

## CELSUS AND ARISTIDES.

BY J. RENDEL HARRIS, M.A., LITT.D., D.THEOL., ETC., HON.  
FELLOW OF CLARE COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE.

THE discovery of a fragment of the "Apology of Aristides" among the Oxyrhyncus Papyri is a fact of some importance in the Patristic literature. It is the first *bona fide* piece of Greek evidence for the text of this famous Christian document. It will be remembered that the "Apology" is known to us, apart from the preservation of a single fragment in Armenian, by two phenomenal discoveries; first, that of the Syriac text by myself in the Monastery of Mt. Sinai in 1889; second, Dr. Armitage Robinson's discovery that the lost Greek text had been incorporated, with some modifications, in the famous Christian romance known as the "History of Barlaam and Joasaph," which was supposed to have been written by St. John of Damascus in the monastery of St. Saba, near the Dead Sea. Thus two great convents united to give us back the missing "Apology," one finding us a Syriac translation, the other a Greek incorporation or adaptation. It is natural, then, that the discovery of this precious fragment from the sands of Egypt should re-open a number of questions, which could not be settled at the time of the first publication. Of these the principal points for further discussion and debate are two in number. The one relates to the question of priority and preference, where the Greek and Syriac differ; the other to a non-textual question, but one of no less importance, the enquiry whether the "Apology" was referred to by Celsus in his attack on Christianity in the second century, to which Origen replied with such skill and in such detail in the following century. We may, with advantage, review the situation from these two points of view.

Let us begin with the question of Celsus and Aristides, and so we can proceed to discuss the involved question of the comparative value of the Greek and Syriac texts.

The Celsus and Aristides problem arose out of a series of observations made by myself as to the coincidences which could be traced between the polemic of Celsus and the statements made by Aristides. The parallels were not exhaustively treated, but were sufficient to show a connection of ideas and language expressing those ideas, which would either prove Celsus dependent on Aristides, as I supposed, or both of them to be dependent upon a third document. It was at this point that the difficulty arose, for it was maintained by Dr. Armitage Robinson in his exposition of the Greek text which he had so brilliantly recovered, that the coincidences between Celsus and Aristides were due to a common employment of the lost "Preaching of Peter". Accordingly, he collected from the fragments of the Preaching a series of agreements on five principal points *plus* six supplementary possibilities of dependence, as follows :—

(1) That the Preaching called the Deity *παντοκράτωρ*.

(2) That it stated that "God created the heaven and earth and all that is therein."

(3) That all things were made "for the sake of man" and placed in subjection to him.

(4) That it contained a reference to the folly of guarding the Deity, as in the case of carefully watched statues of gold, silver, etc.

(5) That it maintained that God has no need of sacrifices.

To these five points he added more hesitatingly the following six :—

(6) That God must give the power to speak rightly of Himself.

(7) That it contained a reference to the superstitions of the Jews with regard to circumcision and clean and unclean meats.

(8) That Christians maintain and sustain the world.

(9) That they have God's commandments fixed in their hearts.

(10) It also had a reasoned condemnation of the worship of the elements, such as fire and water,

(11) And a statement that God was to be worshipped by benevolence.

From these parallels it was concluded that "most of the coincidences (between Celsus and Aristides) which had been pointed out would be accounted for by the supposition that it was not our 'Apology,' but the 'Preaching of Peter,' which, like 'Jason and Papisus,' and other apocryphal writings, supplied the materials of his attack."

As we shall examine the question presently, *de novo* and *ab initio*, we do not at this point discuss the parallels in detail. Dr. Robinson was evidently not quite satisfied with his result ; for, at the risk of repetition, he made a fresh collection of the supposed loans from Aristides in the pages of Celsus, enumerating eight passages which contained striking coincidences of thought or language. He then made an observation (the value of which he did not sufficiently estimate) that Celsus was, sometimes, as it would seem, retorting upon Christians language which had been employed by themselves (the *tu quoque* argument) as, for instance, when he says that Jesus in His Passion, had *no help* from His Father, nor was enabled to *help Himself*. This would be a very natural reply to the language of Aristides about the gods who could not help others nor help themselves, and it would be decisive as to the dependence of Celsus or Aristides, or 'almost decisive. We will examine the point more closely presently. Dr. Robinson seems to have been so much impressed with these suggested Celsian retorts that he finally concluded that it "is not easy to say whether it was the 'Preaching of Peter' or the 'Apology of Aristides' which lay before Celsus, but we can hardly doubt that it must have been one or the other." So he left the matter in suspense, as was not unnatural thirty years ago, and in dealing with a newly found document ; let us see whether, on reviewing the evidence to-day, we can come to a more definite conclusion.

