴν Γένεσιν εἰρήκαμεν· καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἀνωτέρω δὲ ἐγκαλοῦντες
τοῖς κατὰ τὴν προχειροτέραν ἐκδοχὴν φήσασι χρόνους εἰς
ἡμερῶν διεληλοθῆναι εἰς τὴν κοσμοποιΐαν.

60. 4:38

61. 4:9 ἐπεὶ δὲ καὶ τὰ περὶ τὸν ὄφιν ὡς ἀντιπρόσποντα τοῖς τοῦ θεοῦ πρὸς τὸν ἄνθρωπον παραγγέλλασιν ὁ Κέλσος κωμῶδει, μῦθόν τινα παραπλήσιον τοῖς παραδιδομένοις ταῖς γραφαῖς ὑπολαβῶν εἶναι τὸν λόγον.

It will be noted that this is not a direct quotation of Celsus and that at this point we are entirely dependent upon Origen. Origen's refutation consists in chiding Celsus for not adopting an allegorical interpretation (καὶ τὰ ἐπὶ τούτοις εἰρημένα, ἐνδύμενα αὐτὸ θεὸν κινῆσαι τὸν εὐμένως ἐντυχάνοντα, ὅτι πάντα ταῦτα οὐκ ἀσέμνως τροπολογεῖται)

To support his argument Origen mentions the statements about Eros in Plato's Symposium and maintains that Plato is here teaching in the guise of a myth. Because of his allegorical exegesis, Origen's argument is not very cogent.

62. 4:36

63. 6:53 εἰ δὲ < αὐτοῦ > ταῦτ' ἔστιν ἔργον πῶς μὲν κακὰ ὁ θεὸς ἐποίει.

The exact force of κακὰ is not entirely clear, as Origen himself notes.

64. 4:41, 42

65. 4:41 ἐξῆς δὲ τοιαῦτά φησιν· εἶτα, κατακλυσθῆναι τινα καὶ κιβωτὸν ἀλλόκοτον, ἅπαντα ἔνδοξον ἔχουσαν, καὶ περιστεράν τινα καὶ κορώνην ἀγγέλους, παραχαράττοντες καὶ ῥαδιουργοῦντες τὸν Δευκαλίωνα· οὐ γὰρ οἶμαι προσεδόκησαν ὅτι ταῦτ' εἰς φῶς πρόεισιν, ἀλλ' ἀτεχνῶς παισὶ νῆπίοις ἐμυθολόγησαν.

66. Origen's reply to Celsus concerning the size of the ark is indeed surprising. The submits of the length and breadth were contracted

(συναγομένης) he says, so that the thirty cubits in height terminated in a summit which was one cubit square. The measurements are capable of being taken in the meaning (τῷ δυνάμει λέγεσθαι τὰ μέτρα) that the length was nine myriads of cubits in the base, and two thousand five hundred in breadth. It is not at all clear upon what ground Origen could make statements such as these. Apparently in this instance we have an example of that flight of fancy of which he was at times capable. In the entire discussion of the ark and the deluge neither Celsus nor Origen appears to be very impressive in his reasoning.

67. 4:21

68. Cf. Odyssey, 11:305

69. 4:21 τῷ περὶ τοῦ μὴ τετηρηκέναι τὰ τῆς Μωϋσέως ἀρχαιότητος.

70. 4:23 ἀτοπωτάτην δὲ λέγει καὶ ἔσωρον παιδοποιῶν.

71. Origen's quotation is based upon the LXX of Genesis 30:42.

ἐγένετο δὲ τὰ μὲν ἄσχημα τοῦ Λάβαν, τὰ δὲ ἐπίσημα τοῦ Ἰακώβ

Origen substitutes καὶ ἦν for ἐγένετο δὲ. Apparently, Celsus' failure to see the proper reference of these words lay, according to his opponent, in his not understanding them as having an allegorical (τυπικῶς) interpretation.

72. 4:43 καὶ οὐκ ἔώρα ὅτι "ταῦτα πάντα τυπικῶς συνέβαινεν ἐκείνοις, ἐγράφη δὲ δι' ἡμᾶς, εἰς οὓς τὰ τέλη τῶν αἰῶνων κατήντησε." παρ' οἷς τὸ ποικίλα ἤθη, ἐπίσημα " γινόμενα τῷ λόγῳ τοῦ θεοῦ πολιτεύεται, δοθέντα κτήσις τῷ τροπικῶς καλούμένῳ Ἰακώβ ἀπὸ γὰρ τῶν ἔθνων οἱ εἰς αὐτὸν πιστεύοντες ἐδηλοῦντο διὰ τῶν ἀναγεγραμμένων περὶ Λάβαν καὶ Ἰακώβ.

73. 4:44 τὸν θεὸν καὶ φρέατα τοῖς δικαίοις δωδωκέναι.

