

# WRITINGS OF ARISTIDES THE PHILOSOPHER

by Aristides the Philosopher

---

*Writings of Aristides the Philosopher (c. AD 200). Aristides the Philosopher was an early church father whose writings have been preserved for the edification of the church.*

9 Chapters

## Table of Contents

0. Writings of Aristides the Philosopher
1. The Apology - Appendix- The remains of the original Greek of the Apology of Aris...
2. The Apology - Introduction to the 1891 translation
3. The Apology - Introduction
4. The Apology - Preface to the online text
5. The Apology - Prefatory matter to the 1891 translation
6. The Apology - Selected Notes on the Syriac Version\_1891
7. The Apology - Translation from the Syriac\_1891
8. The Apology - Translation of the Greek and of the Syriac versions in parallel co...

## Writings of Aristides the Philosopher

---

## The Apology - Appendix- The remains of the original Greek of the Apology of Aristides by J.Armitage Robinson\_1891\_Extracts

---

The Apology of Aristides: Texts and Studies 1 (1891) pp.

65-99. Appendix: The Remains of the Original Greek of the Apology of Aristides

[Extracts]

[Note to the online edition: much of this

appendix is directed to a hypothetical reconstruction of other documents, with

copious citation of the Greek. This has been almost entirely omitted]

APPENDIX THE REMAINS OF THE ORIGINAL GREEK OF THE APOLOGY OF ARISTIDES BY  
J. ARMITAGE ROBINSON M.A.

FELLOW AND ASSISTANT TUTOR OF CHRIST'S COLLEGE CAMBRIDGE THE ORIGINAL  
GREEK OF THE APOLOGY OF ARISTIDES.

While Mr Harris was passing the preceding pages through the press, he kindly allowed me to read the proof sheets of his translation of the Syriac. Shortly afterwards as I was turning over Latin Passionals at Vienna in a fruitless search for a lost MS. of the Passion of S. Perpetua, I happened to be reading portions of the Latin Version of the 'Life of Barlaam and Josaphat,' and presently I stumbled across words which recalled the manner and the thought of Aristides. Turning back to the beginning of a long speech, I found the words: 'Ego, rex, providentia Dei veni in mundum; et considerans celum et terram, mare et solem et lunam, et cetera, admiratus sum ornatum eorum.' The Greek text of 'Barlaam and Josaphat' is printed in Migne's edition of the works of S. John of Damascus: and it was not long before I was reading the actual words of the Apologist himself: [Greek] It was with some impatience that I waited for my return to Cambridge, in order to examine the proof sheets again, and so to discover by a comparison of the Syriac Version how much of our author was really in our hands in the original tongue. To what extent then does the Greek speech in 'Barlaam and Josaphat' correspond to the Syriac Version of the Apology of Aristides? In other words: How far may we claim to have recovered the original Apology in the language in which it was written? The circumstances under which the Greek has been preserved at all demand first a brief notice. 'The Life of Barlaam and [68 Joasaph (or Josaphat)'] is the title of a religious romance, which, by a tradition dating at the latest from the 11th century, has been connected with the name of S. John of Damascus. It is true that SS. Barlaam and Josaphat find a place in the Calendars of both the Eastern and Western Churches: but it has long been recognised that their 'Life' is a working up of the Indian legend of Sakya Mouni, or Buddha; and a number of the apologues scattered over the piece have also been identified as Eastern stories of a very early date. The popularity of the book has rarely been equalled in the history of literature. Before the 13th century it had been translated into almost every known language of the world; an Icelandic Version was

made about the year 1200 by the order of a Norwegian king; and there is an early English rendering in metre.

It has lately been argued, and I think with success, by Zotenberg<sup>1</sup>, that the book is much earlier than the time of S. John of Damascus; and that the matter which it has in common with several of his works is drawn from previous writers such as Gregory Nazianzen and Nemesius. This being so, it may well go back to the 6th century, or perhaps earlier still. The outline of the story is as follows. An Eastern king, named Abenner, persecutes the Christians, and especially the monks, whom he expels from India. He is childless; but at length the young prince Josaphat is born, and the astrologers, as in the case of Buddha, predict for him an extraordinary greatness. They add however that he will become a Christian. This his father determines to prevent. He encloses him in a magnificent palace; allows none but young and beautiful attendants to approach him; and forbids the mention of sorrow, disease and death, and above all of Christianity. When the prince is grown to man's estate he asks his father to give him liberty. His entreaties are at length successful, as it seems that otherwise his life will be saddened, and the first step will have been taken towards his reception of the forbidden faith. He is allowed to drive out, but the way is carefully prepared beforehand, and guarded from the intrusion of sad sights and sounds. At last precaution fails, and he sees one day a lame man and a blind man, and another day a man wrinkled and tottering with age. He inquires whether accidents may befall any man, and whether every man must come at last to miserable old age or death. There is but one answer: and the joy has fled from his life. A monk of the desert, Barlaam by name, is divinely warned of the prince's condition; and comes disguised as a merchant, and obtains entrance to the prince to shew him a most goodly pearl. In a long discourse, into which Gospel parables and Eastern apologues are skilfully woven, he expounds to him the vanity of the world and the Christian hope of the life to come. In the end the prince is baptized, and Barlaam disappears into the desert. The king, distracted with rage on the one hand and love for his son on the other, casts about for means to shake his faith. A wily counsellor propounds a plan. An old man, who closely resembles Barlaam and who is an admirable actor, is to defend the cause of Christianity in an open debate. He is to make a lame speech, and be easily refuted by the rhetoricians. The prince, seeing his instructor baffled, will renounce his newly accepted faith. The day comes, and Nachor, for this is the old man's name, appears to personate Barlaam. Josaphat addresses him in vigorous terms, reminding him of the difficulties in which his instructions have involved him, and promising him a miserable fate if he fails to prove his point. Nachor is not reassured by this mode of address; but after some preliminary fencing on the part of the rhetoricians he begins to speak. Such, says our author, was the providence of God, that like Balaam of old he had come to curse, but he ended by blessing with manifold blessings. Or, as he says again, lowering his metaphor; 'He beckoned to the multitude to keep silence, and he opened his mouth, and like Balaam's ass he spake that which he had not purposed to speak; and he said to the king: I, O king, by the providence of God came into the world...' The Apology of Aristides carried the day: and, to cut the long story short, Nachor himself and finally the king and his people were converted: and at last Josaphat, who in due course succeeds his father, resigns his kingdom and retires to spend his days with Barlaam in the desert<sup>2</sup>.

What modifications then were required to fit the Apology for its new surroundings? Surprisingly few.

(1) The king is of course addressed throughout: but this is so in the original piece. Only a short sentence at the end praises the wise choice of the king's son.

(2) The fourfold division of mankind into Barbarians and Greeks, Jews and Christians, was out of place in an Indian court. We find in its stead a triple division----Worshippers of false gods, Jews and Christians: and the first class is subdivided into Chaldeans, Greeks and Egyptians, as being the ringleaders and teachers of heathenism to the rest of the world<sup>3</sup>.

(3) A short passage at the close, in which the Christians are defended from the foul charges so often brought against them in the first days, was out of date and consequently has disappeared.

(4) If we add to this that there are traces of compression here and there, and that the description of the Christians at the close is considerably curtailed, we have exhausted the list of substantial modifications which can with certainty be detected. The substance of the Apology then is for the most part faithfully preserved: but can we say that with the exceptions already named we have the actual Greek words of Aristides himself? The first and most obvious test to apply is that of comparative length. The Syriac is, speaking roughly, half as long again as the Greek: and this difference is not fully accounted for by the combination in the latter of the preliminary statements about the Jews and the Christians with the fuller descriptions of them given later on, and by the omission of nearly two pages at the close. [71 The fact is that the Syriac has a large number of repetitions and not a few additional details which are absent from the Greek. Thus at the end of each description of the several gods and goddesses of the heathen, the Syriac Version points the moral and drives home the inevitable conclusion: and again such histories as those of Kronos and of Isis and Osiris are somewhat more elaborately told in this form of the Apology. Are we then to conclude that the Syriac translator has enlarged upon his original, and supplemented it here and there from his own resources? Or must we say that the author of 'Barlaam and Josaphat' found the Apology too long for his purpose, and pruned away unnecessary details? The second hypothesis has a prima facie probability, and the general reputation for faithfulness of Syriac translators might point us in the same direction. On the other side it is to be observed that, even when read in the light of the Syriac Version, the Greek form is still felt to be a harmonious and consistent whole: and it certainly does not convey the impression of serious mutilation. The genius of the author, in so framing his plot as perfectly to suit the Apology which he intended to introduce, needs no further praise than is involved in the fact that hitherto no one has had the remotest suspicion that he did not write the speech of Nachor himself. If anything could make his genius appear more extraordinary still, it would be the proof that he had consistently compressed the original document in almost every alternate sentence without leaving any traces of rough handling: but such proof is at present not forthcoming. In the absence of further documents, the question must be decided largely by internal evidence and the minute investigation of the points of difference. But there are

two external sources from which light may be thrown upon the problem.

(1) In 1855 Cureton published in his *Spicilegium Syriacum* a treatise bearing the title: 'Hypomnemata, which Ambrose, a chief man of Greece, wrote;' and commencing with the words: 'Do not suppose, men and Greeks, that without fit and just cause is my separation from your customs.' These words are the literal translation of the opening sentence of the *Oratio ad* [72 *Gentiles* traditionally ascribed to Justin Martyr: [Greek] When we compare the original Greek with the Syriac Version of this document, we find that in point of length they stand to one another exactly as do the Greek and Syriac forms of the *Apology of Aristides*: that is to say, in either case the Syriac is about half as long again as the Greek. Moreover, as in the case of our *Apology*, the variation begins to shew itself immediately after the first sentence, which I have quoted. For the Greek continues thus: [Greek]. But the Syriac replaces this by the following, as Cureton renders it: 'For I have investigated the whole of your wisdom of poetry, and rhetoric, and philosophy; and when I found not anything right or worthy of the Deity, I was desirous of investigating the wisdom of the Christians also, and of learning and seeing who they are, and when, and what is this its recent and strange production, or on what good things they rely who follow this wisdom, so as to speak the truth. Men and Greeks, when I had made the enquiry I found not any folly, as in the famous Homer, who says respecting the wars of the two rivals, "for the sake of Helen many of the Greeks perished at Troy, far from their beloved home." For first they say respecting Agamemnon,' &c.

Here then we have a similar problem to that of the *Apology of Aristides*; and in this case we are not hampered by the consideration that the Greek may possibly have been abbreviated to fit it for incorporation into a religious novel. Few will be disposed to challenge the verdict of Otto<sup>4</sup>, that the Syriac translator has so altered and amplified his original as almost to have produced a new work.

We may give one more illustration of the manner in which the translator has proceeded. We have seen already that he has paraded at the outset his independent acquaintance with Homer. [73 Where Ulysses is alluded to, later on, the Greek has a sentence full of satire and liable to be misunderstood. [Greek]. Corresponding to this we find in the Syriac Version: 'But respecting the guile of Odysseus, son of Laertes, and his murders, who shall tell? For to a hundred and ten suitors in one day his house was a grave, and was filled with dead bodies and blood. And he it is that by his wickedness purchased praises, because by the excellence of his wisdom he was concealed: and he it is that, as ye say, sailed over the sea, and heard the voice of the Sirens, because he stopped his ears with wax.' The translator then has first supplemented his author by introducing fresh details about Ulysses: and then he has totally missed the meaning of the Greek. He has obviously read it as if it were [Greek], 'through the excellence of his wisdom he kept himself in the dark.' Then not seeing the point of [Greek], he simply tells us that 'he stopped his ears with wax.' This of course the hero did not do: and the translator has got the Homeric story wrong: nor shall we mend matters much by inserting with Cureton the word 'not' after 'and heard.' We see at any rate plainly enough what was this Syrian's conception of a translator's function

when his author seemed obscure. The parallel between the two Apologies is the more striking, because the line of argument in these Hypomnemata vividly recalls parts of Aristides, and the same illustrations of the misdemeanours of the gods frequently reappear in almost the same language. The satire of the so-called Ambrosius is a much keener weapon than the simple narrative of Aristides: but there is not the same intensity of moral earnestness. It is quite credible that the later Apologist had the work of Aristides before him when he wrote, and endeavoured to reproduce the same arguments in what he thought was a more telling manner. Thus he says: [Greek] (cf. infra p. 109, 1. 7). And again: [Greek]. |74 (cf. p. 106, 1. 24). And once more: [Greek] (cf. p. 105, 1. 18).

Enough then has been said to shew that a Syriac translator, finding an early Greek Apology and desiring to reproduce it in his own language, might have no scruple whatever in dealing very freely with his author, in expunging sentences which he was not able or did not care to translate, and in supplementing the original here and there out of his own resources. The Syriac translator of the *Oratio ad Gentiles* has clearly so treated his unknown author; and this fact removes any a priori objection to the supposition that the Syriac translator of Aristides has acted in a similar way.

(2) We are fortunate in having an additional source of evidence in the Armenian fragment which contains the opening sentences of the Apology. The Armenian translator has clearly done what we have had some reason to suspect in the case of the Syriac translator. He has dealt freely with his original, adding words and even sentences, and introducing the stock phrases of a later theology. But this, while it diminishes very considerably the amount of the evidence which can be produced from his version, does not materially affect its value as far as it goes. Phrases which are only found in the Armenian, or only found in the Syriac, may be dismissed as possibly the inventions of the respective translators: but there remains a considerable quantity of matter common to the two Versions, which therefore presupposes a Greek original. The question we have to ask is: What is the relation of this common matter to the Greek text now in our hands? A preliminary point however demands attention: Is the Armenian translated from the Syriac, or is it an independent translation made directly or indirectly from the Greek itself? A few instances in which the Armenian corresponds with the Greek against the Syriac will suffice to shew that it cannot come from the Syriac as we now have it. In the opening sentence we have [Greek] and 'providentia' (Arm.) against 'goodness' (Syr.). Immediately afterwards [Greek] and 'luna' (Arm.), which the Syriac omits. Lower down 'rectorem' |75 three times corresponds to parts of [Greek], but there is nothing to answer to these in the Syriac. In the Christological passage near the end of the fragment, 'una cum Spiritu Sancto' (Arm.) answers to [Greek]: and here again the Syriac has no equivalent.

Moreover in the description of the Divine nature the Armenian Version says: 'Ei neque colores sunt neque forma,' or as Mr Conybeare renders it 'Colour and form of Him there is not.' This corresponds to the Syriac phrase: 'He has

no likeness, nor composition of members.' The Greek fails us here: but we may suppose that the -Greek word which has been variously rendered ' colour ' and ' likeness ' was [Greek], as in the passage quoted by Mr Harris from Justin (supra p. 54): [Greek].

We may conclude then that the Armenian Version is not made from the Syriac Version in its present form<sup>5</sup>: and similar arguments could be adduced, if there were any necessity, to shew that the Syriac Version is independent of the Armenian.

I have mentioned already almost all the cases in which the Syriac fails to reproduce in any form matter which is common to the Greek and the Armenian. They scarcely make up between them more than a dozen words. The additional matter found only in the Syriac Version is more considerable.

First, there is the second title which introduces the name of Antoninus Pius, and so conflicts with the first which has the support of the Armenian<sup>6</sup>.

Then we have the following phrases:

(a) Who is hidden in them and concealed from them: and this is well known, that... |76 (b) And in saying that He is complete, I mean that there is no deficiency in Him.

(c) And that which has an end is dissoluble.

(d) From man He asks nothing.

(e) Who begat...from whom was born...who begat.

(f) Of their religion (bis).

(g) And it is said that (in the Christological statement)... and clad Himself with...and they say that...who are well known.

I have taken no account of the many places in which the two Versions wander far from each other, and yet seem to have some common basis. Here the Armenian is obviously the worst offender, and its interpolations are far more numerous.

We now turn to the Greek itself in the passage covered by the Armenian fragment, in order to see first of all to what extent what we actually have faithfully represents the Greek words which underlie the Syriac and Armenian

Versions.

(1) The first sentence which bears the appearance of compression is the following: [Greek]. This seems to bring together several more expanded phrases witnessed to by the two Versions, which however do not agree with one another sufficiently closely to allow us to make a certain reconstruction.

(2) In the sentence, [Greek], a word, corresponding to ' praefatas ' (Arm.) and ' which we have spoken concerning Him ' (Syr.), has dropped out before [Greek]: and instead of [Greek] there must have been a verb in the original; ' ab eis erraverint ' (Arm.), ' have erred therefrom ' (Syr.).

The difference is of course exceedingly slight in itself: but it is important from a critical point of view, when we are testing the faithfulness with which the author of 'Barlaam and Josaphat' has preserved to us the original Apology. We may probably trace in this sentence the influence of an almost identical one, which comes later on, after the preliminary descriptions of the four races have been given. As the Greek combines these descriptions with the fuller [77 accounts afterwards given, it brings the parallel sentences close together.

(3) The division of mankind into three races, and not four, has been already noticed<sup>7</sup>.

(4) It is just at this point that the most serious divergence is found: viz., the omission of the preliminary descriptions of the races, as noted above. This was perhaps the result of the change in the method of their division, which rendered unsuitable the sentences which immediately followed.

Once more, we have to ask how much is there which can be shewn, by the united testimony of the Versions, to have stood in the original Greek, and which yet finds no place in the Greek which has survived.