We begin, then, by reading the arguments of Celsus, as represented in Origen, side by side with the arguments of Aristides in order to see whether one of them is replying to the other. We should easily satisfy ourselves that Celsus is replying to something or somebody, to some written statement or some living people ; and if we put ourselves as far as possible, in Celsus' position, and, so to speak, identify ourselves with him, we can reconstruct his adversary by a study of the blows that are being aimed at him. If it is a book that is being demolished, the critic will have been reading the book with an annotating and underscoring pencil ; he will point out by his annotation, too, what his antagonist, or the person whom he has elected to antagonise, has emphasised or underlined in his own speech or treatise. He will concentrate his attention on those points which are vital and must be replied to, or those which are vulnerable and must be held up to ridicule. Let us try for awhile to acquire a Celsus-consciousness.

We find we are writing a book in which, after a brief introduction on illicit assemblies, which is really addressed to the Government (*non licet vos esse*), and so is an evidence that the appeal which we are trying to counter was itself an appeal to the Government, that is, to the Emperor, we begin by pointing out that Christianity is a religion of barbarians. The reason why we introduce this abrupt form of attack is that the Apologist whose scalp we are after, has been using the term "barbarian" in his address, and has either made the Greek world into a world of barbarian ideas, or has put the Greeks next door to barbarians. The natural answer to this is the *tu quoque* which Dr. Robinson detected; what do you mean by barbarians, dear sir? Are you not in your religion an off-shoot of Judaism and are not the Jews barbarians? So we have by our retort reconstructed the world of four religions, to wit the Greeks (ourselves and Celsus) the barbarians whom you quote and to whom both of you, Jews and Christians, belong, and your twain selves.

βάρβαρόν φησω ἄνωθεν τὸ δόγμα, δηλονότι τὸν  
'Ιουδαϊσμόν οὐ Χριστιανισμόν ἤρτηται.

—"c. Celsum," i. 2.

Here then we have the suggestion of a world of four religions. Now it will be remembered that the Syriac Aristides divides mankind into four races, the *Barbarians*, the Greeks, the Jews, and the Christians, while the Greek of Barlaam and Joasaph has three only, viz., idol worshippers, Jews and Christians: and the first class three subdivisions, Chaldeans, Greeks, and Egyptians. Upon this Dr. Robinson remarks that "the fourfold division of the Syriac and Armenian versions . . . comes under grave suspicion; and the more we examine it the less primitive it appears. For to the Greek mind the Jews were themselves barbarians. . . . Moreover, there seems to be no parallel to this fourfold classification of races in early Christian literature." Precisely: the Jews were themselves barbarians: that is what Celsus is trying to say; and it requires the Syriac Aristides for an antecedent.

Returning to our Celsus, we find that the next point is that, so far as Christianity is a philosophy it is common with other philosophies: it has nothing new about it. We are attacking someone in a philosopher's garb. He appears to have a wallet labelled "novelties" but it is stuffed with matters borrowed from other schools. If he poses

as a philosopher, and prates of philosophy, let him produce something fresh, if he wishes to make a fresh religion.

It need hardly be said that this attempt to discount the philosophy of an opponent was extremely natural, if the opponent or opposed person had begun by saying, "I am a philosopher from Athens," and had produced a string of Stoic sentences about the Divine Nature and the Cosmos. Evidently Celsus has read the prologue and the first chapter. He annotates it, "no novelty"; as he goes on he finds that manufactured goods are said not to be gods; he puts on the margin the words "*nihil novi: confer Heraclitum, θεοὶ ἄψυχοι*". He will do this the more emphatically if the claim for novelty should be found in the volume to which he is replying. Well, we actually find in the "Apology of Aristides" the statement made to the Emperor that,

Truly this is a new people, and there is something divine mingled with it. Take now their writings and read.

We notice that this assertion of novelty and appeal for attention is in the Syriac text, and not in the Greek.

Celsus, then, disposes rapidly enough of the philosophy of the man whom he is criticising, as if it were enough to say, "one more philosopher! What of that?" but as he runs his eye over the section on the Divine Nature, and catches sight of the statement that God "made all things for the sake of man," he cannot refrain from an attack on this ridiculous Stoic doctrine, and as it is clearly one of the special beliefs of Aristides, it must be reserved for a special refutation.