74. Cf. Proverbs 5:15-17.

75. *idem.* ὁ φ' οὐδ' εἰδήλων δ' ὅτι τοῦ Ἰωσήφ) τὸ λαμπρὸν καὶ θεσπέσιον Ἰουδαίων γένος, ἐπὶ πλῆθος ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ σπαρέν, ἕξω που παροικεῖν καὶ ποιμαίνειν ἐν τοῖς ἀτίμοις ἐκελεύσθη.
76. e.g. 3:5,7; 4:31
77. 4:7:72. Cf. De Faye, op. cit. I, 151. "Enfin ce que le platonicien Celse ne peut souffrir, ce sont les anthropomorphismes de l'Ancien Testament. On représente Dieu avec des bras et des mains; on parle de sa colère, de sa vengeance. C'est un langage inadmissible lorsqu'on croit au Dieu de Platon."
78. 6:53
79. 6:61 cf. also 6:62 where Celsus refers to the mouth of God.
οὐδὲ στόμα αὐτοῦ ἐστὶν οὐδὲ φωνή.
80. 4:74 διὰ πολλῶν δ' ἑσθῆς ἐγκαλεῖ ἡμῖν ὡς τῶ ἀνθρώπῳ φάσκουσι πάντα πεποιηκέναι τὸν Θεόν.
81. 4:75
82. 4:76
83. 4:77
84. 4:78
85. 4:79
86. 4:80
87. 4:81 The argument continues through 4:85.
88. 4:86

89. 4:88 τί γὰρ ἂν φαίη τις θειότερον τοῦ τὰ μέλλοντα προγινώσκειν, τὲ καὶ προδηλοῦν;
90. 4:88 τοιοῦτον ἔοικεν ἐγγυτέρω τῆς θείας ὁμιλίας ἐκεῖνα πεφικέναι καὶ εἶναι σοφώτερα καὶ θεοφιλέστερα.
91. 4:88 ἐλεφάντων δὲ οὐδὲν εὐορκότερον οὐδὲ πρὸς τὰ θεῖα πιστότερον εἶναι δοκεῖ, πάντως δὴ που διότι, γινώσκιν αὐτοῦ ἔχουσιν.
92. 4:98
93. Origen does, apparently, express doubt as to the truth of the story of the Phoenix, yet throughtout the discussion he appears not to have risen above the then prevailing scientific view.
94. 7:3 τὰ μὲν ὑπὸ τῆς Πυθίας ἢ Δωδωνίδων ἢ Κλερῆου ἢ ἐν Βράγχιδαῖς, ἢ ἐν Ἄρμωνος ὑπὸ μυρίων τε ἄλλων θεοπράπων προειρημένα. εἰς ἃν ἐπιεικῶς πᾶσα γῆ κατακρίθη, ταῦτα μὲν (ἐν) οὐδενὶ λόγῳ τίθενται. τὰ δὲ ὑπὸ τῶν ἐν Ἰουδαίᾳ τῶ ἐκείνων τρόπῳ λεχθέντα ἢ μὴ λεχθέντα, καὶ ὡς περ εἰώθησιν ἔτι νῦν οἱ περὶ Φοινίκην τε καὶ Παλαιστίνην, ταῦτα γὰρ θαυμαστὰ καὶ ἀπαράλλακτα ἠγοῦνται.
95. 7:9
96. 7:12 ἔχρην δ' αὐτὸν ἀπὸ τῶν προφητῶν τὸ φαινόμενον ἐν αὐτοῖς πονηρὸν ἢ τὸ δοκοῦν αὐτῷ αἰσχρὸν ἢ τὸ νομιζόμενον αὐτῷ ἀκάθαρτον ἢ δὲ ὑπελάμβανεν εἶναι μιαρὸν παραθέσθαι, εἴπερ τοιαῦτα ἔβλεπεν ἐν τοῖς προφήταις εἰρημένα. πληκτικώτερος γὰρ ἂν ὁ λόγος αὐτοῦ ἦν καὶ πρὸς εὐβούλετο ἀνυτικώτερος. νυνὶ δὲ οὐ παρέθετο, ἀλλ' ἐπανατεινόμενος ἀπειλεῖ, τοιαῦτα φαίνεσθαι ἐν ταῖς γραφαῖς, καταψευδόμενος αὐτῶν.