(1) In the first line both Versions have 'into this world,' while the Greek has [Greek]: but the demonstrative may perhaps only be an attempt to represent the Greek article. The first real gap is eight lines lower down, where the Versions are very divergent<sup>8</sup>, but yet

point- to some common original. It is probable that the Greek text at this point was difficult or corrupt, and so was omitted altogether by the author of 'Barlaam and Josaphat.' The topic is the difficulty and uselessness of elaborate investigation concerning the Divine nature: and the conclusion is drawn ' that one should fear God and not grieve man ' (Syr.), ' utpote unum Deum nos adorare oportet: unumquemque autem nostrum proximum suum sicut semetipsum diligere ' (Arm.). To this the Greek has nothing to correspond.

(2) For the list of properties of the Divine nature we have in the Greek merely the compressed sentence, part of which was quoted above. The Versions agree in telling us more fully that ' God is not begotten, not made '; ' without beginning, because that which has a beginning has also an end'; 'without name, because that which has a name belongs to the created'; 'without likeness (Arm. ' colores,' implying [Greek] in the Greek) and composition of members (Arm. ' forma '), for he who possesses this is associated with things created' (Arm. 'mensurabilis est, [78 limitibusque cogitur'); 'neither male nor female' (Arm. adds 'quia cupiditatibus agitatur qui huic est distinctioni obnoxius '); ' the heavens do not contain Him: but the heavens and all things visible and invisible are contained in Him '; ' He has no adversary ' (in the reason for this there is fresh discrepancy); ' He is altogether wisdom and understanding.' After this the Greek, as we have it, is again, for the next seven lines, obviously the same as that which lay before the translators.

(3) Now comes the new division of mankind, and the Greek has omitted the following: ' Now the Barbarians reckon---- and from Dionysus,' about six lines.

(4) The preliminary accounts of the Jews and the Christians are found in the Greek later on, where they are amalgamated with the fuller descriptions. The account of the Jews agrees fairly well with that given in the Versions, especially in the Armenian. The additions in the Greek will be noticed presently. It adds at the close: [Greek].

(5) The Christological passage which follows is so important that it will be an advantage to have the three forms side by side.

[Greek] The Christians then reckon the beginning of their religion from Jesus Christ, Who is named the Son of God most High; and it is said that God came down from Heaven, and from a Hebrew virgin took: and clad Himself with flesh; and there dwelt in a daughter of man the Son of God.

Christianorum tandem gentili a Domino Jesu Christo oritur. Ipse Dei altissimi est Filius, et una cum Spiritu Sancto reuelatus est nobis: de coelis descendit, ex Hebraea uirgine natus, ex uirgine carnem assumpsit, assumpta-que humana natura semet-ipsum Dei Filium reuelauit.

Here I have distinguished by spaced type or by italics every word, which having a double testimony may be referred to the original Greek. As regards omissions, the Greek omits only the epithet ' Hebrew ', which it replaces by the epithet *agia*, and the second reference to 'the Son of God,' where however there is a discrepancy between the two Versions. The Syriac omits [Greek], [79 The Armenian has no omission that can be certainly traced. The additions in each case may be seen at a glance. The Armenian has practically none; though a few lines further down the epithet corresponding to *theotokos* is applied to the Virgin. The most serious change is that in the Syriac, where the word ' God ' is inserted as the subject of the verbs which follow. The passage is one which was more likely than any other in the whole piece to tempt later writers to make changes of their own. It is to be noted that here the Greek in spite of its additions represents the original Apology much more faithfully than the Syriac does.

(6) In the words which follow next the Versions do not agree either with one another, or with the Greek, which has displaced the sentence and gives it a little lower down. But both the Greek and the Syriac appeal to a written Gospel, which the king might read if he chose.

(7) The repetition of the fourfold division of mankind is of course not found in the Greek, and with it has disappeared the problematical sentence: ' To God then ministers wind, and to angels fire; but to demons water, and to men earth.'

At this point the Armenian fragment ends.

What then is the result of our investigation of this opening passage, in which alone we have a triple testimony to the contents of the original Apology?

(1) There is one serious modification (if, indeed, we have not here the original) in the Greek, as it is preserved to us; but it was necessitated by the conditions of its reproduction in its new surroundings.

(2) There is one serious displacement in the Greek; but this was almost necessitated by the modification just mentioned.

(3) The description of the Divine nature is very much abbreviated in the Greek; but no word occurs in it which has not the support of the Versions.

(4) In the Christological passage which we examined in detail the Greek was seen to preserve the original statements, though with the addition of the later phrase |80

(5) The Syriac Version is often loose and inaccurate: it drops a phrase here and there; and it makes insertions by way of explanation or of supplement, and sometimes in such a way as to convey a wholly false conception of the original.

We learn then to expect for the remainder of the Apology that the Greek, as we have it, will as a rule give us the actual words of Aristides, except in the very few places in which modification was obviously needed. Where the Syriac presents us with matter which has no counterpart whatever in the Greek, we shall hesitate to pronounce that the Greek is defective, unless we are able to suggest a good reason for the omission, or to authenticate the Syriac from some external source<sup>9</sup>. The Greek Text of 'Barlaam and Josaphat.'

It is remarkable that this work, which at one time enjoyed such extraordinary popularity, should not have found its way into print in its original language before the present century. The Latin Version wrongly attributed to Georgius Trapezuntius, but really, as the MSS. of it prove, of a much earlier date, was printed, together with various works of S. John of Damascus, at Basel in 1539: but it was reserved to Boissonade to publish the Greek Text for the first time in the fourth volume of his *Anecdota*, which appeared at Paris in 1832.

Boissonade apologises for the meagreness of his apparatus criticus on the ground that an edition was expected almost immediately from Schmidt and Kopitar the librarian of the Imperial Library at Vienna. This edition, however, never appeared. Out. of seventeen MSS. preserved in the Library

at Paris, Boissonade used throughout but two, 903 and 1128, which he refers to as A and C. He gives occasional readings from two others, 904 and 907, which he names B and D. In the portion of the book which specially concerns us, viz. the speech of Nachor, C is defective for about 10 of Boissonade's pages, and the testimony of D is frequently |81 recorded. From time to time readings are also quoted from the Latin Version. This very inadequate text has been reprinted in Migne's Patrologia Graeca, tom. 96, in the third volume of the works of S. John of Damascus: but we have gained nothing by the reproduction except new blunders. In the Wiener Jahrbücher für Deutsche Literatur (lxxii. 274, lxxiii. 176) Schubart has given some description of the Vienna MSS., and a list of the principal variants contained in them.

Lastly, Zotenberg<sup>10</sup> has made a useful list of about 60 MSS., and has constructed a critical text of certain passages of special interest. Nothing however has been attempted as yet in the way of a genealogical classification of the MSS.; a work which will involve great labour, but which is essential to the production of a satisfactory edition. In editing the Remains of the Apology of Aristides I have used three MSS., which were kindly placed at my disposal in Cambridge. I have recorded their variants with a greater completeness than is necessary for my present purpose, in order to aid a future editor of the whole treatise in assigning them without further trouble to their proper families.

(1) I have to thank Miss Algerina Peckover of Wisbech for kindly sending to the University Library a MS. in her possession, which apparently belongs to the beginning of the eleventh century. This Codex is specially interesting for the pictures which a later hand has drawn in the margin, sometimes in ink and sometimes in colours. It is unfortunately defective at the beginning and at the end. It commences with the words [Greek] (Bois. p. 48), and ends with [Greek] (Bois. p. 357). Unhappily it has been corrected very largely throughout, and it is frequently impossible to discover the original readings: those which are obviously by a later hand I have marked as W2.

(2) The authorities of Magdalen College, Oxford, with a like generosity allowed me to use their codex, Gr. 4, side by side with |82 the Wisbech MS. in our Library. This bears the date 1064. It contains besides: a Life of S. Basil, a tract on Images, the Martyrdom of SS. Galaction and Episteme, a tract on Penalties, and a work of Anastasius Sinaiticus. It has remained for the most part uncorrected.

(3) In the Library of Pembroke College, Cambridge, there is a MS. of the 17th century, the readings of which are of sufficient interest to be recorded for the present in spite of its late date; in my apparatus criticvs these MSS. are referred to by the letters W, M and P respectively. I have

now and then recorded readings from the Vienna MSS. collated by Schubart, using the signs V21, V102, &c., where the figures correspond with Schubart's numbers. Wherever I have differed from the text of Boissonade, I have recorded his readings, and sometimes I have expressly mentioned his MSS., A, C and D. I have given in the margin of the Greek text the reference to Boissonade's pages. Where it seemed desirable I have recorded readings of the Latin Version, taking them from the Basel edition of 1539 mentioned above. The Bearing of the Apology on the Canon.

There are but few references to the Books of Scripture in the Apology of Aristides, which thus stands in striking contrast with the works of Justin. On two occasions the Emperor is referred to Christian writings. In the first case a written Gospel is distinctly implied, as the matter in hand is the outline of our Lord's Life; the words in the Greek are 11:

[Greek] (p. 110, l. 21). The second reference is more general, and possibly includes Books outside the Canon: [Greek] (p. 111, l. 24; cf. Syr. supra p. 50 fin.). There are no direct quotations from the New Testament, although the Apologist's diction is undoubtedly coloured at times by the language of the Apostolic writers.

(1) The opening sentence recalls the words of 2 Macc. vii. 28: [Greek] |83 (2) p. 100, l. 11. [Greek]. Cf. Col. i. 17, [Greek] (cf. [Greek] in i. 16).

(3) p. 101, l. 6. [Greek]. This is clearly based on Rom. i, 25:

[Greek]. The addition of [Greek] is interesting. The Syriac translator renders: ' and they began to serve created things instead of the Creator of them'; he is probably led to make the change by the recollection of the Syriac Version (Pesh.) in this passage, where the word ' Creator ' has the suffix of the fem. plural.

(4) p. 104, l. 2. [Greek]. Cf. Rom. i. 22: [Greek].

(5) p. 107, l. 12. [Greek]. These words are a kind of echo, although in a different sense, of Rom. vii. 8: [Greek].

(6) p. 109, l. 12. [Greek]. Here again we seem to feel the influence of the same chapter; Rom. vii. 12, 16, [Greek] (cf. 1 Tim. i. 8).

(7) p. 109, l. 26. [Greek]. The first part of this sentence has

affinities with Heb. xi. 8, 9, [Greek]. And the whole may be compared with Acts xiii. 17, [Greek]. The second part of the phrase however is not attested by the Syr. and Arm. Versions, and may possibly have been introduced by the author of 'Barlaam and Josaph.it' from Ps. cxxxvi. 11, 12.

(8) p. 110, l. 2. [Greek]. This is a combination of words found in S. Matt. xiii. 17, [Greek], and S. Matt, xxiii. |84 37 (cf. S. Luke xiii. 34) [Greek]. But here again we cannot be sure that we have the words of Aristides himself. This last remark applies also to the phrase, [Greek] (p. 110, l. 9), which comes from Rom. x. 2.

(9) p. 110, l. 19. [Greek] clearly comes from Heb. ii. 9; but the Syr. simply has 'He died,' and the Arm. has nothing at all to correspond. Hence we cannot be certain that these are the words of Aristides. They probably have replaced the statement preserved in the Syr. ' He was pierced by the Jews.' Throughout this great Christological passage it is worth noting how the actual phrases of the N. T. are not introduced.

(10) p. 111, l. 30. [Greek]. With this we may perhaps compare 1 Thess. ii. 13, [Greek] The Apology and the Didaché. A source from which our author has drawn part of his description of the life and conduct of the Christians is the Two Ways, though it may well be doubted whether he knew it in the form preserved to us in the Didaché. [...] |85 When we turn to the Epistle of Barnabas we find there the same parallels which have been quoted from the Didaché, [...] |86

It is possible then that here we have a witness to the earlier Two Ways, which has been variously embodied in the Didaché and the Epistle of Barnabas. Some support may be given to this view when we observe that the wording of the negative form of the Golden Rule in our Apology has a greater affinity to the famous interpolations in Codex Bczae than to the clause in the Didaché. This appears partly from the position of the first negative, and partly from the use of [Greek] rather than [Greek].

Let us bring the various texts together: [...]

It is hardly possible therefore to believe that Aristides can have drawn this precept directly from the Didaché in the form in which we know it. The Apology and the Preaching of Peter. At the close of

the Apology Aristides challenges the Emperor 'to examine the writings of the Christians, from which he declares that the materials for his defence are drawn: p. 111, l. 23: [Greek]: or, as it is more fully said in the Syriac Version: ' Take now their writings and read in them, and lo ! ye will find that not of myself have I brought these things forward nor as their advocate have I said them, but as I have read in their writings, these things I firmly believe,' &c.

We have seen already that he refers to a written Gospel for his statements as to the life and work of our Lord. We have also seen that he has drawn part of his description of the conduct of the Christians from the ' Two Ways.' Moreover the Book of |87 Wisdom seems to have influenced his method and his language, in several parts of his work. The following investigation will tend to shew that he owes a still greater debt to a work now lost, which exercised a considerable influence upon the writings of the second century. The Preaching of Peter ( [Greek]) is classed by Eusebius (H . E. in. 3) together with his Acts, his Gospel and his Apocalypse as outside the Canon of writings accepted by the universal Church ( [Greek]). He goes on to say of these four books that none of the early writers or of his contemporaries used quotations from them. This statement is however incorrect: for Clement of Alexandria again and again quotes from both the Preaching and the Apocalypse, as authoritative works. The Preaching of Peter then was one of those books which, like the Didaché, the Epistle of Barnabas and the Shepherd of Hennas, at one time claimed a place in the Canon; though its claim was disallowed, even more emphatically perhaps than the claims of these other competitors.

We must in the first instance gather together all the fragments which can be assigned with certainty to this work<sup>12</sup>. For the sake of clearness I have arranged them in the order in which it will be most easy to compare them with our Apology.

Clem. Al. Strom. VI. 39 ff. [Greek] |88

|89

Ibid. 48.

Ibid. 43.

Ibid. 128. |90

I have given above in full (with one exception; Clem. Strom. i. 182, [Greek]) all the indisputable fragments of the Preaching of Peter<sup>1</sup>: and the parallels adduced from the Apology of Aristides shew that there is an intimate connexion between the two documents.

Before going further into the interesting problem of the reconstruction of the Preaching, let us inquire what light these parallels throw upon the relation of the Syriac Version to the Greek text of the Apology.

(1) Several passages of the Syriac Version, quoted above in the notes, which are wanting in the Greek as we now have it, are authenticated by their similarity to portions of the Preaching. Of these the most important are: (a) the worship of angels attributed to the Jews; (b) the description of the Christians as a ' new people '; (c) the confession of the converted heathen; (d) the attribution of our Lord's sufferings to the Jews, Especially valuable are (a) and (c), as giving us ground for believing that the great closing section of the Syriac Version, which is so curtailed in the Greek, is substantially the writing of Aristides himself.

(2) On the other hand, the division into three races, which we find in the Greek, has the support of the famous [Greek] of the Preaching. The fourfold division of the Syriac and Armenian Versions (Barbarians and Greeks, Jews and Christians) comes therefore under grave suspicion: and the more we examine it, the less primitive it appears. For to the Greek mind the Jews were themselves Barbarians: see, for example, Clem. Strom, vi. 44, [Greek]: and Orig. c. Cels. i. 2, [Greek]. Moreover there seems to be no parallel to this fourfold classification of races in early Christian literature. The Preaching of Peter is quoted by Heracleon (Orig. Comm. in Joan. xiii. 17), and we shall see that possibly it was used by 91 Celsus. It seems also to have been in the hands of the unknown writer of the Epistle to Diognetus. Moreover in the Sibylline Oracles we have several passages which seem to be based on it. Some of these are especially interesting, as shewing coincidences with our Apology, though not with the existing fragments of the Preaching 13.

Now if three or four extant works can be shewn to have drawn materials from a document, which is known to us now only by a few fragments, there is obviously a possibility that the lost document may be to some extent critically reconstructed by a consideration of common matter found in any two of the works, which may accordingly have been taken from the document in question. To attempt to do this fully for the Preaching of Peter would be beyond our present scope: but we may fairly consider here what contributions to such a reconstruction are afforded by our Apology, which has apparently made so free a use of it.

Let us begin with those passages which either the Preaching or the Apology have in common with the Sibylline Oracles. I shall not attempt a discrimination between the various writings which are gathered under the name of the Sibyl, but shall simply give references to Alexandre 's edition of 1869. Prooem. 7 ff. [...] 92 93 94 95 With regard to the second passage, there is a still more striking parallel in c. xvii., preserved to us only in the Syriac Version. ' The Greeks then, O king, because they practise foul things in sleeping with males, and with mother and sister and daughter, turn the ridicule of their foulness upon the Christians; but the Christians are honest and pious,' etc.

These coincidences are worth noting even if we are not prepared, with our present knowledge, to suppose that they send us back for their explanation to the Preaching of Peter.

Next let us turn to the Epistle to Diognetus. As soon as the Armenian

fragment of Aristides was discovered, it was observed that it had points in common with this anonymous Epistle. The coincidences have multiplied greatly with our larger knowledge of the Apology. Several of them have been quoted by Mr Harris in his notes, but it is necessary for our present purpose to bring them together again under one view. I shall do this in the briefest possible form, giving in the footnotes references to such parallels in the Apology as have not already been quoted above. [...] |96 |97

We cannot account for these parallels by merely supposing that Aristides had the Epistle to Diognetus before him: for there are many points in common between Aristides and the Preaching of Peter, such as the worship of angels ascribed to the Jews, which do not appear in the Epistle. Nor will the converse hypothesis hold good. For, to take one instance out of several, the phrase in the Epistle [Greek] is directly parallel to [Greek] in the Preaching; but it has no counterpart in form in the Apology.