It is interesting to observe how careful Celsus is to confute the emphatic and repeated statements of his adversary: and since Aristides has the trick of saying things several times over, like a counsel addressing a jury, Celsus feels bound to take him on his repetitions.

Most of his references to the making of the world for the sake of man are given by Origen in his fourth book, to the effect that the world was no more made for man than for brute beasts, or for plants or shrubs, ants and bees, lions and dolphins. He laughs zoologically and botanically, he will even set the sun, moon, and stars laughing at the pigmy pride of man. The world is not anthropocentric for Celsus, any more than it is melittocentric or even heliocentric.<sup>1</sup> On the

<sup>1</sup> "c. Celsum," iv. 74, 75, 99.

surface of the argument the Epicurean wins easily, but surface arguments are in two dimensions, the true philosopher has to work in three.

The next step in the evolution of the attack of Celsus is a rapid lunge at the Jews, in order to detach them from the Christians, with whom he had previously coupled them, followed by a decision to take the Christians first and the Jews later. We know, says Celsus, that

The Jews worship angels and are devoted to sorcery of which Moses was their teacher (*ἧς ὁ Μωϋσῆς αὐτοῖς γέγονεν ἐξηγήτης*).

“but we will show presently that they are deceived and have stumbled through ignorance” :

*ἐπαγγέλλεται δὲ διδάξειν ἐξῆς, πὼς καὶ Ἰουδαῖοι  
ὑπὸ ἀμαθίας ἐσφάλησαν ἐξαπατῶμενοι.*

—“c. Celsum,” i. 26.

In making these statements we may observe two things : first that the reply of Celsus does what the “Apology” itself suggests ; it refers to the Jews and postpones them ; next, the language of Celsus anticipates the statement of Aristides that the “Jews have gone astray from accurate knowledge . . . their service is to angels and not to God.” In both respects Celsus runs parallel to the Syriac version, which differs from the Greek, both in the order of the material and in its content.

According to the same Syriac version, we have the defence of the Christian faith introduced by a brief study of origins :—

The Barbarians reckon the head of their religion from . . . and the Greeks from . . .

The Jews reckon the head of their race from Abraham, who begat Isaac, from whom was born Jacob, etc.

The Christians reckon the beginning of their religion from Jesus Christ. Now it is clear that this repeated expression stands for an original Greek *γενεαλογούνται*.

We can see this as regards the Jews, if we turn to the fifth book against Celsus :

He (Celsus) did not wish to appear ignorant of a fact not easily to be neglected. For it is clear that the Jews reckon their racial origin from the three patriarchs, Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob (*ὅτι καὶ γενεαλογούνται Ἰουδαῖοι ἀπὸ τῶν τριῶν πατέρων, τοῦ Ἀβραάμ, καὶ τοῦ Ἰσαάκ, καὶ τοῦ Ἰακώβ*).<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> “c. Celsum,” v. 33, and compare v. 35, “the genealogy which he deemed the Jews to have so shamelessly arrogated in boasting of Abraham and his descendants” : “those names from which the Jews derive their genealogies.”

The Greek text preserves the same statement for the Christians in the form

*οἱ δὲ Χριστιανοὶ γενεαλογοῦνται ἀπὸ τοῦ Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.*

If, however, this fragment had been missing from the Greek text, we could have divined it from the statement of Celsus, who, after postponing the study of Judaism, first of all makes his discourse concerning our Saviour, inasmuch as he was our leader, so far as we are Christians by race : (*πρῶτον ποιεῖται τὸν λόγον περὶ τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν, ὡς γινομένου ἡγεμόνος τῆ καθὸ Χριστιανοὶ ἐσμεν γενέσει ἡμῶν*).<sup>1</sup>

It is clear that these successive statements of genealogy belong where the Syriac "Apology" has placed them, and not at the end of the Oration : Celsus will speak first of what comes first in the book, the origin of the Christians and their beliefs ; and these are his actual words : "In quite recent times he became the leader of this teaching, being regarded by the Christians as the Son of God" : (*αὐτὸν πρὸ πάντων ὀλίγων ἐτῶν τῆς διδασκαλίας ταύτης καθηγήσασθαι, νομισθέντα ὑπὸ Χριστιανῶν υἱὸν εἶναι τοῦ θεοῦ*).<sup>2</sup>

Clearly Celsus is following Aristides very carefully at this point, not only as regards the order of the argument, but as to its content ; for here we are at the centre of the Christian confession. The Syriac says,—

The Christians reckon the beginning of their religion from Jesus Christ, who is named the Son of God most High,

and the Greek says,—

Who is confessed to be the Son of God most High.