97. 5:2 θεὸς μὲν, ὡς Ἰουδαῖοι καὶ Χριστιανοὶ, καὶ θεοῦ πατρὸς οὐσείς οὔτε κατήλθεν οὔτε κατέλθει.
98. 1:17
99. 4:48 καὶ Ἰουδαίων καὶ Χριστιανῶν οἱ ἐπιεικέστεροι ταῦτ' ἀλληγοροῦσι. λέγει δὲ ἀίσχυνομένους ἐπὶ τούτοις καταφεύγειν ἐπὶ τὴν ἀλληγορίαν.
100. 4:51 αἱ γοῦν δοκοῦσαι περὶ αὐτῶν ἀλληγορίαι γεγραφαὶ πρὸς τῶν μύθων ἀισχίους εἶσι καὶ ἀτοπώτεσαι, τὰ μηδαμῶς ἀρμυσθήναι, συνάρμενα ἑαυραυτῇ τινι καὶ πανταπᾶσι ἀναισθητῶ μωρῶ συνάπτουσαι.
101. Most recently by R. H. Pfeiffer, Introduction to the Old Testament, p. 135, "Celsus not only denied the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch but questioned its literary unity."
102. 4:33 ὡς ἄρα ἐπεχείρησαν γενεαλογεῖν αὐτοὺς κ.τ.λ.
103. 4:42 εἰ μὴ ἄρα οὐδὲ Μωϋσέως οἶεται εἶναι τὴν γραφήν, ἀλλὰ τινῶν πλειόνων. τοιοῦτον γὰρ ἐηλοῖ τό, παραγάρτοντες καὶ λαδουσαυόντες τὸν Δευκαλίωνα, καὶ τοῦτο· σὺ γὰρ, οἶμαι, προσεδόκησας ὅτι ταῦτ' εἰς φῶς πρόεισι.
104. Cf. Gray, Old Testament Criticism Its Rise and Progress, pp. 19-20.
105. This is proved by his many assertions that Moses Wrote, said, etc.
106. Cf. Preface 3 ὅπως δ' ἵνα μὴ δέκωμεν ὀκνεῖν πρὸς τὸ ἐπιταχθέν ὑπὸ σοῦ, πεπειράμεθα ὑπαγορευσαί κατά τὴν παρούσαν δύναμιν πρὸς ἕκαστον τῶν ὑπὸ Κέλσου.

γεγραμμένων τὸ φανέν ἡμῖν ἀνατρεπτικὸν τῶν πιστῶν
οὐδένα διαρμένων σείσαι λόγων αὐτοῦ.

107. 6:21

108. 4:40 ε Μωυσέως λόγος.

109. 6:50

III. The Importance of Celsus and His Work

1. Cf. e.g. De Faye, op. cit., p. 158 and the relevant discussions in Keim; Pélagaud; Baur, Vorlesungen über die christliche Dogmengeschichte; I, 29755.; Seeberg, Dogmengeschichte, I, 332-334; Bardenhewer, Patrologie, p. 130.
2. Pélagaud, op. cit., p. 386 has discussed the question thoroughly.
3. e.g. Hesiod, 4:6 Euripides 2:34; Herodotus 1:5; Homer 1:36; Plato 4:54; Pythagoras 5:41; Heraclitus 5:14; Empedocles 8:53. (References are to Contra Celsum).
4. Cf. Keim, op. cit., p. 219; Coen, op. cit., p. 281.
5. Renan, op. cit., p. 353 refers to 5:62; 6:24,27,3038.
6. Mosheim, p. cit., p. 33.
7. Cf. e.g. Buhl, op. cit., p. 18 "...Celse nous montre dans son écrit une connaissance assez étendue du côté extérieur du christianisme, de ses sources, se son histoire."
8. Pélagaud, op. cit., pp. 453,454. I.
9. Buhl, op. cit., p. 22
10. Duchesne, op. cit., p. 147.
11. Tollinton, op. cit., p. 85 Cf. 2:45; 3:9,10,12,73 and 5:59.
12. 1:1 De Faye, op. cit., I, 155 says "Il est à remarquer que s'il critique les livres des chrétiens et leurs doctrines il ne s'attaque pas a leur moeurs." But if Celsus criticizes secret meetings of Christians, is this not an attack upon what he believes to be their customs?"
13. e.g. 3:49-54.

14. This is apparent from the fact that Celsus attacks Christianity in such a variety of manners.
15. Cf. Baur, op. cit., p. 168, "In spite of all the mockery and derision with which he treated Christianity, Celsus took up with all seriousness the task of refuting it, and as a Platonist did what he could to maintain the heathen view of the world against the opposite Christian view."
16. While this object is not explicitly stated as such in the True Discourse yet the very existence of such a writing shows that such was Celsus' aim.
17. Cf. Patrick, op. cit., p. 109. "It was the first onset of pagan thought, and also its most powerful; if the Gospel of Christ were not overthrown by such an attack, its victory was assured."
18. Cf. Krüger, op. cit., p. 196.
19. Cf. also Kidd, A History of the Church to A.D. 461, I, 412.
20. It is also for this reason that the exact nature of Celsus' philosophical position is somewhat obscure.
21. 1:2 Cf. also 3:6,8
22. Cf. Mackinnon, From Christ to Constantine, p. 491; James Orr, Neglected Factors in the Study of the Early Progress of Christianity, p. 59.