Here again then we are guided to the hypothesis that the Preaching lies behind both of these works. Can we gain anything further in the way of its reconstruction? [...] |98

Mr Harris has collected (pp. 23 ff.) several instances of contact between the Apology of Aristides and the True Word of Celsus; and he has suggested that Celsus may have had the Apology in his hands when he wrote his attack upon Christianity. We are now in a position to see that most of the coincidences which have been pointed out would be accounted for by the supposition that it was the Preaching of Peter itself, and not our Apology, which, like ' Jason and Papiscus ' and other apocryphal writings, supplied the materials of his attack. It will be more satisfactory to present the evidence in full as we have done in the previous cases, even at the risk of some repetition. I shall follow the order of Origen's reply. [...] |99

It is not easy on the evidence here collected 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. The statement that the world was made for the sake of man does not find a place in the recognised fragments of the Preaching; but we have given good reasons for believing that it was contained in it. On the other hand, the Apology gives no starting point for the attack of Celsus on Jewish prophecies about the Messiah, whereas the Preaching laid great stress on this point (see above, p. 89).

[...] [Footnotes moved to end and renumbered]

1. 1 Notice sur le livre de Barlaam et

Joasaph, Paris, 1886. A useful summary of the literature on 'B. and J.' is given by Krumbacher in Iwan von Müller's Handbuch der alt. Wissensch. vol. 9, pt. 1, p. 469,

2. 1 A small fragment (below, p. 104), which

is omitted from its proper place in Nachor's speech, is embodied in an early part of the book (Bois. p. 49). We thus see that the writer had the Apology before him at the outset of his work, and designed his plot with the definite intention of introducing it.

3. 2 See, however, below, p. 90; where

reasons are given which tend to shew that the Greek has preserved the original triple division, as against the Syriac and the Armenian.

4. 1 Justini Opera, tom. 2, p. xxix.

5. 1 See however p. 90, where the fourfold

division of mankind, common to Syr. and Arm., is further criticised.

6. 2 Mr Harris inclines to accept this

second title of the Syriac Version as the true one: see above, pp. 7 ff. But the course of the present argument tends to shew that the Syriac translator has introduced many arbitrary changes on his own account: and this makes me the more unwilling to accept his testimony against that of the Armenian Version, which has moreover the explicit statement of Eusebius to support it. The circumstances under which the Greek has been preserved to us necessitated the omission of the

title altogether; so that no direct evidence on the point reaches us from that quarter.

7. 1 See above, p. 70; and further remarks on p. 90.

8. 2 The Syriac is untranslatable as it stands.

9. 1 Cf. *infra*, p. 90.

10. 1 Notice sur le livre de B. et J., pp. 3-5.

11. 1 For the Syriac see above, p. 36 *fin*.

'This is taught from that Gospel,' &c.

12. 1 Hilgenfeld (N. T. *extra Can.* pp. 56 ff.), to whose work I need scarcely acknowledge my indebtedness, has brought together under the head of [Greek], various fragments of the Didascalia Petri, &c. The fact that these find no parallels in Aristides will give a new reason for keeping them separate.

13. 1 The Gnostic Acts of Thomas are frequently indebted to the Preaching of Peter, as may be seen by the following passages: c. 1, [Greek]: C. 15, [Greek]: c. 28, [Greek]: C. 36, [Greek]: C. 38, [Greek]: C. 55, [Greek]: c. 56, [Greek] (see too the argument from prophecy in the same chapter). This text was transcribed by Roger Pearse, 2004. All material on this page is in the public domain - copy freely.

Greek text is rendered using the Scholars Press SP Ionic font, free from here.

Early Church Fathers - Additional Texts

## The Apology - Introduction to the 1891 translation

---

The Apology of Aristides: Texts and Studies 1 (1891) pp.

1-34. Introduction.

INTRODUCTION. THE present volume contains one of the earliest of the Apologies made to the Roman Emperors on behalf of the Christians, that, namely, which was said to have been presented to the Emperor Hadrian by an Athenian philosopher of the name of Aristides. Our information concerning this Apology has hitherto been of the scantiest kind, depending chiefly upon certain allusions of Eusebius in his Ecclesiastical History and in his Chronicon; as Eusebius did not, however, preserve any extracts from the book and presents only a most obscure figure in a philosopher's garb as its author, while subsequent writers have added little or nothing to what they found in Eusebius, it must be admitted that our ideas as to the character and scope of one of the earliest apologetic treatises on Christianity were about as vague as it was possible for them to be. It is true that there was a suspicion abroad which came from Jerome that the lost work of Aristides had been imitated by Justin in his Apology, and Jerome had also ventured the opinion that the Apology was woven out of materials derived from the philosophers: but it was almost impossible to put any faith in Jerome's statements, which are usually mere editorial expansions and colourings of what he found in the pages of Eusebius. Not that there was any à priori improbability in the opinion that one Christian Apologist had imitated another, for almost all the Apologies that are known to us are painfully alike, and it would not be difficult to maintain of any two of them selected at random that one of them had borrowed from or imitated the other. The difficulty lay in the want of literary faith in statements made by Jerome; but even if [2 this confidence had not been wanting, we should not have been very much the wiser. In the case of a companion Apology to that of Aristides, we were more happily placed for forming an opinion; since Eusebius not only describes an Apology presented to the Emperor Hadrian by a certain Quadratus, at the time of one of the imperial visits to Athens, but gives us also some striking and powerful sentences, just enough to convince one that the document was marked by argumentative force and spiritual insight, and could not have been a mere conventional tirade against paganism. Until recent times, then, all that could be said on the subject of these lost Apologies was that we had Eusebian tradition for their existence, Eusebian authority for their date, and a Eusebian extract from one of them as a specimen of sub-apostolic defence, a mere brick from a vanished house. The mist, however, lifted some time ago, when the learned Armenians of the Lazarist monastery at Venice added to the obligations under which they have so often laid the scholarly and Christian world, by publishing an Armenian translation of the opening chapters of the lost Apology of Aristides; and although their document was received in some quarters 1 with incredulity, it will be seen; by what we have presently to bring forward, that the fragment which they printed was rightly entitled, and that they had at least made the way for a satisfactory conception of [3 the dogmatics which underlay the apologetics. This was a great gain. Moreover their published fragment shewed traces of an interesting originality of method in the classification of the religious beliefs of the time. Our contribution to the subject consists of a Syriac translation of

the whole, or substantially the whole, of the missing Apology. We were so happy as to discover this text in a volume of Syriac extracts preserved in the library of the convent of St Catharine, upon Mount Sinai, during a delightful visit which we paid to those majestic solitudes and silences in the spring of 1889. Our copy has suffered somewhat in the course of time from successive transcriptions, and needs occasionally the hand of the critical corrector. The language and thought of the writer are, however, so simple and straightforward that the limits of error are much narrower than they would be in a document where the structure was more highly complicated; the unintelligible sentences which accumulate in a translation so much more rapidly than in the copying of an original document, are almost entirely absent. In fact the writer is more of a child than a philosopher, a child well-trained in creed and well-practised in ethics, rather than either a dogmatist defending a new system or an iconoclast destroying an old one: but this simplicity of treatment, so far from being a weakness, adds often greatly to the natural impressiveness of the subject and gives the work a place by the side of the best Christian writing of his age. But, before going further, it will be best to describe a little more closely the volume from which our text is taken.

Description of the MS. The MS. from which we have copied is numbered 16 amongst the Syriac MSS. of the Sinaitic convent. The MS. may be referred to the 7th century, and is written in two columns to the page. The book is made up of a number of separate treatises and extracts, almost all of which are ethical in character. Thus on fol. 1 b we have [Syriac] or, the history of the Lives of the Fathers, translated from Greek into Syriac. On fol. 2b [syriac]

Apparently we have here the Liber Paradisi or Lives of the Holy Fathers of the Desert, of which many copies exist in Greek, though it may be doubted whether there is any critical edition. Some portions of this Syriac version were published at Upsala by Tullberg and his disciples, in 1851, from MSS. in the Vatican and in the British Museum. In our MS. the current heading of the pages is [syriac]

or, History of the Egyptian Hermits.

After fol. 86 b two leaves appear to have been cut away. Fol. 87 b bears the heading [syriac]

Of the holy Nilus the Solitary.

At the foot of fol. 93 a begins the Apology of Aristides. On fol. 105 a begins [syriac]

or, A discourse of Plutarch on the subject of a man's being assisted by his enemy.

At the foot of fol. 112 a [syriac]

or, A second discourse of the same Plutarch perì a)skh&sewj.

Apparently this is the tract published by Lagarde in his *Analecta*, pp. 177-186, and translated by Gildemeister and Bücheler. |5 On fol. 121 b [syriac]

A discourse of Pythagoras,

probably the same as is published in Lagarde's *Analecta*, pp. 195 -201. On fol. 126 a [syriac]

A discourse of Plutarch, on Anger,

for which see Lagarde, *Analecta Syriaca*, pp. 186-195. On fol. 132 b [syriac]

A discourse of Lucius (Lucianus), that we should not receive slander against our friends:

peri\ tou~ mh\_ r(a|di/wj pisteu&ein diabolh~|.

Apparently the same as is given in Sachau, *Inedita*, pp. 1-16. On fol. 140 a [syriac]

A discourse made by a philosopher, *De Anima*:

probably the same as is given in Sachau, *Inedita*, as *Philosophorum de anima sententiae*. On fol. 143 a, [syriac]

or, the Counsel of Theano, a female philosopher of the school of Pythagoras:

see Sachau, *Inedita*, pp. 70-75, as *Theano: Sententiae 2*. On fol. 145 b a collection of Sayings of the Philosophers, beginning with [Syriac] (Plato the Wise said). On fol. 151 6 [Syriac] A first discourse in explanation of Ecclesiastes, made by Mar John the Solitary for the blessed Theognis. See Wright's *Cat. of the Syr. MSS. in the Brit Mus.* p. 996. [6 And from fol. 214a onward the volume is occupied with translations from the Homilies of Chrysostom on Matthew. The above description will shew something of the value of the MS. It will also suggest that it was the ethical character of the Apology of Aristides that secured its incorporation with the volume. Let us now pass on to discuss the effect which this recovered document has upon our estimate of the Eusebian statements concerning the earliest Church Apologists.

Aristides and Eusebius.

According to the *Chronicon* of Eusebius we have the following date for the Apologies of Quadratus and Aristides:

1. The Armenian version of the *Chronicon* gives under the year 124 A.D. as follows:

Ol. A. Abr. Imp. Rom. d226 2140 8c d Adrianus Eleusinarum rerum gnarus fuit multaue (dona) Atheniensium largitus est. c Romanorum ecclesiae episcopatum excepit septimus Telesphorus annis xi.

Codratus apostolorum auditor et Aristides nostri dogmatis (nostrae rei) philosophus Atheniensis Adriano supplicationes dedere apologeticas (apologiae, responsionis) ob mandatum. Acceperat tamen et a Serennio (s. Serenno) splendido praeside (iudice) scriptum de Christianis, quod nempe iniquum sit occidere eos solo rumore sine inquisitione, neque ulla accusatione. Scribit Armonicus Fundius (Phundius) proconsuli Asianorum ut sine ullo damno et incusatione non damnarentur; et exemplar edicti eius hucusque circumfertur.

One of the Armenian MSS. (Cod. N) transfers this notice about the Apologists to the following year, and it is believed that this represents more exactly the time of Hadrian's first visit to Athens (125-126 A.D.). With this agrees the dating of the Latin version of Jerome. We may say then that it is the intention of Eusebius to refer the presentation of both these [7 Apologies to the time when Hadrian was spending his first winter in Athens; and to make them the reason for the Imperial rescript to Minucius Fundanus which we find attached to the first Apology of Justin Martyr. And since Minucius Fundanus and his predecessor Granius were consuls suffect in the years 106

and 107, it is not unreasonable to suppose that they held the Asian pro-consulate in the years A.D. 123 and 124, or 124 and 125. If then Aristides and Quadratus presented apologies to Hadrian, it is reasonable to connect these Apologies with his first Athenian winter and not with the second (A.D. 129-130). But here we begin to meet with difficulties; for, in the first place, much doubt has been thrown on the genuineness of the rescript of the emperor to Minucius Fundanus; in the second place there is a suspicious resemblance between Quadratus the Apologist and another Quadratus who was bishop of Athens in the reign of Antoninus Pius, succeeding to Publius whom Jerome affirms to have been martyred; and in the third place our newly-recovered document cannot by any possibility be referred to the period suggested by Eusebius, and there is only the barest possibility of its having been presented to the Emperor Hadrian at all. Let us examine this last point carefully, in order to answer, as far as our means will permit, the question as to the time of presentation of the Apology of Aristides and the person or persons to whom it was addressed. The Armenian fragment is headed as follows: To the Emperor Hadrian Caesar, from Aristides, philosopher of Athens.

There is nothing, at first sight, to lead us to believe that this is the original heading; such a summary merely reflects the Eusebian tradition and might be immediately derived from it. When we turn to the Syriac Version, we find a somewhat similar preface, to the following effect.

Apology made by Aristides the Philosopher before Hadrianus the King, concerning the worship of Almighty God. But this, which seems to be a mere literary heading, proper, shall we say, for one out of a collection of apologies, is immediately followed by another introduction which cannot be anything else than a part of the primitive apology. It runs as follows:

...Caesar Titus Hadrianus Antoninus, Worshipful and Clement, from Marcianus Aristides, philosopher of Athens. The additional information which we derive from this sentence is a sufficient guarantee of its genuineness; we have the first name of the philosopher given, as Marcianus; and we have the name of the emperor addressed given at length. To our astonishment this is not Hadrian, but his successor Antoninus Pius, who bears the name of Hadrian by adoption from Publius Aelius Hadrianus. Unless therefore we can shew that there is an error or a deficiency in the opening sentence of the Apology we shall be obliged to refer it to the time of the emperor Antoninus Pius, and to say that Eusebius has made a mistake in reading the title of the Apology, or has followed some one who had made the mistake before him. And it seems tolerably clear that if an error exist at all in such a precise statement as ours, it must be of the nature of an omission. Let us see what can be urged in favour of this theory. We will imagine that the original title contained the names both of Hadrian and of Antoninus Pius, his adviser and companion, much in the same way as Justin opens his first Apology with the words, "to the Emperor Titus Aelius Hadrianus Antoninus Pius Augustus Caesar and to his son Verissimus the Philosopher, and to Lucius the Philosopher, natural son of Caesar and adopted son of Pius...I Justin...have written the following appeal and supplication." In support of this theory we might urge the apparent dislocation of the opening sentence of our Apology. The Syriac version is clearly wrong in its punctuation, for example, since it transfers the expression [Syriac] (Almighty) to Caesar, by placing a colon after the word [Syriac] (God). This is clearly impossible, for that the writer did not attempt to translate, say,  $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\kappa\rho\alpha\ \tau\omega\rho$  as if it were  $\pi\alpha\tau\omicron\kappa\rho\alpha\ \tau\omega\rho$  will be evident from his correct use of the Divine attribute later on in his work. But even if the translator had been guilty of such a mistake, the case would not have been bettered, because Antonine would now have been styled Emperor as well as

Caesar. But let us imagine if we please that the term Caesar or |9 Emperor Caesar belongs to a previous name which has dropped out and supply the connective necessary, so as to read, "To the Emperor Aelius Hadrianus Augustus Caesar and to Titus Hadrianus Antoninus." In support of this we may urge that the adjectives which follow are marked in the Syriac with the sign of the plural, as if the writer imagined himself to be addressing more persons than one. Supposing then that this is the case we should still have to face the question as to the name given to Antonine; if he is called Hadrian, this must mean that the Apology is presented at some time subsequent to his adoption, which is generally understood to have taken place in the year A.D. 138, only a little while before Hadrian's death. So that in any case we should be prohibited by our document from dating the Apology in question either in the first visit of Hadrian to Athens or in the second visit, and we should only have the barest possibility that it was presented to Hadrian at all. It would have, so to speak, to be read to him on his death-bed at Baiae. Seeing then the extreme difficulty of maintaining the Hadrianic or Eusebian hypothesis, we are driven to refer the Apology to the reign of Antoninus Pius, and to affirm that Eusebius made a mistake in reading or quoting the title of the book, in which mistake he has been followed by a host of other and later writers. If he followed a text which had the heading as in the Syriac, he has misunderstood the person spoken of as Hadrian the king; and if on the other hand he takes the opening sentences as his guide, he has made a superficial reference, which a closer reading would have corrected. All that is necessary to make the Syriac MS. intelligible is the introduction of a simple prepositional prefix before the imperial name, and the deletion of the ribbui points in the adjectives. Nor is this all; for there can be no doubt that the two adjectives in question ([Syriac]) are intended to represent two of the final titles of Antoninus: [Syriac] standing for the Greek Sebasto&j, which again is the equivalent of the Latin Augustus; and [Syriac] being the equivalent of the title Pius which the Roman Senate gave to Antoninus shortly after his accession and which the Greeks render by eu)sebh&j. And it is precisely in this order that the titles are usually found, |10 viz. Augustus Pius, which the Syriac has treated as adjectives, and connected by a conjunction. Moreover this translation of eu)sebh&j on the part of the Syriac interpreter shews that the meaning of the title is 'clement' or 'compassionate,' rather than that of mere filial duty, which agrees with what we find in a letter of Marcus Aurelius to Faustina; "haec (clementia) patrem tuum imprimis Pii nomine ornavit 3."