The Greek "confessed" is later theological language than the Syriac ; *νομισθέντα* was not strong enough but the Syriac appears to have misread a Greek *νομίζεται* as *ὀνομάζεται*.

And now Celsus scrutinises every word, and rains down his blows heavily on his opponent : first of all, "it is said that God came down from heaven" ; (the Greek indulges in expansions, as that He came down by the Holy Spirit, and that it was for us men and our salvation, as the early Creeds say).

Now this his Epicurean philosophy would not allow : he breaks out with—

<sup>1</sup> "c. Celsus," i. 21.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*

O Jews and Christians, no God or Son of God has ever descended nor ever may descend :

and it was natural that Origen should, in his fifth book, convict him of impiety in the first case, as denying either the descent from Heaven or the actual divinity, of Apollo and Æsculapius, or as forsaking the camouflage of his own Epicurean doctrine, which he had hitherto judiciously practised. See how the fellow, says Origen, in his zeal to make wreckage of us, though he never admitted throughout his work that he was an Epicurean, is now caught sneaking off to Epicurus.<sup>1</sup> Is he going to accept the doctrine of Providence which we Christians affirm with the Stoics? He had better take another turn at the Christian Scriptures, and learn accurately the care of God for man.

The same contradiction of Celsus to the doctrine of a descending God is in the opening of Origen's fourth book, where Celsus is reported as saying, that certain Christians and the Jews maintain, some that *God has descended*, others that *God or the Son of God will descend* to a certain land, but this does not require a serious refutation. Celsus has a further fling at the idea that the coming of God could be foretold. Anyone could fulfil such prophecies, "some fanatically, and others making collections, say that the Son of God is come from above." To which Origen replies that we have no trace of such self-divinising in the Jewish records.

We notice that the language of Celsus about the descent of God, or the Son of God is suggested by the Syriac "Aristides," which tells us that Jesus Christ is the *Son of God* and that it is said that *God* comes down from heaven; the point is missed in the Greek. Celsus did not miss the variation in the language. By this time we are in the heart of the Creed; when we come to the statement of the Virgin Birth, we find the Greek text varying from the Syriac, chiefly by the addition of later theological language. The Syriac says that "God came down from heaven and from a Hebrew Virgin took and clad himself with flesh, and in a daughter of man there dwelt the Son of God." The Greek says, "He was born of a holy Virgin, ἀσπύρωσ καὶ ἀφθόρωσ and took flesh and appeared to men."<sup>2</sup> Here there is

<sup>1</sup> "c. Celsum," v. 1.

<sup>2</sup> That the term "Hebrew Virgin" is genuine Aristides, and has been replaced by "Holy Virgin" in the Greek, appears from a fragment of a lost work of Aristides preserved in the Armenian. It runs as follows: "He

only a trace of the Syriac form, but that the latter is correct will appear by turning to another passage in Barlaam and Joasaph (i. 3) where it is said that Christ ὠφθη καθ' ἡμᾶς καὶ . . . παρθένον ὠκήσε δι' ἡμᾶς where the *dwelling* of Christ in the Virgin is clearly taken from the Syriac.

The next sentence in the Syriac is mistranslated in the *editio princeps*. It should run thus :

This is learned from the Gospel, which, they say, has been preached a short time ago.

Celsus is directed to the Virgin Birth and the Gospel, and he accepts the challenge vigorously : he had already picked up the admission that it was " a short time ago " (πρὸ πάνυ ὀλίγων ἐτῶν τῆς διδασκαλίας ταύτης) and now he hits out hard with the story of the illicit connection between the Virgin and the soldier Panther, employing a second camouflage for his own personal opinions, by the introduction of a Jew who is now the protagonist, an Epicurean converted for the nonce. The battle is a long one and we do not follow it in detail ; all that we are concerned with is the proof that everything of importance in the Syriac is taken over by Celsus, and every vital statement has an arrow sticking in it.

Returning to the Syriac text we notice that the punctuation has got wrong. It should read :—

In order that a certain *οἰκονομία* might be fulfilled, he was pierced by the Jews, etc.