Now how will this conclusion react upon the companion Apology of Quadratus? We could, no doubt, maintain that it leaves the question where it found it. The mistake made by Eusebius need not have been a double error, and the correct reference to Hadrian for Quadratus's Apology would have furnished a starting-point for the incorrect reasoning with regard to Aristides. On this supposition we should simply erase the reference to Aristides from Eusebius and his imitators. But there is one difficulty to be faced, and that is the fact that we were in confusion over Quadratus before we reached any conclusion about Aristides. And our investigation has not helped to any elucidation of the confusion. Read for example the language in which Eusebius (H. E. IV. 3) describes the presentation of the Apology,

[Greek] and compare it with the Greek of the Chronicon as preserved by Syncellus,

[Greek] and we naturally suspect with Harnack<sup>4</sup> that the title must have been something like the following,

[Greek] and we are confirmed in this belief by finding that the Aristides Apology was also headed a)pologi/a u(pe'r th~j qeosebei/aj?: at least its literary heading must have been very like this. [11 May we not also infer that the opening sentences of the Quadratus-Apology must have contained the dedication Ai0li/w| 9Adrianw~| which we find suggested above? But when we have made these suppositions the similarity between the two apologies in the titles is very great, for Aelius Hadrianus is also a part of the adopted name of the emperor Antoninus. And let us look at the matter from another point of view. One of our early sources of information about Quadratus, the bishop of Athens, is found in a passage of a letter of Dionysius of Corinth preserved by Eusebius, and certainly Dionysius of Corinth ought to be good authority for Athenian religious history of the time immediately preceding his own. Eusebius does not actually quote the letter which Dionysius wrote to the church at Athens, but he tells us its scope and makes it easy to divine its contents: his language is as follows:

[Greek] From this it would naturally be inferred that the Quadratus mentioned in the letter was a contemporary of Dionysius of Corinth; for the latter writes to the Athenians at once convicting them of slackness in the faith, and congratulating them on their happy revival under the ministrations of Quadratus. And since Dionysius writes letters also to Soter, the bishop of Rome, who belongs to the early years of Marcus Aurelius, we should probably say that Quadratus was not very much earlier than this, which would place him in the reign of Antoninus Pius. And the persecution at Athens which ended in the martyrdom of Publius must therefore fall in the same reign. Now Jerome (de Virr. ill. § 19) identifies this Quadratus, the bishop of Athens, with the Apologist 5, and consequently pushes back the persecution into the [12 reign of Hadrian. We do not indeed attach any especial weight to Jerome's statement as to the time of the persecution, which is simply a combination made up out of passages from Eusebius concerning Quadratus and Dionysius with slight amplifications. He can hardly be right in placing the persecution under the reign of Hadrian, for, as Lightfoot points out 6, Eusebius, from whom he draws his facts, knows nothing about it: moreover we have information from Melito 7 that Antoninus Pius did actually write to Athens to suppress a persecution of the Christians. But, on the other hand, may he not be right after all in his identification of the bishop Quadratus with the Apologist, and do not the circumstances of the persecution suggested by Melito and testified to by Dionysius exactly suit the presentation of the Apology to the emperor?

While then we would readily admit that, as long as the Apology of Aristides was held to belong to the time of an Athenian visit of Hadrian, the Apology of Quadratus naturally remained with it, yet on the other hand when the Hadrian hypothesis is untenable for Aristides, will not the Quadratus-bishop and Quadratus-apologist naturally run together, and be one and the same person? Or is there anything to prevent the identification? The words 'apostolorum discipulus,' used by Jerome, and the corresponding words of Eusebius, a0posto&lwn a0kousth&j, can hardly be held to militate seriously against this hypothesis, for they are evident deductions from the passage which Eusebius quotes from the Apology of Quadratus about the sick people healed by the Lord, 'some of whom continued down to our times.' Jerome says boldly that Quadratus had seen very many of the subjects of our Lord's miracles; which is in any case a gross exaggeration. But if such persons, either many or few, had really lived into the age of Quadratus, it would be very difficult to place [13 the Apologist in the reign of Antoninus Pius. Unless, therefore, it can be maintained that the language quoted by Eusebius from Quadratus is an exaggeration or a

misunderstanding we can hardly identify the bishop with the apologist. This is the furthest point to which the evidence carries the argument. And now let us return to Aristides and see whether we can determine anything further concerning the time and manner of presentation of the Apology. And first of all we may say that the simplicity of the style of the Apology is in favour of an early date. The religious ideas and practices are of an antique cast. The ethics shew a remarkable continuity with Jewish ethics: the care for the stranger and the friendless, the burial of the dead and the like, are given as characteristic virtues both of Judaism and of Christianity. Indeed we may say that one of the surprising things about the Apology is the friendly tone in which the Jews are spoken of: one certainly would not suspect that the chasm between the Church and the Synagogue had become as practically impassable as we find it in the middle of the second century. There is no sign of the hostile tone which we find towards the Jews in the martyrdom of Polycarp, and nothing like the severity of contempt which we find in the Epistle to Diognetus. If the Church is not in the writer's time any longer under the wing of the Synagogue, it has apparently no objection to taking the Synagogue occasionally under its own wing.

Such a consideration seems to be a mark of antiquity, and one would, therefore, prefer to believe, if it were possible, that the Apology was earlier than the Jewish revolt under Bar-Cochab. But since we have shewn that view to be untenable (and yet how attractive if we could place Aristides in the second visit of Hadrian to Athens, and Quadratus in the first !) we must content ourselves with seeking as early a date as is consistent with the superscriptions.

Another point that seems ancient about our Apology is that it contains traces, and very interesting traces, of the use of a creed, very similar to the Apostolic Symbol, but involving certain notable points of difference. We shall discuss the question more at length by and by; but at present it will be interesting to notice, especially in view of the obviously friendly attitude of the writer towards the Jews, that his creed contained a clause to the effect that 'He was crucified by the Jews,' perhaps without the clause that was current in later times, 'under Pontius Pilate.' Now I am aware that there are some persons to whom this will seem an argument for a later date; for example M. Renan, *Origines* vi. p. 277, says: "les Chrétiens commençaient à faire retomber sur l'ensemble de la nation juive un reproche que sûrement ni Pierre ni Jacques ni l'auteur de l'Apocalypse ne songeaient à lui adresser, celui d'avoir crucifié Jésus." It would be interesting however to compare this statement of M. Renan with the language of Peter in Acts ii. 36, "Whom ye crucified;" of James in Ep. v. 6, "ye murdered the Just;" or with the writer of the Apocalypse where he describes Jerusalem as the spiritual Sodom and Egypt, "where also our Lord was crucified." The very same charge is made by Justin in his dialogue with Trypho 8, who uses language very similar to that of the Epistle of James, and in discussing the miseries which have befallen the Jewish race, says pointedly "Fairly and justly have these things come upon you; for Ye slew the Just One." Why should we assume such a sentiment to be a mark of late date?

These references do not, however, suggest that the sentence in question was in the Creed. To prove that, we should have to go much farther afield, for the known forms of early creeds do not seem to contain it: if, however, we were to examine the Apocryphal Christian Literature of the early centuries, we should, no doubt, find many traces of the lost sentence. For example, it comes over and over in the Apocryphal Acts of John, a Gnostic document which Wright edited and translated from the Syriac. Here we find the sentence frequently in the very connexion which it would have with other Christian dogmatic statements if it had been incorporated with some actual form of the

Symbol of Faith. When we find that these Acts give us as the staple of Apostolic teaching that

|15

"The Jews crucified Him on the tree, And He died And rose after three days, And He is God, And He ascended to Heaven And is at the right hand of His Father"

we must admit that the sequence of ideas, and probably the very words, are from a Creed. The same thing is true when we find the Apostle speaking, and saying

"In the name of Jesus the Messiah, God, Whom the Jews crucified and killed in Jerusalem; And He died and was buried And rose after three days: And lo ! He is above in Heaven At the right hand of His Father."

At all events we may maintain that there is evidence for the diffusion of the Creed in early times under a slightly different form to that generally received, and if so, we may call it a mark of antiquity to have the Apology of Aristides expressing itself to that effect; for certainly no such sentence in the generally received Creed existed in later times, however widely the sentiment against the Jews may have been diffused.

It is interesting also to compare the custom of the early Christians in the matter of fasting, that they might relieve by their self-denial the necessities of the poor. This is precisely what we find described so fully in the Similitudes of Hermas (Sim. v. 3), where the directions are given that on the day when we fast we are ourselves to eat only bread and water, and calculate the amount saved thereby and bestow it on the poor. Now very many of the later fathers teach the same doctrine, that fasting and alms are conjoined in duty and merit, and that it is proper, under certain circumstances, for the church to call for such an expression of religion. But what makes for the antiquity of the Apology is that the whole church fasts, not merely one day, but two or three days, and that not by direction or rule, but because they are poor and have no other way of meeting the needs of those who are poorer |16 than themselves. It is a spontaneous, rather than a commanded charity, dictated at once by love and necessity. Can such a practice in such a form be other than early? But if the Apology is early in its doctrines and practices, where shall we place it? Must it not be at least as early as the first years of the reign of Antoninus Pius? But here we are in difficulty again, for, if we assume that the Apology was presented to Antoninus Pius in person, we have no satisfactory evidence that Antoninus was ever in the East, or in Greece after his accession, and even the suspicions as to an Eastern visit belong to a later period of his reign, say A.D. 154. Did Aristides present the Apology at Rome or elsewhere? May we infer from his calling himself Marcianus Aristides, Philosopher of Athens, that he was in some city not his own natural dwelling-place? For that he came from Athens is deducible not only from his own statement but also from the fact to which we have already alluded that Antoninus wrote to Athens to suppress a persecution of the Christians. But this almost implies that Antoninus was not in Athens when he received the Apology, or where would be the need of writing a letter at all? He must have been out of Greece.

Only two solutions seem to present themselves, (i) that Aristides journeyed to Rome to present his apology; (ii) that Antoninus made some unrecorded visit to the East.

Now with regard to the second of these suppositions there is reason, outside of our argument and its necessities, to believe that some such visit must have taken place, and that Antoninus held court at Smyrna, some time after his accession to the throne. In the celebrated letter of Irenaeus to Florinus (written probably later than A.D. 189) the writer speaks of having seen Florinus when he lived in lower Asia with Polycarp, when he was at the royal court, and rising in esteem there; he, Irenaeus, being at that time a boy. Now this seems to imply some kind of royal residence at Smyrna; but it has always been difficult to determine what is meant by such a royal residence. The problem is discussed by Lightfoot in his Ignatius (ed. ii. vol. I. p. 449), It cannot be Hadrian's visit in A.D. 129, which would be too early; and Lightfoot thinks that although there is some reason for believing [17 Antoninus Pius to have been in Syria, and presumably also in Asia Minor, somewhere about A.D. 154, 155, this date is too late, on account of the mention of Polycarp. Accordingly Lightfoot frames, with some hesitation, the following hypothesis: "About the year 136 T. Aurelius Fulvus was proconsul of Asia. Within two or three years of his proconsulate he was raised to the imperial throne, and is known as Antoninus Pius. Even during his proconsulate omens marked him as the future occupant of the imperial throne. ...Florinus may have belonged to his suite, and Irenaeus in after years might well call the proconsul's retinue the 'royal Court' by anticipation, especially if Florinus accompanied him to Rome, &c." This ingenious hypothesis only fails to meet our requirement on one point, viz. that the name given to Antoninus in the Apology is the name given him after adoption, and so is subsequent to Feb. 25, A.D. 138. But suppose we imagine a visit of Antoninus to Asia Minor some years later than this, we could find then some support for the theory that Aristides presented his Apology to the Emperor at Smyrna. For we might say that the name of Marcianus is a conspicuous one in the Church at Smyrna. When the Church of the Smyrnaeans wrote for the Church of Philomelium the account of the martyrdom of Polycarp, they employed to compose the narrative a person whom they characterise as our brother Marcianus 9. Now it is worthy of note that this person must have been conspicuous in the Church of Smyrna, for he is probably the same person to whom Irenaeus, whose relations with the Church at Smyrna are so intimate, dedicated one of his treatises 10. Moreover the relations of the Church to the Emperor through Florinus would have been favourable for the presentation of the Apology.

Let us then say, in recapitulation, that we have found it difficult to assign the Apology to any other period than the early years of the reign of Antoninus Pius; and it is at least conceivable that it may have been presented to the Emperor, along with other Christian writings, during an unrecorded visit of his to his ancient seat of government in Smyrna.

[18

There are a few later references to Aristides to which we have drawn no attention hitherto, because it seemed to be impossible to extract any trustworthy data from them: they are as follows:

(1) A passage in a letter of Jerome to Magnus, "Aristides philosophus, vir eloquentissimus, eidem principi (Hadriano) Apologeticum pro Christianis obtulit, contextum philosophorum sententiis, quem imitatus postea Justinus, et ipse philosophus." This is simply a réchauffé of the Eusebian data, with reflections thereupon. Justin being a philosopher, his Apology naturally imitates the philosophical treatise which has preceded his own.

(2) Martyrologium Vetus Romanum<sup>11</sup> ad v. Nonas

Octobris.

"Athenis Dionysii Areopagitae sub Hadriano diversis tormen-tis passi, ut Aristides testis est in opere quod de Christiana religione composuit; hoc opus apud Athénien ses inter antiquorum memorias clarissimum tenetur." Aristides himself is commemorated on ii. Kal. Septr. and it is said that in his treatise he maintained "quod Christus Jesus solus esset Deus."

It would be very interesting to determine how the Martyrologies arrived at these statements. Our Syriac Apology certainly contains no trace of an allusion to Dionysius the Areopagite; on the other hand it fairly enough teaches the Divinity of Christ. We would dismiss the statements at once as archaeological fictions if it had not been that evidence has been produced for the existence of a Latin version of Aristides. Harnack's attention was drawn by the pastor Kawerau to the following letter of Witzel to Beatus Rhenanus, dated Bartholomew's day 1534. "Dedisti nobis Eusebium, praeterea Tertullianum. Restat ut pari nitore des Justinum Martyrem, Papiam et Ignatium graece excusum. Amabo, per Bibliothecas oberrare, venaturus si quid scripsit Quadratus, si praeter epistolam alia Polycarpus, si nonnihil praeter Apologeticum Aristides. Despice, si quae supersunt Cornelii et tanta bonorum librorum panoethria. Plures sunt Dionysii scriptores, sed omnes praeter unum Areopagitem desyderamus, qui utinam sua quoque in lingua extaret. Utinam exorirentur Stromata Clementis, breviter quicquid est kro&ni+on. Tineae pascuntur libris, quibus |19 homines pasci debebamus &c." I have given the extract from Harnack's copy 12, not having access to the original letter.

It seems to me that Witzel's language almost implies that the Apology was already in print in Latin. Is it conceivable that some portion of the Apology may have found its way into print before the year 1534 and remained unnoticed in later times? But even if it existed in manuscript, we must leave it an open question whether it may not have contained some matter which is wanting in the Syriac; nevertheless it is à priori extremely improbable that the story about the martyrdom of Dionysius the Areopagite can belong here.

Celsus and Aristides.

We have alluded above to a possible connexion between the True Word of Celsus and the Apology of Aristides, and it may be worth while to follow the matter up a little closer for the following reasons:

1. Celsus is undoubtedly very nearly contemporary with Aristides; although it is difficult to determine his date exactly (and even Origen was doubtful as to his identity), we may probably say with a good assurance of safety that he was at the zenith of his influence and fame under the reign of Antoninus Pius.

2. It is peculiarly difficult to determine what Christian books had come into the hands of Celsus, whether gospels or other literature. We know however for certain that he had read the dialogue between Jason and Papiscus, a work of Aristo of Pella, written not long after the close of the Jewish war under Hadrian, and so at a period very near to the one in which we are interested. Now if he were reading contemporary Christian literature he could hardly miss

Aristides.

3. And since we find more and closer parallels between the fragments preserved by Origen from the great work of Celsus and our Apology than between most of the other books of the century, it is at least a fair question whether Aristides was not one of the persons to whom Celsus undertook to reply.

|20

One of the leading beliefs in Aristides is that God made all things for the sake of man. This doctrine he repeats in various forms, shewing that the separate elements, the earth, the air, the fire, and the water together with the sun, moon and stars, are his ministers. Now Celsus seems to have been particularly opposed to this doctrine and to have discussed it at length: it was one of the points of contact between the Stoic philosophy and the Jewish and Christian faiths, and Celsus was, no doubt, well prepared to be diffuse on the subject by many previous philosophical encounters.

He draws ridiculous pictures of the philosophy of the frogs in the swamp, of the ants in their ant-hill, and of beavies of bats, discussing the to them obvious proposition that the world has been made solely for their benefit. Accordingly Origen remarks, [Greek] 13. In which sentence he has pretty well covered the argument from Providence as stated by Aristides. Were the elements and the stars, says he, made for the self-congratulation and self-exaltation of the bat, the frog, or----the man? But he carries out the argument in detail: a providence over man is as reasonable as a providence over beasts and vegetables, which can be proved from the same data. [Greek] 14. Indeed, according to Celsus, Providence is more apparent in the case of ants and bees and the like, which obtain their food without labour or with much less labour than happens in the case of man. He will not hear of such a statement as that the sun and stars serve man, much less what Aristides affirms, that the sun was created to serve the multiplicity of human need. Do not, says he, quote me verses from Euripides about sunshine and shade serving man; how do they serve him any more than the ants or the flies, which sleep |21 and wake much as we do? [Greek] 15;

Now of course we do not mean to suggest that Aristides invented the argument from Providence or that Celsus was the first to heap easy scorn upon it. The argument and the reply are commonplaces. Celsus's question as to whether the world was created for the sake of vegetables will be found discussed in Cicero, de Natura Deorum II. 133. "Cuiusnam causa tantarum rerum molitio sit? Arborumne et herbarum? quae quamquam sine sensu sunt, tamen a natura sustentur. At id quidem absurdum est. An bestiarum? Nihilo probabilius, deos mutorum et nihil intelligentium causa tantum laborasse----Ita fit credibile deorum et hominum causa factum esse mundum, quaeque in eo sint omnia."

It is easy to see how both the Jewish and Christian teachers, starting from the same text, the first verse in the book of Genesis, and formulating the same statement of faith, that the Almighty was 'Maker of Heaven and Earth,' found themselves fighting in the ranks with the Stoics against the Epicureans, and so exposed from time to time to the infinite raillery which seemed to the latter school to be proper to the situation. As we have said, Aristides does not stand alone in the statement. Justin Martyr takes the same ground and implies that it is a part of the regular Christian teaching. "We are taught," says he, "that God in His goodness created all things in the beginning from formless matter, for the sake of man<sup>16</sup>;" and the unknown writer of the Epistle to Diognetus affirms that "God loved men, for whom He made the world, to whom He subjected all things that

are in the earth<sup>17</sup>."

It is however worthy of notice that in Aristides the argument is repeated over and over, and that Celsus answers it, as Origen thought, at unnecessary length. It is not therefore inconceivable that Aristides may have drawn the Epicurean fire upon himself (and in this matter we may certainly count Celsus with the Epicureans) by the stress which he laid on the point in his Apology.

Let us pass on to another point upon which Aristides is <sup>22</sup>

somewhat original, viz. the doctrine of the races of the world and of their origin.

Aristides divides the world into four races, the Barbarian, the Greek, the Jew, the Christian. The last two races are curiously described; the Jews derive their origin from Abraham, Isaac and Jacob: they went down from Syria into Egypt; they came back from Egypt into Syria. As for the Christians, the new race, they derive their origin from Jesus the Messiah, and He is called the Son of God Most High.

Now in the first book against Celsus, Origen remarks as follows: "Celsus promises that he will speak on the subject of the Jews later on, and he begins his discourse concerning our Saviour, as being the leader of our generation in so far as we are Christians

<sup>18</sup>, and he goes on to say that he was the leader of this teaching, a few years ago, being regarded by the Christians as the Son of God."

Now it is worthy of note that if Celsus is handling any written document, that document proceeded from the discussion of the Jews to the Christians, affirmed Christ to be the head of the new race, and declared that His followers regarded Him as the Son of God. The agreement at this point with Aristides is certainly striking. When moreover we come to the discussion of the Jews, Celsus breaks out that the 'Jews were mere Egyptian runaways, and that this darling people of God had never done anything worth remembering<sup>19</sup>,' just as if he had passed over the names of the Patriarchs and fastened on the admission that the Jews had come out of Egypt. Accordingly Origen replies that it is universally agreed that the Jews reckon their genealogy from Abraham, Isaac and Jacob; [Greek]. When Aristides deals with the beliefs of the Jews he expresses the remarkable opinion that the Jewish ritual is rather an adoration of angels than a worship of God. The expression is the more remarkable, because Aristides affects to reason throughout as the <sup>23</sup> philosopher rather than the Christian, and he forgets himself and introduces the angels without even an explanation to the emperor, as to what beings are intended. What shall we say then when we find Celsus affirming that the Jews worship angels <sup>20</sup>? [Greek] And Origen is so puzzled as to ask 'where in the world did Celsus find in the Mosaic writings instruction in the worship of angels?' It is certainly curious that we find the missing link supplied by the Apology of Aristides. No doubt further analogies might be traced; for example, Celsus is especially irate with the Christians for their ridicule of Egyptian superstitions<sup>21</sup>, they see nothing except ephemeral animals, instead of grasping eternal ideas. Now there is no doubt that it is a very common subject of Christian merriment, but perhaps no one of the early Christian Writers has laughed so much in detail about it as Aristides. We will not however press the matter further: there are always numerous points of contact and necessary collisions between the attack and the defence of given religions: suffice it to say that we have shewn it to be by no means an inconceivable proposition that Celsus had read the Apology of Aristides before he penned his 'Alhqh\_j lo&goj. The Symbol of the Faith in the time

of Aristides.

Aristides the Philosopher is a Christian who has preserved the philosophic manner, and probably the philosophic dress, with a view to future service in the gospel. It seems to have been the practice of not a few of the famous second-century Christians to attract an audience in this way. Justin certainly did so, and almost as surely Tatian; and if these why not Aristides? But as we have already said, the professedly dispassionate presentation of the Christian case, the endeavour to talk reasonably on all sides successively, soon breaks down; the man throws off his disguise and gives the note of challenge: *Christianus sum; nihil Christianum alienum a me puto*. He talks of angels as though all men knew them, dashes through the dogmatic statements of the Church as though they were perfectly familiar, and without a

|24 word of preliminary explanation of terms, makes a peroration of the impending judgment-day. And so the philosopher with an imperial audience turns out to be another illustration of the Christian city that is set on a hill and cannot be hid.

It is especially interesting to observe that in the time of Aristides the Church already had a Symbol of the Faith: and we may reconstruct a good many of its sentences. Of course in such matters we proceed from the things that are practically certain to those which are less demonstrable; we should not start by saying that the words "Maker of heaven and earth" were proof of the existence of an approximately fixed symbol. But if we can establish other sentences with good confidence, there is no reason to omit these words from the reconstructed formula. The certain passage from which we proceed is in the words:

"He was pierced (crucified) by the Jews;

"He died and was buried;"

" and they say that after three days He rose, and ascended into Heaven."

It may be taken for granted that these words represent a part of the *Symbolum Fidei* as known to Aristides.

What else may we say was contained in his creed? We may add words which must have stood respectively at the beginning and ending of the Creed: viz. that God was the Maker of Heaven and Earth; and that Jesus Christ was to come to judge the world.

Whether we can go further is a more difficult question: but there is at least a strong suspicion that the creed contained the clause "He was born of the Virgin Mary;" for in Aristides' statement the language about the 'Hebrew virgin' precedes the account of the Crucifixion; moreover, here also, we find Aristides is most pronounced in the enunciation of the doctrine, and Celsus is emphatically scornful in the rejection of it. Accordingly Celsus brings forward the story of the infidelity of Mary, affirming that the father of Jesus was in reality a soldier whose name was Panthera

22. The same story appears in the Talmud under the name Pandera, which is a transliteration of the foregoing.

|25

Indeed it has been generally held that the legend was invented by the Jews, through the difficulty of accounting for our Lord's birth; apparently, therefore, the Jews were in search of a more tenable hypothesis than the paternity of Joseph; and it is not unreasonable to refer to an early Jewish scandal the story which we find in the Talmud and in Celsus. But if the story be Jewish in origin, it was certainly Greek in manufacture. Some persons have tried to explain the Greek name Panthera by regarding it as a symbol of violent and unrestrained lust. They are, however, mistaken: the name is simply a Greek anagram on the word 'Parthenos,' by which the Blessed Virgin was commonly known. Those who are familiar with the literary tricks of that time, its anagrams, acrostics, isopsephics, and the like, will have not the least difficulty in seeing that this is the true solution. The inventor has only changed the order of the letters and slightly altered the ending of the word. Everything that we know of the dogmatics of the early part of the second century agrees with the belief that at that period the Virginity of Mary was a part of the formulated Christian belief. Nor need we hesitate, in view of the antiquity of the Panthera-fable, to give the doctrine a place in the creed of Aristides.

We restore the fragments of Aristides' creed, then, as follows:

We believe in one God, Almighty Maker of Heaven and Earth: And in Jesus Christ His Son

\* \* \* \* Born of the Virgin Mary:

\* \* \* \* He was pierced by the Jews:

He died and was buried: The third day He rose again:

He ascended into Heaven:

\* \* \* \* He is about to come to judge.

\*

\*

\*

\* |26

The Armenian Fragment of the Apology.

We give, later on, the Latin translation of the Armenian fragment, as published by the Venetian editors. The passage has also been translated into German by von Himpel

23, and this translation will be found in Harnack's *Griechische Apologeten*, pp. 110-112. Von Himpel rightly affirms the Armenian text to have been made from the Greek: it will be observed, however, that the Armenian text has the same lacuna as the Syriac in the discourse on the four elements and the powers to which they are respectively subject. This lacuna would seem to be an early feature of the Greek text.

There are one or two points in which we may get some authority from the Armenian for the original text. For instance in c. ii. where the Syriac reads that the origin of the Greeks is to be traced through "Danaus the Egyptian, and through Kadmus, and through Dionysus." Here the Armenian

reads "Danaus the Egyptian and Kadmus the Sidonian and Dionysus the Theban," and I am disposed to believe the words added in the Armenian belong there: for instance, we may compare Tatian's language

24, "Dionysus is absolute sovereign over the Thebans." In a similar manner something seems to have dropped in the Syriac after the statement that in God there is no distinction of male or female; for the Armenian text adds the reason "quia cupiditatibus agitur qui huic est distinctioni obnoxius." Again in the opening sentences of the Apology the Armenian text has the words, "Eum autem qui rector atque creator est omnium, investigare perdifficile est

25." We recognize at once in these words the ring of the characteristic Christian quotation from the Timaeus, which is usually employed to shew the superior illuminating power of Christian grace over philosophic research, but seems here to be taken in the Platonic sense. The Armenian is perhaps a little nearer to the Platonic language than the Syriac; both versions however will claim the passage from the Timaeus as a parallel.

|27

Allowing then for the occasional preservation of a passage in greater purity by the Armenian fragment, we shall find that the Armenian translator has often made changes, and added glosses, and epitomized sentences. For example, in the summary of the Christian Faith, he describes the Son as the Logos, His mother as the Theotokos. When the disciples are sent forth, in order that a certain oi0konomi/a may be fulfilled, the Armenian translator calls it a dispensation of illuminating truth; the preaching too is with 'signs following,' 'comitantibus prodigiis,' which seems to come from Mark xvi. 20 and would be, if genuine, one of the earliest illustrations of that text. It will be seen how large an element of paraphrase is found in the Armenian text. The Armenian Fragment (from the Venice edition).

IMPERATORI CAESARI HADRIANO,

ARISTIDES, PHILOSOPHUS ATHENIENSIS.

Ego, O Rex, Dei providentia creatus, hunc mundum ingressus sum, et caelis, terra ac mari, sole, luna et stellis, caeterisque omnibus creaturis conspectis, huius mundi constitutionem admirans miratus sum, atque conscius factus sum mihi, quoniam omnia quae sunt in mundo necessitate ac vi diriguntur, omnium creatorem et rectorem esse Deum: quia iis omnibus quae reguntur atque moventur, fortior est creator et rector.

Eum autem, qui rector atque creator est omnium, investigare perdifficile atque in immensum pertinens mihi videtur: penitus vero eum et certa ratione describere, quum inexplicabilis et ineffabilis sit, impossibile et sine ulla prorsus utilitate. Deus enim naturam habet infinitam, imperscrutabilem et creaturis omnibus incomprehensibilem. Hoc unum scire necesse est, qui creaturas universas Providentia sua gubernat, ipsum esse Dominum Deum et creatorem omnium: quia visibilia omnia creavit bonitate sua, eaque humano generi donavit. Quapropter illum solum, utpote unum Deum, nos adorare et glorificare oportet: unumquemque autem nostrum proximum suum sicut semetipsum diligere.

|28

Verumtamen de Deo saltem sciendum est, Eum ab alio factum non fuisse, neque semetipsum fecisse, atque, a nullo circumscriptum, omnia comprehendere. Ex se ipsomet est

26. Ipse sapientia immortalis, principio et fine carens, immortalis atque aeternus, perfectus, nulli necessitati obnoxius, et necessitatibus omnium satisfaciens, nullo indigens et indigentis omnium ipse magnificus

opitulator.

Ipse est principio carens, quia, qui habet principium, habet et finem. Ipse sine nomine, quod quicumque nomine appellatur, creatus est factusque ab alio. Ei neque colores sunt neque forma:

quod, quicumque his praeditus est, mensurabilis est, limitibusque cogitur. Eius naturae nulla inest maris et feminae distinctio, quia cupiditatibus agitur qui huic est distinctioni obnoxius. Ipse sub caelis incomprehensibilis est, quia caelos excedit: nec caeli caelorum Illo maiores sunt, quia caeli caelorum et creaturae omnes quae sub caelis sunt, ab Illo comprehenduntur.

Ipsi nemo contrarius neque adversarius: quod si quis Ei contrarias et adversarius esse posset, eidem compar fieri videretur.

Ipse immobilis est atque praeter quemcumque terminum et circuitum: quia ubi et unde moveri possit locus deest. Ipse neque mensura comprehendi, neque circumdari potest, quia Ipse omnia replet, atque est ultra omnes visibiles et invisibiles creaturas. Ipse neque ira, neque indignatione movetur, quia nulla caecitate afficitur, quum omnino et absolute sit intellectualis. Propterea hisce omnibus miraculis variis omnibusque beneficiis Ipse omnia creavit. Sacrificiis, oblationibus et hostiis Ipse non indiget, neque, ulla in re, visibilibus creaturis opus habet; quia omnia replet, et omnium egestatibus satisfacit, Ipse numquam indigens ac semper gloriosus.

De Deo sapienter loqui ab ipso Deo mihi datum est, et pro meis viribus locutus sum, quin tamen altitudinem imperscrutabilis magnitudinis Ejus comprehendere possem. Sola fide vero Ilium glorificans

adoro.

Nunc igitur ad genus humanum veniamus et quinam praefatas veritates secuti fuerint videbimus, et quinam ab eis erraverint. Compertum est nobis, o Rex, quatuor esse humani generis stirpes, quae sunt Barbarorum, Graecorum, Hebraeorum atque Christianorum. Ethnici et Barbari genus suum ducunt a Belo, Crono et

[29 Hiera, aliisque suis Divis pluribus. Graeci vero a Jove, qui Zeus vel Jupiter dicitur, originem trahunt, per Helenum, Xuthum, aliosque eorum descendentes, nempe Helladem, Inacum, Phoroneum, ac demum Danaum Aegyptium, Cadmum Sidonium, ac Dionysium Thebanum. Hebraei autem genus suum ducunt ex Abrahamo, Isaaco, Jacobo, et duodecim Jacobi filiis, qui e Syria in Aegyptum se receperunt, et a legislature suo Hebraei nuncupati fuerunt, inde vero terram promissionis ingressi, Judaei sunt appellati. Christianorum tandem genus a Domino Jesu Christo oritur.

Ipse Dei altissimi est Filius, et una cum Spiritu Sancto revelatus est nobis: de caelis descendit ex Hebraea Virgine natus, ex Virgine carnem assumpsit, assumptaque humana natura, semetipsum

Dei filium revelavit. Qui Evangelio suo vivificante mundum Universum, consolatoria sua bonitate, sibi captivum fecit.

Ipse est Verbum, qui ex progenie Hebraica, secundum carnem, ex Maria virgine Deipara natus est. Ipse est qui Apostolos duodecim inter suos discipulos elegit, ut mundum Universum dispensatione. illuminantis Veritatis suae institueret. Ipse ab Hebraeis crucifixus est: a mortuis resurrexit et ad caelos ascendit: in mundum Universum discipulos suos mittens, qui divino et admirabili lumine suo, comitantibus prodigiis, omnes gentes sapientiam docerent. Quorum praedicatio in hunc usque diem germinat atque fructificat, orbem Universum vocans ad lucem.

Quatuor ergo nationes, O Rex, ostendi tibi: Barbaros, Graecos, Hebraeos atque

Christianos.

\* \* \* \* \* Divinitati spiritualis natura propria est, Angelis ignea, daemoniis aquosa, generique humano terrestres.

\*

\*

\*

\*

\*

\*

\*

\*

\* \*

We have now reprinted all that is known of the Armenian translation of the Apology; it is out of our limit and beyond our measure to think of reprinting the actual Armenian text. For the purpose of comparison we add, however, another copy of the same Armenian fragment, taken from a MS. at Edschmiazin, and translated into English by Mr F. C. Conybeare, of Oxford, for whose kindly aid we are very grateful. According to the information which he has supplied, the MS. at Edschmiazin was written on paper, and is much worn by age. The date was certainly not |30 later than the eleventh century. The fragment from the Apology which it contains was followed by the fragment from the Homily on the Penitent Thief. Here and there the text was illegible, and in these cases the missing words have been supplied from the Venice text, as reprinted by Pitra. The two texts in question are moreover in very close agreement, except for the occasional addition of a word or two by the Edschmiazin MS. The rendering is designedly a literal one. The Armenian Fragment (from the Edschmiazin MS.). TO THE AUTOCRATIC CAESAR ADRIANOS FROM ARISTIDES, ATHENIAN PHILOSOPHER.

I, O Ruler, who was by the providence of God created and fashioned man in the world, and who have beheld the heaven and the earth and the sea, the sun and the moon and the stars and all

creatures, wondered and was amazed at the eternal

27 order thereof. I also by reflection learned that the world and all that is therein is by necessity and force guided and moved and of the whole God is controuler and orderer: for that which controuls is more powerful than that which is controuled and moved. To enquire about Him who is guardian and controuls all things seems to me to quite exceed the comprehension and to be most difficult, and to speak accurately concerning Him is beyond compass of thought and of speech, and bringeth no advantage; for His nature is infinite and unsearchable, and imperceptible,<sup>28</sup> and inaccessible to all creatures. We can only know that He who governs by His providence all created things, He is Lord and God and creator of all, who ordered all things visible in His beneficence, and graciously bestowed them on the race of man. Now it is meet that we serve and glorify Him alone as God, and love one another as ourselves. But this much alone can we know concerning God,

|31

that He was not generated from any source, and did not Himself make Himself, and is not contained by aught, but Himself contains all.