The allusion to the *οἰκονομία* will be found reflected on Barlaam and Joasaph (c. 61), as follows :—

" Do you ask me how we came to hear the words of the incarnate God ? Know that it was through the holy Gospels that we learnt all about the Divine-human *οἰκονομία*." The dependence of this passage on the " Apology " is clear, and it is one more illustration of the extent to which the Barlaam and Joasaph story is saturated with Aristides. The Greek now becomes interesting : it connects the completion of the economy with the crucifixion, but without any reference to the Jews : καὶ τελέσας τὴν θαυμαστὴν αὐτοῦ οἰκονομίαν, διὰ σταυροῦ θανάτου ἐγεύσατο, ἐκουσία βουλῇ, κατ'

united to Himself the flesh from a *Hebrew Virgin* the Holy Mary". If this is Aristides it suggests to us that the " Hebrew Virgin " should belong to the primitive draft of the " Apology ".

οικονομίαν μεγάλην. But this completion of the economy<sup>1</sup> will also be found in Barlaam and Joasaph in the opening chapter as follows :—

καὶ πᾶσαν μὲν τὴν διὰ σαρκὸς ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν τελέσας οἰκονομίαν.  
—“ B. and J.,” 4.

Celsus continues his examination of the Christian Creed. He accepts the statement that our Lord “was crucified by the Jews,” but says that it was on account of his crimes, and makes his camouflaged representative say the same. “We punished him” says the Jew : Celsus says a second time that he paid the penalty among the Jews for his offences. “We both found him guilty and condemned him as deserving death” says the Jew.<sup>2</sup>

So there need be no hesitation in believing that Celsus had before him a statement that Jesus suffered at the hands of the Jews, even though there is nothing to that effect in the Greek text as edited by Robinson.

The next point that Celsus has to face is the question whether gods, of whom images are made, can be trusted to take care of themselves ; and if not, how they can take care of their worshippers ? As this is a special theme with Aristides, on which he enlarges and which he repeats over and over, we will look somewhat more closely at the section in which it first appears, which is headed in Syriac as the Folly of the Barbarians, but in Greek as the Aberrations of the Chaldeans. We have already explained that Chaldean is secondary and Barbarian primary in the tradition of Aristides. The section which we are engaged on has a special interest, since both the Greek and the Syriac make Aristides quote the first chapter of Romans :

<sup>1</sup>The expression *τελεῖν οἰκονομίαν* becomes almost classical. Here is a very curious early case in the “Life of Abercius,” which runs parallel to Aristides :—

Τίνος ἕνεκεν διὰ τῆς ἁγίας παρθένου προήγαγεν  
Μαριάς ὁ Θεὸς τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ καὶ εἰς τὸν κόσμον  
ἀπέστειλεν, εἰ μὴ τινα χάριν καὶ οἰκονομίαν ἐξετέλει ;

It is a translation or transference from the “Acts of Peter” (c. 7, p. 53):—

“Cujus rei causa deus filium suum misit in saeculo aut cujus rei per virginem Mariam protulit, si non aliquam gratiam aut *procuracionem proficeret.*”

<sup>2</sup>“c. Celsum,” ii. 4, 5, 10.

“they began to serve created things rather than the Creator,”<sup>1</sup> and the Greek text has made its mark on one or two other places in Barlaam and Joasaph, showing once more how saturated the monk of St. Saba is with his favourite book. For example we have—

ἐγκλείσαντες ἐν ναοῖς προσεκύνησαν, λατρεύοντες  
τῇ κτίσει παρὰ τῷ Κτίσαντι.

—“B. and J.,” vii. 48.

μορφώματα ἀνετυπώσαντο καὶ τούτους θεοὺς ἐκάλεσαν.

—*Ibid.*, vii. 49.

τηροῦντες αὐτὰ ἐν ἀσφαλείᾳ, τοῦ μὴ ὑπὸ κλεπτῶν  
συληθῆναι, . . . καὶ τὸ μὴ γινώσκειν ὅτι οὐκ ἐξαρκοῦνται  
καὶ βοηθεῖν, πῶς ἄλλοις γένοιτο φύλακες καὶ σωτῆρες ;

—*Ibid.*, x. 81.

As we have said, Aristides harps on this theme again and again. How can Asclepius be a god when he was unable to help himself, when struck by lightning, or Dionysus, who could not save himself from being slain be able to help others? Or Herakles, whose end was sad, and bad, and mad, be able to respond to an appeal for help? Or Aphrodite be a goddess when she could not help Adonis, or Adonis be a god when he could not help himself? Or Rhea when she could not help Attis? Or Koré who was carried off to Hades? Or Isis be a goddess and unable to help Osiris her lord? And speaking generally how can gods who cannot help themselves be of any use? They are too weak for their own salvation. It seems that the humour of the discussion is not all on one side. Aristides is really laughing, and some will say laughing too loud and long. How shall we refute him?