Au)togene|j ei]doj 29 and wisdom immortal, without beginning or end, not passing away and undying, He is complete and wanteth nothing, while He fulfilleth all wants. In Himself He wanteth nought, but gives to and fulfils the needs of all. In Himself He is without beginning, for He is beginning of everything whatever, and is perfect. In Himself He is nameless, for whatever is named is fashioned out of something else<sup>30</sup> and created. Colour and form of Him there is not, for that falls under measure and limit, unto whatsoever colour and form belong. Male and female in that nature there is not, for that is subject to particular passions, in whatsoever that distinction exists. Within the heavens He is not contained, for He is beyond<sup>31</sup> the heavens; neither are the heavens greater than He, for the heavens and all creation are contained in Him. Counter to Him and opposed there is no one: if any one be found counter to Him, it appears that that one becometh associate with Him. He is unmoved and unmeasured and ineffable; for there is no place whence or with which He could move; and He is not, by being measured, contained or environed on any side, for it is Himself that filleth all, and He transcends all things visible and invisible. Wrath and anger there is not in Him, for there is not in Him blindness, but He is wholly and entirely rational, and on that account He established creation with divers wonders and entire beneficence. Need hath He none of victims and oblations and sacrifices, and of all that is in the visible creation He wanteth nought. For He fulfilleth the wants of all and completeth them, and being in need of nothing He is glorified unto all time.

Now by the grace of God it was given me to speak wisely concerning Him. So far as I have received the faculty I will speak, yet not according to the measure of the inscrutability of His greatness shall I be able to do so, but by faith alone do I glorify and adore Him.

Let us next come to the race of man, and see who are capable |32 of receiving the truth of these sayings, and who are gone astray. It is manifest<sup>32</sup>, O Ruler, for there are four tribes<sup>33</sup> of the human race. There are barbarians, and some are Greeks and others Hebrews, and there are who are Christians. But the heathens and barbarians count their descent from Baal, and from Cronos, and from Hera, and from many others of their gods. But the Greeks say Zeus (who is Dios) is their

founder<sup>34</sup>, and reckon their descent from Helenos and Xuthos, and one after another from Hellas, Inachos and Phoroneus, and also finally from Danaus the Egyptian, and from Cadmus the Sidonian, and Dionysius the Theban. But the Jews reckon their race from Abraham, and Abraham's son they say was Isaac, and from Isaac Jacob, and from Jacob the twelve who migrated from Assyria into Egypt and were there named the tribes of the Hebrews by their lawgiver, and having come into the land of recompence, were named.....<sup>35</sup> the tribes of the Jews. But the Christians reckon their race from the Lord Jesus Christ. He is Himself Son of God on high, who was manifested of the Holy Spirit, came down from heaven, and being born of a Hebrew virgin took on His flesh from the virgin, and was manifested in the nature of humanity the Son of God: who sought to win the entire world to His eternal goodness by His life-giving preaching<sup>36</sup>. He it is who was according to the flesh born of the race of the Hebrews, by the God-bearing<sup>37</sup> virgin Miriam. He chose the twelve disciples, and He by his illuminating truth, dispensing |<sup>33</sup> it<sup>38</sup> taught, all the world, and was nailed on the cross by the Jews. Who rose from the dead and ascended into heaven, and sent forth His disciples into the whole world<sup>39</sup>, and taught all with divinely miraculous and profoundly wise wonders. Their preaching until this day blossoms and bears fruit, and summons all the world to receive the light.

These are the four tribes, whom we set before thee, O Ruler, Barbarians, Greeks, Jews and Christians. But to the Deity is appointed the spiritual, and to angels the fiery, and to devils the watery, and to the race of men the earth.

\* \* \* \* \* An additional Armenian Fragment of Aristides.

Over and above the fragments of the lost Apology of Aristides, and the homily de Latrone, there is a scrap printed by Pitra in his Spicilegium Solesmense which professes to come from an epistle of Aristides to all Philosophers. It is, as far as we can judge, in the form in which we have it presented to us, a theological product of the time of the Monophysite controversy. But we must bear in mind what we have learned from the Armenian fragment of the Apology, that an Armenian translation is made up out of the matter of the original writer plus the terms and definitions of the translator, as for instance we see to have happened in the ascription of the term Qeoto&koj to the Blessed Virgin. And the question is whether under the amplified folds of the theology of this fragment printed by Pitra there may be hidden the more scanty terms of a theologian of the second century, and if so, whether the writer be our Aristides, and the work quoted be the Apology or some other work. In order to test this point, we will give a rendering of the fragment into Greek, for which again I am indebted to the kindness of Mr Conybeare. |<sup>34</sup> Armenian Fragment.

(Frag. iii. of Pitra.) FROM AN EPISTLE OF ARISTIDES TO ALL PHILOSOPHERS.

[Greek].<sup>40</sup> 41

Now with reference to the foregoing passage, we may say at once that the concluding terms are not second-century language at all. On the other hand, the reference to the "Hebrew virgin" is precisely the language of the Apology. Further, the opening words of the fragment, with their allusion to a real passion of a real body, are certainly anti-Docetic, and therefore may be taken as second-century theology. We may compare with them the sentiments of the Ignatian epistles, as for example the letter to the Smyrnaeans (c. ii.), where we read:

----

[Greek]

It does not, therefore, seem as if these words in the opening of the fragment were a translator's invention or addition. They have a second-century ring about them. If so, then the extract is either a translation of a paragraph of the Apology, or of some other tract by the same writer, and probably the latter. We have, however, no means of discriminating further the original form of the sentence from the later accretions. It is, however, by no means impossible that the heading may be correct; that Aristides may have written an epistle or address to Philosophers on the subject of the Christian religion in general, or of the Incarnation in particular. |35 [Footnotes renumbered and moved to the end]

1. 1 Especially by M. Renan, who in his *Origines de Christianisme*, vol. vi. p. vi., says: "Le présent volume était imprimé quand j'ai eu connaissance d'une publication des mékhitaristes de Venise contenant en Arménien, avec traduction Latine, deux morceaux, dont l'un serait l'Apologie adressée par Aristide à Adrien. L'authenticité de cette pièce ne soutient pas l'examen. C'est une composition plate, qui répondrait bien mal à ce que Eusèbe et S. Jérôme disent du talent de l'auteur et surtout à cette particularité que l'ouvrage était contextum philosophorum sententiis.

L'écrit Arménien ne présente pas une seule citation d'auteur profane. La théologie qu'on y trouve, en ce qui concerne la Trinité, l'incarnation, la qualité de mère de Dieu attribuée à Marie, est postérieure au ive siècle. L'érudition historique ou plutôt mythologique est aussi bien indigne d'un écrivain du ii<sup>e</sup> siècle. Le second 'sermon' publié par les mékhitaristes a encore moins de droit à être attribué au philosophe Chrétien d'Athènes: le manuscrit porte Aristaeus: c'est une homélie insignificable sur le bon larron."

M. Renan was rightly opposed in this sweeping negation of authenticity by Doulcet, who pointed out relations between Aristides and the Timaeus as a justification of the philosophical character of the work. Unfortunately Doulcet

went too far, by trying to identify Aristides with the author of the Epistle to Diognetus.

Harnack (*Theol. LZ.* 1879, no. 10, col. 375 f.) was very favourable to the genuineness of the fragment, and made some excellent points in its defence.

M. Renan will now have the opportunity of verifying for himself that the term Theotokos, to which he objected so strongly as savouring of the fourth century, is not in the Syriac text.

2. 1 See Wright's Catalogue, p. 1160. The general contents of this MS. (Brit. Mus. 987) should be compared with those of the MS. here described: it contains e.g. the Apology of Melito and the Hypomnemata of Ambrose, and various Philosophical treatises.

3. 1 Quoted by Eckhel, *Doctrina* vii. Ft. n. p. 36. This would seem to resolve the perplexity of Spartianus as to the origin of the name.

4. 2 *Die griechischen Apologeten* p. 101. I need not say how much I am indebted to Harnack's investigations. It will be apparent throughout these pages.

5. 1 "Quadratus apostolorum discipulus, Publio Athenarum episcopo ob Christi fidem martyrio coronato, in locum eius substituitur et ecclesiam grandi terrore dispersam fide et industria sua

congregat. Cumque Hadrianus Athenis exegisset

hiemem, invisens Eleusinam, et omnibus paene Graeciae sacris initiatus dedisset occasionem his, qui Christianos oderant, absque praecepto imperatoris vexare credentes, porrexit ei librum &c."

6. 1 Lightfoot, Ignatius, ed. ii. 11. 541.

7. 2 Euseb. H. E. iv. 26, ex apologia Melitonis, [Greek]. This certainly looks like an outbreak of persecution in Greece.

8. 1 Dial. 16.

9. 1 Mart. Polyc. 20.

10. 2 Euseb. H. E. v. 26.

11. 1 Migne, Patr. Lat. cxxiii.

12. 1 Die Griechischen Apologeten, p. 107 note. I cannot find it in Briefwechsel des Beatus Rhenanus by Horowitz and Hartfelder, Leipzig, 1886. I understand, however, from Prof. Kawerau, that it may be found in Epistolarum G. Wicelii libri tres, Lipsiae, 1537.

13. 1 Origen c. Celsum, lib. iv. 23.

14. 2 lib. iv. 74.

15. 1 lib. iv. 77.

16. 2 Justin Apol. i. c. 10.

17. 3 Ep. ad Diogn. 10.

18. 1 Orig. c. Cels. i. 26 [Greek] 19. 2 Orig. c. Cels. iv. 32.

20. 1 Orig. c. Cels. i. 26.

21. 2 Orig. c. Cels. iii. 19.

22. 1 Orig. c. Cels. i. 32.

23. 1 Tüb. Theol. Quartalschrift, 1877, ii. p. 289, f. 1880, I. p. 109-127.

24. 2 Cohortatio, c. viii.

25. 3 Plato, Timaeus, 28 C, [Greek] 26. 1 Sensus dubius: armeniaca verba idem sonant ac graeca au)togene\j ei]doj.

27. 1 Here there is a copyist's error in the Edschmiazin text.

28. 2 Here the Edschmiazin text adds a word which means 'not to be observed or looked at.'

29. 1 au0togene\j (or

au)toge/nnhton) ei]doj is the Greek that answers to the Armenian texts. 'Ex se ipsomet est' does not give the sense. I give the Greek, for I really hardly know how to render it in English.

30. 2 Or "by another."

31. 3 e0pe/keina.

32. 1 So it stands in the Venice text: but in the Edschmiazin copy, for 'manifest' there is a word which means 'the name' followed by a lacuna of a few letters, as if the scribe had intended to read 'I will recount the names, O Ruler,' or something of that kind.

33. 2 The word answers to the Greek fulai/ or

dh~moi. In the same sense at the end of the fragment another word is used, answering rather to ge/nh.

34. 3 These three words are added to make sense, the whole passage being grammatically much confused.

35. 4 Here the Edschmiazin MS. was unreadable from age. The printed text has no lacuna and gives no hint of the word whatever it was which

was read in the Edschmiazin text.

36. 5 eu)agge/ion.

37. 6 The word Qeoto&koj is implied.

38. 1 Oi0konomiko&j is here rendered. Perhaps it should be taken as an epithet of 'truth,' for in the original it precedes the word 'illuminating.' 39. 2 Oi0koume/nhn.

40. 1 The same word is used by the translator to render

sw~ma and sa&rc.

41. 2 More exactly e9autou~: an additional word being necessary in the Armenian in order to give the sense 'conjunct sibi': but the sense seems to require e9autw~|. This text was transcribed by Roger Pearse, 2004. All material on this page is in the public domain - copy freely.

Greek text is rendered using the Scholars Press SP Ionic font, free from here.

Early Church Fathers - Additional Texts

## The Apology - Introduction

---

### Introduction.

Introduction. The Church Histories, hitherto in dealing with early Christian literature, have given Aristides along with Quadratus the first place in the list of lost apologists. It was known that there had been such early defenders of the faith, and that Quadratus had seen persons who had been miraculously healed by Christ; but beyond this little more could be said. To Justin Martyr, who flourished about A.D. 150, belonged the honour of heading the series of apologists whose works are extant, viz., Tatian, Melito, Athenagoras, Theophilus, the author of the Epistle to Diognetus, who all belonged to the second century and wrote in Greek; and Tertullian, Minucius Felix, Arnobius, and Lactantius, who wrote in Latin, and Clement and Origen who wrote in Greek, during the third century. While Christianity was winning its way to recognition in the Roman empire, these writers tried to disprove the gross calumnies current about Christians, to enlighten rulers and magistrates as to the real character and conduct of the adherents of the new religion, and to remove the prejudice which led to the violent persecutions of the populace. They also endeavoured to commend Christianity to "the cultured among its despisers," by showing that it is philosophy as well as revelation, that it can supply the answers sought by philosophy, and is unlike human wisdom in being certain because divinely revealed. At the same time they demonstrated the folly of polytheism and pointed out its disastrous effects on morality. This faithful company of the defenders of the faith has now regained Aristides as their leader in place of Justin Martyr. It will be well to recount briefly what was previously known about Aristides, and to tell how the lost Apology has been found.

Eusebius, in his History of the Church, written during the reign of Constantine,

A.D. 306-387, has a chapter (bk. iv., c. 3) headed "The authors that wrote in defence of the faith in the reign of Hadrian,

A.D. 117-188." After describing and quoting the Apology of Quadratus, he adds:

"Aristides also, a man faithfully devoted to the religion we profess, like Quadratus, has left to posterity a defence of the faith, addressed to Hadrian. This work is also preserved by a great number, even to the present day." The same Eusebius in his Chronicon states that the Emperor Hadrian visited Athens in the eighth year of his reign (i.e., A.D. 125 ) and took part in the Eleusinian mysteries. In the same connection the historian mentions the presentation of Apologies to the Emperor by Quadratus and Aristides, "an Athenian philosopher; "and implies that Hadrian was induced by these appeals, coupled with a letter from Serenius Granianus, proconsul of Asia, to issue an Imperial rescript forbidding the punishment of Christians without careful investigation and trial.

About a century later Jerome (died A.D. 420) tells us that Aristides was a philosopher of Athena, that he retained his philosopher's garb after his conversion to Christianity, and that he presented a defence of the faith to Hadrian at the same time as Quadratus. This Apology, he says, was extant

in his day, and was largely composed of the opinions of philosophers ("contextum philosophorum sententiis"), and was afterwards imitated by Justin Martyr. After this date Aristides passes out of view. In the mediaeval martyrologies there is a faint reflection of the earlier testimony, as, e.g., the 31st of August is given as the saint's day "of the blessed Aristides, most renowned for faith and wisdom, who presented books on the Christian religion to the prince Hadrian, and most brilliantly proclaimed in the presence of the Emperor himself how that Christ Jesus is the only God." In the seventeenth century there were rumours that the missing Apology of Aristides was to be found in various monastic libraries in Greece; and Spon, a French traveller, made a fruitless search for it. The book had apparently disappeared for ever. But in recent times Aristides has again "swum into our ken." Armenian literature, which has done service to Christendom by preserving so many of its early documents, supplied also the first news of the recovery of Aristides. In the Mechitarite convent of b. Lazarus at Venice there is a body of Armenian monks who study Armenian and other literature. In 1878 these Armenians surprised the learned world by publishing a Latin translation of an Armenian fragment (the first two chapters) of the lost Apology of Aristides. Renan at once set it down as spurious because it contained theological terms of a later age, e.g., "bearer of God" applied to the Virgin Mary. These terms were afterwards seen to be due to the translator. At what time the translation from Greek into Armenian was made is not apparent; but it may reasonably be connected with the work begun by the famous Armenian patriarch Mesrobes. This noble Christian invented an alphabet for his country, established schools, and sent a band of young Armenians to Edessa, Athens, and elsewhere with instructions to translate into Armenian the best sacred and classical books. And in spite of Mohammedans and Turks Armenia has remained Christian, and now restores to the world the treasures committed to its keeping in the early centuries.

Opinions as to the Armenian fragment of Aristides remained undecided till 1889. In the spring of that year Professor J. Rendel Harris, of Cambridge, had the honour of discovering a Syriac version of the whole Apology in the library of the Convent of St. Catharine, on Mount Sinai. He found the Apology of Aristides among a collection of Syriac treatises of an ethical character; and he refers the ms. to the seventh century. Professor Harris has translated the Syriac into English, and has carefully edited the Syriac text with minute discussions of every point of interest.<sup>1</sup> The recovery of the Syriac version by Professor Harris placed the genuineness of the Armenian fragment beyond question. It also led to the strange reappearance of the greater part of the original Greek. Professor J. A. Robinson, the general editor of the Cambridge Texts and Studies, having read the translation of the Syriac version, discovered that the Apology of Aristides is incorporated in the early Christian Romance entitled, *The Life of Barlaam and Josaphat*.

Some account must be given of this remarkable book in order to show its connection with the Apology of Aristides. Its author is said to be John of Damascus, who died about A.D. 760. Whoever wrote it, the book soon became very popular. In the East it was translated into Arabic, Ethiopic, Armenian, and Hebrew; in the West there are versions of it in nearly a dozen languages, including an English metrical rendering. As early as 1204 a king of Norway had it translated into Icelandic. It is now known to be the story of Buddha in a Christian setting, furnished with fables and parables which have migrated from the far East and can be traced back to an extreme antiquity. The outline of the story is as follows: A king in India, Abenner by name, who is an enemy of the Christians, has an only son Josaphat (or Joasaph). At his birth the astrologers predict that he will become great, but will embrace the new doctrine. To prevent this, his father surrounds the

prince with young and beautiful attendants, and takes care that Josaphat shall see nothing of illness, old age, or death. At length Josaphat desires his freedom, and then follow the excursions as in the case of Buddha. Josaphat seeing so much misery possible in life is sunk in despair. In this state he is visited by a Christian hermit-Barlaam by name. Josaphat is converted to Christianity, and Barlaam withdraws again to the desert. To undo his son's conversion the king arranges that a public disputation shall be held; one of the king's sages, Nachor by name, is to personate Barlaam and to make a very weak statement of the Christian case, and so be easily refuted by the court orators. When the day comes, the prince Josaphat charges Nachor, the fictitious monk, to do his best on pain of torture. Thus stimulated, Nachor begins, and "like Balaam's ass he spake that which he had not purposed to speak; and he said, 'I, O king, in the providence of God, 'etc.'" He then recites the Apology of Aristides to such purpose that he converts himself, the king, and all his people. Josaphat finally relinquishes his kingdom, and retires into the desert with the genuine Barlaam for prayer and meditation. Not only so, but the churches of the Middle Ages, forgetting the fabulous character of the story, raised Barlaam and Josaphat to the rank of saints, with a holy day in the Christian calendar. Thus the author of Barlaam and Josaphat caused Christianity unwittingly to do honour to the founder of Buddhism under the name of St. Josaphat; and also to read the Apology of Aristides in nearly twenty languages without suspecting what it was. The speech of Nachor in Greek, that is to say, the greater part of the original Greek of the Apology of Aristides, has been extracted from this source by Professor Robinson and is published in *Texts and Studies*, Vol. I., so that there is now abundant material for making an estimate of Aristides.

It may be asked whether we have in any of our three sources the actual words of Aristides. The circumstances under which the Apology was incorporated in *The Life of Barlaam and Josaphat* are such as to render it unlikely that the author of the Romance should copy with the faithfulness of a scribe; but examination proves that very few modifications have been made. The Greek divides men into three races (the Syriac and Armenian into four); the introductory accounts of these races are in the Greek blended with the general discussion; and at the close the description of early Christian customs is shortened. These few differences from the Syriac are all explained by the fact that the Apology had to be adapted to the circumstances of an Indian court in a later age. On the other hand, when the Syriac is compared with the Greek and Armenian in passages where these two agree, it is found that explanatory clauses are added; and there is throughout a cumbrous redundancy of pronouns in the Syriac. In short, the actual words of Aristides may be restored with tolerable certainty—a task which has been already accomplished by a German scholar, Lic. Edgar Hennecke.<sup>2</sup> In any case we have the substance of the Apology of Aristides with almost verbal precision. In regard to the date of Aristides, Eusebius says expressly that the Apology was presented to Hadrian while he was in Athens about the year A.D. 125. The only ground for questioning this statement is the second superscription given in the Syriac version, which implies that the Apology was presented to Antoninus Pius, A.D. 138-161. This heading is accepted by Professor Harris as the true one; and he assigns the Apology to "the early years of the reign of Antoninus Pius; and it is at least conceivable," he adds, "that it may have been presented to the Emperor along with other Christian writings during an unrecorded visit of his to his ancient seat of government at Smyrna." But this requires us to suppose that Eusebius was wrong; that Jerome copied his error; that the Armenian version curiously fell into the same mistake; and that the Syriac translator is at this point exceptionally faithful. So perhaps it is better with Billius, "not to trust more

in one's own suspicions, than in Christian charity which believeth all things," and to rest in the comfortable hypothesis that Eusebius spoke the truth.

Writing in A.D. 125, or even twenty years later, Aristides becomes an important witness as to the nature of early Christianity. His Apology contains no express quotation from Scripture; but the Emperor is referred for information to a gospel which is written. Various echoes of New Testament expressions will at once be recognized; and "the language moulding power of Christianity "is discernible in the new meaning given to various classical words. Some topics are conspicuous by their absence. Aristides has no trace of ill-feeling to the Jews; no reference to the Logos doctrine, nor to the distinctive ideas of the Apostle Paul; he has no gnosticism or heresy to denounce, and he makes no appeal to miracle and prophecy. Christianity, in his view, is worthy of a philosophic emperor because it is eminently reasonable, and gives an impulse and power to live a good life. On the whole, Aristides represents that type of Christian practice which is found in the Teaching of the Twelve Apostles; and to this he adds a simple Christian philosophy which may be compared with that of St. Paul at Athens. Although the details about the elements and the heathen gods are discussed with tedious minuteness, still his closing section describing the lives of the early Christians should always be good reading. The translation of the Syriac given here is independently made from the Syriac text, edited by Professor Harris<sup>3</sup>. Full advantage has been taken of his notes and apparatus criticus, but no use has been made of his translation. In obscure passages the German translation of Dr. Richard Raabe<sup>4</sup> has been compared; and the Text-Rekonstruktion of Hennecke has been consulted on textual points in both translations. The Greek translation is made from the text edited by Professor Robinson.<sup>5</sup> The translations from the Greek and from the Syriac are arranged side by side, so that their relation to one another is apparent at a glance. No attempt has been made to force the same English words from passages which are evidently meant to be identical in the two languages; but the literal tenour of each has been allowed to assert itself.

1 Texts and Studies. Contributions to Biblical and Patristic Literature. Edited by J. A. Robinson, B.D. Vol i., No. 1, the Apology of Aristides, edited and translated by J. Rendel Harris, MA., with an Appendix by J. A. Robinson, B.D. (Cambridge University Press.)

2 Die Apologie des Aristides. Recension und Rekonstruktion des Textes, von Lic. Edgar Hennecke. (Die Griechischen Apologeten: Heft 3.) 3 The Cambridge Texts and Studies, vol i., No. 1.

4 Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der Altchristlichen Litteratur, Gebhardt und Harnak, IX. Band, Heft 1.

5 The Cambridge Texts and Studies, vol. i., No. 1.

## The Apology - Preface to the online text

---

Aristides the Philosopher: Apology. Preface to the online text. In the printed edition of the Ante-Nicene Fathers, volume 10 contains a translation in parallel columns of both the Greek and the Syriac texts of the Apology of Aristides. However the translation itself is absent from the Christian Classics Ethereal Library, perhaps because it was found hard to layout. I have scanned this, but I gather it will not appear soon online. Rather than have this most interesting text offline, I have departed from the general approach of this collection, and included it here.

Roger PEARSE 21st November 2003 This text was transcribed by Roger Pearse, 2003. All material on this page is in the public domain - copy freely.

Greek text is rendered using the Scholars Press SP Ionic font, free from here.

Early Church Fathers - Additional Texts

## The Apology - Prefatory matter to the 1891 translation

---

The Apology of Aristides: Texts and Studies 1 (1891)

Prefatory matter.

TEXTS AND STUDIES CONTRIBUTIONS TO BIBLICAL AND PATRISTIC LITERATURE

EDITED BY J. ARMITAGE ROBINSON B.D.

FELLOW OF CHRIST'S COLLEGE CAMBRIDGE

VOL. I. THE APOLOGY OF ARISTIDES THE PASSION OF S. PERPETUA THE LORD'S PRAYER IN THE EARLY CHURCH THE FRAGMENTS OF HERACLEON

CAMBRIDGE AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS 1891 [Photograph of manuscript folio] TEXTS AND STUDIES CONTRIBUTIONS TO BIBLICAL AND PATRISTIC LITERATURE

EDITED BY J. ARMITAGE ROBINSON M.A.

FELLOW OF CHRIST'S COLLEGE CAMBRIDGE

VOL. I.

No. 1. THE APOLOGY OF ARISTIDES

CAMBRIDGE AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS

1891 London: C. J. CLAY AND SONS, CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS WAREHOUSE,

AVE MARIA LANE.

[Arms omitted] Cambridge: DEIGHTON, BELL AND CO.

Leipzig: F. A. BROCKHAUS.

New York: MACMILLAN AND CO. THE APOLOGY OF ARISTIDES ON BEHALF OF THE CHRISTIANS FROM A SYRIAC MS. PRESERVED ON MOUNT SINAI EDITED WITH AN INTRODUCTION AND TRANSLATION BY J. RENDEL HARRIS M.A.

FORMERLY FELLOW OF CLARE COLLEGE CAMBRIDGE AND NOW PROFESSOR OF BIBLICAL LANGUAGES IN HAVERFORD COLLEGE PENNSYLVANIA WITH AN APPENDIX CONTAINING THE MAIN PORTION OF THE ORIGINAL GREEK TEXT BY J. ARMITAGE ROBINSON M.A.

FELLOW AND ASSISTANT TUTOR OF CHRIST'S COLLEGE CAMBRIDGE CAMBRIDGE AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS

1891 [All Rights reserved]

Cambridge :

PRINTED BY C. J. CLAY, M.A. AND SONS, AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS.

PREFACE. THE first part of this tract contains the Syriac text of the lost Apology of Aristides, accompanied by such comments and elucidations as I have been able to give to the subject. It is my first venture in Syriac, and I am thankful to my learned friends who have from time to time assisted me with suggestions and criticisms for the elimination of some of the more glaring errors. Amongst them I may mention especially Professor Bensly, of Cambridge, and Professor Isaac A. Hall, of New York. In the attempt to give the Armenian fragments of the Apology, in such a form as may make them accessible for critical use, I have had the valuable aid of Mr Conybeare, of Oxford, who placed at my disposal the results of his own work at Edschmiazin. When the pages were almost through the printer's hands, my friend Mr J. A. Robinson, of Christ's College, by one of those happy accidents, as we call them, upon which progress depends, discovered that substantially the whole of the Greek text was extant, and had been incorporated in that charming half-Greek and half-Oriental story, the Lives of Barlaam and Joasaph. Of course this means that, for the greater part of the Apology of Aristides, we have copies and versions in good number (Greek, Latin, Ethiopic, Arabic, Old French, etc.). This opens quite a new field before the student of Christian Apologetics. Need I say how gladly I make way for him in the Appendix, which will really be the text itself; and that I say in the language of the Acts of St Perpetua : "Hic ordinem totum Apologiae iam hinc ipse narrabit...manu sua et suo sensu."

J. RENDEL HARRIS.

NOTE. WITH the aid of the photographs taken by Prof. Harris the Syriac text has been carefully revised by Prof. Bensly, who has taken special pains with the reproduction of the punctuation of the MS. There seems occasionally to be some deviation from the ordinary system in the use of the diacritical points : but as it is impossible to tell from the photographs to what date the punctuation belongs, it has seemed better to reproduce it without attempting to mend it. The English translation was in the first instance made by Prof. Harris : but the discovery of the Greek made it necessary that it should undergo a complete revision, in order that scholars who do not read Syriac might be able to form a better estimate of the relation of the Syriac to the Greek, than could be given by a translation made without any reference to the latter. Moreover in several places the Greek cast new light upon the Syriac where it was obscure before. The task of revision would have been entirely beyond my power, but for the kind patience of Prof. Bensly, who allowed me to read the whole piece through with him. At his suggestion too I have added, within brackets, a few notes in addition to those made by Prof. Harris. The Facsimile of a page of the Syriac MS. has been made from one of Prof. Harris's photographs. It corresponds with [Syr] 5 — [Syr] 9 of this edition.

J.A. R.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

INTRODUCTION 1-34

Description of the Syriac MS 3 Aristides and Eusebius 6 Celsus and Aristides 19 The Symbol of the Faith in the time of Aristides 23 The Armenian Fragment of the Apology 26 An additional Armenian Fragment of Aristides 33

TRANSLATION OF THE SYRIAC VERSION 35-51 NOTES ON THE SYRIAC VERSION 52-64

APPENDIX 65-118

The original Greek of the Apology of Aristides 67 The Greek text of 'Barlaam and Josaphat' 80 The bearing of the Apology on the Canon 82 The Apology and the Didaché 84 The Apology and the Preaching of Peter 86 The Greek text edited from three MSS 100 Index of Greek words 113 Index of subject matter 117

THE SYRIAC TEXT OF THE APOLOGY [Syriac]

[Blank page] This text was transcribed by Roger Pearse, 2003. All material on this page is in the public domain - copy freely.

Greek text is rendered using the Scholars Press SP Ionic font, free from here.

Early Church Fathers - Additional Texts

## The Apology - Selected Notes on the Syriac Version\_1891

---

The Apology of Aristides: Texts and Studies 1 (1891) pp. 52-64. Selected Notes on the Syriac Version NOTES ON THE SYRIAC VERSION.

[Note to the online text: the majority of these notes are concerned with or cite copious quantities of the Syriac text. This page includes only a selection of those notes likely to be of use to English-speaking readers] p. 35, 1. 7. The demonstration of Divine Providence from the contemplation of the heavenly bodies is common to all forms of Theistic teaching: consequently it occurs freely in Christian Apologetics. We may compare the following passages:

Melito, Oration to Antoninus Caesar (Cureton, Spic. Syr, p.

46). "He hath set before thee the heavens, and He has placed in them the stars. He hath set before thee the sun and the moon, and they every day fulfil their course therein... He hath set before thee the clouds which by ordinance bring water from above and satisfy the earth: that from these things thou mightest understand, that He who moveth these is greater than they all, [Syriac] and that thou mightest accept the goodness of Him who hath given to thee a mind by which thou mayest distinguish these things."

Origen, De Principiis, II. 1. 5. "But that we may believe on the authority of Holy Scripture, that such is the case, hear how in the books of Maccabees, [53 where the mother of the seven martyrs exhorts her son to endure torture, this truth is confirmed: for she says, ' I ask of thee, my son, to look at the heaven and earth, and at all things which are in them, and beholding them, to know that God made all these things when they did not exist.'" [2 Macc. vii. 28.]

Id. iv. 1. 7. "The artistic plan of a providential Ruler is not so evident in matters belonging to the earth, as in the case of the sun, moon and stars." I. 11. Cf. Melito, Oration p. 50. "He made the lights that His works might behold one another, and lie concealth Himself in His might from all His works." II. 14, 15. A comparison with the Armenian suggests that something has fallen out here. The Syriac cannot be translated as it stands. The Greek unfortunately fails us at this point.

1. 19 (r<sup>^</sup> 19). The early Christian teachers emphasised strongly this belief that the world was made for the sake of man: consequently we must not assume, if

we find the same statement in Justin Martyr, that the idea was borrowed from Aristides, for it is a part of the regular second-century teaching. The following parallels may be quoted:

Justin, Apol. I. 10. [Greek] Dial. 41. [Greek].

Ps. Justin, Ep. ad Diogn. 10. [Greek]. i. 23. Cf. Philo, Fragments, p. 70: [Greek] Id. de Fortitudine § 3. [Greek] |54 Acta Mar Kardaghi (ed. Abbeloos, p. 30): [Syriac] I. 28. The same philosophical opinion will be found almost in the same words in Eustathius contra Arianos quoted in John of Damascus, Parallels p. 314, [Greek] I. 30. We may compare the following passages from Justin and from the Epistle to Diognetus, in view of Jerome's statement that Justin imitated Aristides, and the modern theory of Doucet as to the authorship of the anonymous epistle to Diognctus.

Justin, Apol. I. 9. [Greek] Justin, Apol. II. 6.[Greek] Justin, Dial. 4. [Greek] Justin, Apol. I. 10. [Greek] Ep. ad Diogn. 3. [Greek] p.36, l. 18. 'The head of the race of their religion.' This seems to be a conflation of the two phrases which occur lower down: 'the head of their race,' and 'the beginning of their religion.' It should be simply 'the head of their race,' as we see from the Greek.] I. 23. The Armenian has 'Kadmus the Sidonian and Dionysus the Theban.' Cf. Herod. II. 91 [Greek]. But Kadmus is a Sidonian in Eur. Bacch. 171 and Ovid, Met. iv. 571.

[I. 27. The statement that the people received the name of 'Hebrews' from Moses is peculiar to the Syr. and Arm. translations.] I. 29. The writer not only deduces the name of the Christians from the title of their founder, but he is also ready, like Justin and other |55 fathers, to compare the name with the Greek word  $\chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\acute{o}\varsigma$ , as we shall see in the closing chapter. The following parallels may be noted in Justin. Justin, Apol. I. 12. [Greek] ; Dial. 63. [Greek]; Ibid. 138. [Greek] I. 32. With the closing words of this sentence we may compare the Syriac Acts of John (ed. Wright), p. 37, [Syriac] where we should correct the text so as to read "and when formed as a child in the womb He was. with His Father." I. 34 . The Gospel is clearly a written one, and not the general message (eu)agge(lion). In c. xvi. we again find Aristides offering the Emperor the Christian Scriptures. p. 37, l. 1. Another instance of the formula 'He was crucified by the Jews,' beyond those to which we have already drawn attention, may be found in a fragment of Melito preserved by Anastasius Sinaita; [Greek] for which the Syriac rendering is given by Cureton, Spic. Syr. In later times we may expect to find similar language, though the expression itself disappears from the Creed. In Acta Mar Kardaghi p. 37 we have the following (loquitur Satanas), [Syriac] and again in p. 74 [Syriac]. The idea of the Jews being the special agents of Satan in the Crucifixion |56 comes out also in an unpublished a)ntilogia& between the Devil and Christ, which is preserved in a MS. at Jerusalem (Cod. 66, S. Sep.), where we read [Greek].

[Compare also the Letter of Pilate in the Acts of Peter and Paul § 42 (Tisch. Acta Apocr., Lips. 1851, p. 17): [Greek]] I. 20. The injunction to have a care that your gods be not stolen is not uncommon with the early Christians, and it is not improbable that they were able to refer to special and notable cases of violation of temples and mutilation of images. We may refer, at all events, to the following parallels: Justin, Apol. I. 9. [Greek]; Ep. ad Diogn. 2. [Greek] I. 26. Compare c. vii. From the "Teaching of the Apostles" (c. vi. 3) onwards, idolatry is known as a 'worship of dead gods': e.g. Melito, Oration p. 43, "But I affirm that also the Sibyl has said respecting them, that it is the images of kings, who are dead, they worship." p. 38, l. 1 (co 19). The writer now proceeds to

discuss the views of those who either sought the First Principle in one of the elements or imagined it to be located in one of the heavenly bodies. And it is common for the early Christian writers to demolish the philosophic schools in detail according as they found them referring the origin of all things to water, as Thaïes; or air, as Anaximenes; or fire, as Heraclitus; or earth, as Pherecydes and Xenophanes. We may compare Plutarch *De placitis philosophorum* i. 3, and then notice how the Christian apologists deal with the matter. The writer of the *Epistle to Diognetus* thinks that, if a god is to be found amongst the elements, one element or created thing is as good as another: *Ep. ad Diogn.* 8. [Greek].