Obviously the *tu quoque* argument is the simplest. Say the same things of the other man's god. Ask him if God saved Jesus, or if Jesus was able to save Himself. That will dispose very neatly of Aphrodite and Adonis, or Isis and Osiris, and the rest. Accordingly Celsus reproaches the Saviour because of His sufferings, says that He received no assistance from His Father, nor was in a position to help Himself: ὡς μὴ βοηθέντι ὑπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς ἢ μὴ δυνηθέντι ἑαυτῷ

<sup>1</sup> There is a suspicion also of a quotation from Ephesians by Aristides: for in the 17th chapter he tells the Emperor that there are things recorded in pagan literature which it is not proper to speak of, but they are not only said but actually done; the language is very like Eph. v. 12, “It is a shame even to speak of the disgraceful things done by them in secret”.

*βοηθῆσαι.*<sup>1</sup> How curiously the history of unbelief repeats itself : Celsus is standing with the priests at the Cross and saying the same thing as they—'Himself He cannot save !''

But let us come to more detail of divine disgrace. You have talked, sir philosopher, in mirth of gods who are bound, as Kronos was or Ares, or taken captive or who ran away, as Dionysus did, but tell us plainly whether Jesus was not taken prisoner. Did he not run away hither and thither, with his disciples ? Why had he to be carried as a babe into Egypt for safety ? A god ought not to be afraid of death.<sup>2</sup>

In this way Celsus counters, or thinks to counter, the mirth of Aristides. If the latter makes merriment over gods that have to get their living, as Hephaestus in his smithy, or Apollo taking fees for his oracular advice, we of the Celsus party must point out that Jesus and his disciples went about collecting their daily food in a shameful and importunate manner. Are these friars so very different from the gods whom they denounce ?<sup>3</sup>

It is clear, then, that Aristides' "Apology" is the background of Celsus' "True Word" ; the one is necessary to the understanding of the other.<sup>4</sup>

Moreover we have shown, not only that Celsus is following the argument of Aristides point by point, but that he is following it in a text that agrees closely with the Syriac MS. It is surely hardly necessary to pursue the matter further. Whatever may be the ultimate meaning of the coincidences with the "Preaching of Peter" or the "Epistle to Diognetus" they can only serve as illustrations, they cannot be treated as sources. The attempt so to treat them may be discarded.

We have also learnt another important lesson, viz. : that the text of Aristides is much more widely diffused through the story of Barlaam and Joasaph than the first editions supposed. The "Apology" is not

<sup>1</sup> "c. Celsum," i. 54.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, i. 65, 66.

<sup>3</sup> φησὶ δὲ τὸν Ἰησοῦν μετὰ τῶν μαθητῶν αἰσχρῶς καὶ γλίσχρως τὰς τροφὰς συλλέγοντα περιεληλυθῆναι.

—*Ibid.*, i. 66.

<sup>4</sup> It is curious to note that Aristides is really expanding an argument of Heraclitus : εἰ θεοὶ εἰσιν ἵνα τι θρηνέετε αὐτοὺς ; εἰ δὲ θρηνέετε αὐτοὺς, μηκέτι ταύτους ἠγάγεσθε θεοὺς. See Buresch, "Klaros," p. 118. Neumann, "Heraklitea" : Hermes, xv. 60.

merely borrowed *en bloc*, its use can be traced from the very first page of the story. It was in the mind of John of Damascus when he began to write. Its outcrop is everywhere. Stray words and phrases are constantly occurring which betray their origin.

Another thing which we shall need to bear in mind, when we do further work in the text, is that the Syriac has almost everywhere the right of way. Dr. Robinson presented an ingenious argument from the case of a parallel Syriac Apology, "The Hypomnemata of Ambrosius," of which portions are contained in Ps. Justin's "Address to the Greeks." It was possible to show that the Syriac was frequently an abbreviation or a misunderstanding of the Greek. Dr. Robinson inferred that all Syriac translators may be expected to show similar translator's lapses : no doubt there will be some errors of reading and translation in all versions, but as far as we can judge our Syriac Aristides will not require very much of an apology for his "Apology."