Melito deals even more shortly with the matter, and in a rude common-sense manner says that we may call a creature God without making it to be divine:

Oration, p. 42. "And if, therefore, a man...say that there is another God, it is found from his own words that he calleth some created thing God. For if a man call fire God, it is not God, because it is fire; and if a man call the waters God, they are not God, because they are waters; and if this earth which we tread upon, and if those heavens which are seen by us, and if the sun, or the moon, or one of those stars which run their course by ordinance and rest not, nor proceed by their own will—and if a man call gold and silver gods: are not these things that we use as we please?"

It will be seen that their treatment of the subject was superficial, no other treatment being, in fact, necessary. Aristides, however, takes the matter more seriously and examines each case in detail by the light of his previously stated axioms concerning the divine nature. p. 39, l. 1 This phrase, 'your majesty,' does not in any way suggest that more than one person is addressed. l. 25 He is referring to Apollo, Poseidon and Asklepios: cf. Tertullian, *Apol.* 14, *Hic Apollinem Admeto regi pascendis pecoribus addicit, ille Nepturii structorias operas Laomedonti locat. Est et illis de lyricis (Pindarum dico) qui Aescolapium canit avaritiae merito, quia medicinam nocenter exercebat, fulmine iudicatum.* [58 l. 21. The translator gives the Syriac name for Saturn, [Syriac]. In the *Classical Review* for June 1890, p. 259, Prof. Margoliouth reviewing Budge's *Pseudo-Callisthenes* remarks as follows, "On p. 9 after the name of each planet we are told what the Persian for it is: surely this implies that the book which the translator had before him was in Persian. I will quote one of these, because Mr Budge has by accident missed the truth. The name of Saturn is omitted from the list, but instead we read, the colour [Syriac] of a black stone, and the horoscopus of helani which is called in Persian Farnüg'. Mr Budge would emend Farnüg', but it is a Persian word signifying Saturn ..... Hence [Syriac] 'colour' must stand for a word signifying Saturn; and this will be the Persian [Persian] which the translator has read [Persian] 'colour'." It would seem to be a more direct process simply to emend the Syriac into [Syriac]. p. 42, l. 2. The amours of the gods are, as might have been expected, the staple of early Christian apologetics. A few references may be given in illustration of the scornful summary of Olympic history given by Aristides. Justin, *Apol.* l. 21. [Greek]; Justin, *Apol.* l. 25. [Greek]; *Recog. Clément*, x. 22. "Antiopen Nyctei versus in

Satyrum corruptit: ex qua nascuntur Amphion et Zethus; Alcmenam, mutatus in virum eius Amphitryonem; ex qua nascitur Hercules: Aeginam Asopi, mutatus in aquilam, ex qua nascitur Aeacus. Sed et Ganymedem Dardani mutatus nihilominus in aquilam stuprat; Mantheam Phoci, mutatus in ursum; ex qua nascitur Arctos: Danaen Acrisii, mutatus in aurum; ex qua nascitur Perseus: Europen Phoenicis, mutatus in taurum; ex qua nascitur Minos, et Rhadamanthus Sarpedonque: Eurymedusam Achelai, mutatus in formicam; [59 ex qua nascitur Myrmidon: Thaliā Aetnam nympham, mutatus in vulturem; ex qua nascuntur apud Siciliam Palixi: Imandram Geneani apud Rhodum, mutatus in imbrem: Cassiopiam, mutatus in virum eius Phoenicem; ex qua nascitur Anchinus: Ledam Thesti, mutatus in cycnum; ex qua nascitur Helena: et iterum eandem, mutatus in stellam; ex qua nascuntur Castor et Pollux: Lamiam, mutatus in upupam: Mnemosynen, mutatus in pastorem; ex qua nascuntur Musae novem: Nemesin, mutatus in anserem: Semelen Cadmiam mutatus in ignem; ex qua nascitur Dionysus," etc.

See also Ps. Justin, Oratio ad Gentiles = Ambrose, Hypomnemata (Cureton,

Spic. Syr. pp. 63, 64) for a similar sketch to that of Aristides.

[l. 4. Pasiphae is an erroneous insertion in the Syriac. l. 11. 'Castor and Polydeuces and Hélène and Paludus.' This last word is a vox nihili; and the confusion has arisen in the following manner. The Greek has 'Castor and Hélène and Polydeuces.' The Syriac scribe has written Polydeuces in its more obvious position immediately after Castor, and then the second Polydeuces has suffered corruption.] l. 31. For the ornaments made by Hephaestus, and sarcastic Christian remarks thereon, we may cite: Tatian, Oratio ad Graecos, c. viii. [Greek] [60 p.44, l. 31. [The paragraph on Rhea and the following one on Proserpine are not in the Greek.] The Fathers not infrequently allude to the myth of Rhea and Atys. [Cf. Tatian, ad Graecos, 8, [Greek]] The story is apparently Phrygian in origin, though very similar in its details to forms from the further East. Lucian (De dea Syra, 33) describing the three images in the temple at Hierapolis says that the first two are Zeus and Hera, and the third [Greek]. Baethgen (Beiträge zur Semitischen Religionsgeschichte) p. 73 most ingeniously conjectures this to be a misunderstanding of Lucian's; [Greek] which last stands for Atti or Atys: the name appearing in a variety of forms, sometimes alone, sometimes combined with other deities, and sometimes as a factor in proper names: o.g. in Bardesanes De Fato we are told that the men of Edessa down to the time of Abgar used to sacrifice their foreskins to Tharatha: this seems to be a late form [Hebrew]; or Istar + Atta. As to the establishment of dances in honour of Atys, these are a characteristic feature of Semitic orgiastic worship. One of the best illustrations is the temple of Baal-Marcod, which stands on a spur of the Lebanon above Beyrout, and where there are many inscriptions from the ancient temple built into the walls of a modern convent. The name implies Lord of Dances and in one inscription given by Waddington (Inscr. Syr. No. 1855) is directly paraphrased as koi/rane kw&mwn. p. 45, l. 22. According to our apologist Isis fled to Byblos in Syria; and this agrees with Plutarch De Iside et Osiride, that Byblos was a sanctuary of Isis; now we know from Lucian De Dea Syra c. 6 that the great sanctuary at Byblos was a sanctuary of Aphrodite Publi/n (cf. Strabo xvi. 2, p. 362). We should therefore have to assume that [61 Byblos was the centre at once of an Isis-cult and an Aphrodite-cult which is the same thing as an Astarte-cult, for our apologist tells us to equate the Greek Aphrodite to the Syrian Astera. We must then assume either that the two forms of worship existed side by side, or that there had been a fusion of the two cults, the latter hypothesis being favoured by the similarity between the case of Aphrodite weeping for Tammuz and Isis lamenting Osiris. Moreover the confusion extends to the

personalities of Osiris and Adonis: and Movers quotes from Stephanus of Byzantium as follows:  
[Greek]

Whether, then, we pay attention to the dead gods or the wailing goddesses, there is a great similarity in the matter of the two religions. And we have suggested that in the sanctuary at Byblos the two cults may have been carried on side by side. One other question suggests itself, viz. whether they may not both be modifications of some earlier worship. We have some reason for believing that the original Byblos-worship was that of the Assyrian Baaltis, for Philo Byblius says that this city was the gift of Cronos to Baaltis. Now this Baaltis, the Assyrian mother of the gods, appears in the west in a Greek form, first under the name of Mylitta by a common change in the pronunciation of b and m. But this Mylitta is affirmed by Herodotus to be capable of equation with Aphrodite (i. 131 [Greek]) and this would lead us to recognize in the sanctuary at Byblos an original sanctuary of Mylitta. p.46, l. 3. The local variation in the Egyptian worship appears in Herodotus and is alluded to by the Christian fathers: Herod. II. 69. [Greek]; Justin, Apol. I. 24.[Greek]; Recog. Clement, v. 20. " Nam alii eorum bovem qui Apis dicitur colendum tradidere, alii hircum; alii gattas; nonnulli ibin; quidam serpentera; piscem quoque, et caepas et cloacas, crepitus ventris, pro numinibus habendos esse docuerunt: et alia innumerabilia quae pudet etiam nominare."

[See Mayor's notes to Juv. Sat. xv., for a storehouse of references on this point.] Of the objects of worship mentioned by Aristides, some are rather difficult to identify. The first question that arises is with regard to the animal denoted by [Syriac]. In the Dublin MS. of the Fables of Syntipas, Fable 45, we find [Syriac]. The word therefore stands for a cat. The fable to which we have referred is [62 No. 40 in Landsberger's Fabeln des Sophos. The Syriac reference is due to Prof. Bensly. l. 27. Here the language may be illustrated by a reference to Justin, Apol. I. 9, [Greek]; and Ep. ad Diogn. 2, [Greek] p. 49, l. 1. The description given of the Christians in this chapter recalls in many points the " Teaching of the Apostles." To begin with, we have the golden rule in a negative form, which may be compared with the first chapter of the Teaching, and with a similar Syriac sentence [63 given as a saying of Menander in Land, Anecdota i. 69, from Cod. Mus. Britt. 14658, fol. 166 r, as follows: [Syriac]which is a very different rendering from that of Aristides, and may be suspected from its ascription to Menander to be a translation of some metrical form of the golden rule. The version in Aristides, from its setting in the text of the Apology, between two precepts against idolatry, viz. idols in the form of man, and meats offered to idols, reminds one of the Codex Bezae which completes the rule of the Council at Jerusalem (Acts xv. 29) by adding the words [Greek]. But whether the sentence stood in this connexion in the primitive Didascalia, we cannot say.

Other parallels will suggest themselves, as when Aristides describes Christian practice in words that seem to answer to [Greek] which does not differ much from c. ii. of the Teaching. The parallelisms, however, are only just sufficient to suggest an acquaintance with the Teaching on the part of Aristides; and his whole presentation of Christian ethics is vastly superior to anything in the Didaché, and can only be paralleled for beauty and spirituality in the pages of Tertullian. p. 50, l. 37. The belief that the world stands by reason of the Christians occurs also in the following passages: Justin, Apol. I. 45. [Greek]; Justin, Apol. II. 7. [Greek]; Ep. ad Diogn. 6. [Greek] The extract from the Epistle to Diognetus is nearer to the idea of Aristides than the passages quoted from Justin. p. 51, l. 2. The expression [Syriac] which we have rendered " rolling themselves," occurs again in Melito, Oration (Cureton, Spic. Syr. p. [Syriac], 25), [64 (" Why rollest thou thyself

upon the earth, and offerest supplication to things which are without perception?") I. 36. The concluding words may be compared with Justin Dial. 58, [Greek].

It will be seen that we have given especial attention to the illustrations furnished to the text of our author by the undoubted writings of Justin and by the Epistle to Diognetus. We have not, however, been able to agree with the opinion of Doucet in reference to the latter writing, nor with the tradition of Jerome in reference to Justin's imitation of Aristides. It may, however, be taken for granted, from the parallels adduced, that Justin and Aristides are nearly contemporary. This text was transcribed by Roger Pearse, 2004. All material on this page is in the public domain - copy freely.

Greek text is rendered using the Scholars Press SP Ionic font, free from here.

Early Church Fathers - Additional Texts

## The Apology - Translation from the Syriac\_1891

---

The Apology of Aristides: Texts and Studies 1 (1891) pp. 35-51. Translation from the Syriac. THE APOLOGY OF ARISTIDES, TRANSLATED FROM THE SYRIAC.

Again, the apology which Aristides the philosopher made before Hadrian the king concerning the worship of God.

[To the Emperor] Caesar Titus Hadrianus Antoninus Augustus Pius, from Marcianus Aristides, a philosopher of Athens.

I. I, O king, by the

grace of God came into this world; and having contemplated the heavens and the earth and the seas, and beheld the sun and the rest of the orderly creation, I was amazed at the arrangement of the world; and I comprehended that the world and all that is therein are moved by the impulse of another, and I understood that he that moveth them is God, who is hidden in them and concealed from them: and this is well known, that that which moveth is more powerful than that which is moved. And that I should investigate concerning this Mover of all, as to how He exists—for this is evident to me, for He is incomprehensible in His nature—and that I should dispute concerning the steadfastness of His government, so as to comprehend it fully, is not profitable for me; for no one is able perfectly to comprehend it. But I say concerning the Mover of the world, that He is God of all, who made all for the sake of man; and it is evident to me that this is expedient, that one should fear God, and not grieve man.

Now I say that God is not begotten, not made; a constant nature, without beginning and without end; immortal, complete, and incomprehensible: and in saying that He is complete, I mean this; that there is no deficiency in Him, and He stands in need of nought, but everything stands in need of Him: and in saying that He is without beginning, I mean this; that everything which has a beginning has also an end; and that which has an end is dissoluble. He has no name; for

everything that has a name is associated with the created; He has no likeness, nor composition of members; for he who possesses this is associated with things |36 fashioned. He is not male, nor is He female: the heavens do not contain Him; but the heavens and all things visible and invisible are contained in Him. Adversary He has none; for there is none that is more powerful than He; anger and wrath He possesses not, for there is nothing that can stand against Him. Error and forgetfulness are not in His nature, for He is altogether wisdom and understanding, and in Him consists all that consists. He asks no sacrifice and no libation, nor any of the things that are visible; He asks not anything from anyone; but all ask from Him.

II. Since then it has been spoken to you by us concerning God, as far as our mind was capable of discoursing concerning Him, let us now come to the race of men, in order that we may know which of them hold any part of that truth which we have spoken concerning Him, and which of them are in error therefrom. This is plain to you, O king, that there are four races of men in this world; Barbarians and Greeks, Jews and Christians.

Now the Barbarians reckon the head of the race of their religion from Kronos and from Rhea and the rest of their gods: but the Greeks from Helenus, who is said to be from Zeus; and from Helenus was born Aeolus and Xythus, and the rest of the family from Inachus and Phoroneus, and last of all from Danaus the Egyptian and from Kadmus and from Dionysus.

Moreover the Jews reckon the head of their race from Abraham, who begat Isaac, from whom was born Jacob, who begat twelve sons who removed from Syria and settled in Egypt, and there were called the race of the Hebrews by their lawgiver: but at last they were named Jews. The Christians, then, reckon the beginning of their religion from Jesus Christ, who is named the Son of God most High; and it is said 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. This is taught from that Gospel which a little while ago was spoken among them as being preached; wherein if ye also will read, ye will comprehend the power that is upon it. This Jesus, then, was born of the tribe of the Hebrews; and He had twelve disciples, in order that a certain dispensation of His might be fulfilled. He was |37 pierced by the Jews; and He died and was buried; and they say that after three days He rose and ascended to heaven; and then these twelve disciples went forth into the known parts of the world, and taught concerning His greatness with all humility and sobriety; and on this account those also who to-day believe in this preaching are called Christians, who are well known. There are then four races of mankind, as I said before, Barbarians and Greeks, Jews and Christians. To God then ministers wind, and to angels fire; but to demons water, and to men earth.

III. Let us then begin with the Barbarians, and by degrees we will proceed to the rest of the peoples, in order that we may understand which of them hold the truth concerning God, and which of them error. The Barbarians then, inasmuch as they did not comprehend God, erred with the elements; and they began to serve created things instead of the Creator of them<sup>1</sup>, and on this account they made likenesses and they enclosed them in temples; and lo! they worship them and guard them with great precaution, that their gods may not be stolen by robbers; and the Barbarians have not understood that whatsoever watches must be greater than that which is watched; and that whatsoever creates must be greater than that whatever is created: if so be then that their gods are too weak for their own salvation, how will they furnish salvation to mankind? The Barbarians then have erred with a great error in worshipping dead images which profit them not. And it comes to me to wonder also, O king, at their philosophers, how they too have erred and have named gods those likenesses which have been made in honour of the elements; and the wise men have not understood that these very elements are corruptible and dissoluble; for if a little part of the element be dissolved or corrupted, all of it is dissolved and corrupted. If then these elements are dissolved and corrupted, and compelled to be subject to another harder than themselves, and are not in their nature gods, how can they call gods those likenesses which are made in their honour? Great then is the error which their philosophers have brought upon their followers. |38

IV. Let us turn then, O

king, to the elements themselves, in order that we may shew concerning them that they are not gods, but a creation, corruptible and changeable, which is in the likeness of man<sup>2</sup>. But God is incorruptible and unchangeable and invisible, while seeing, turning and changing all things.

Those therefore who think concerning earth that it is God have already erred, since it is digged and planted and delved; and since it receives the defilement of the excrement of men and of beasts and of cattle: and since sometimes it becomes what is useless; for if it be burned it becomes dead, for from baked clay there springs nothing: and again, if water be collected on it, it becomes corrupted along with its fruits: and lo! it is trodden on by men and beasts, and it receives the impurity of the blood of the slain; and it is digged and filled with the dead and becomes a repository for bodies: none of which things can that holy and venerable and blessed and incorruptible nature receive. And from this we have perceived that the earth is not God but a creature of God.

V. And in like manner again have those erred who have thought concerning water that it is God. For water was created for the use of man and in many ways it is made subject to him. For it is changed, and receives defilement, and is corrupted, and loses its own nature when cooked with

many things, and receives colours which are not its own; being moreover hardened by the cold and mixed and mingled with the excrement of men and beasts and with the blood of the slain: and it is compelled by workmen, by means of the compulsion of channels, to flow and be conducted against its own will, and to come into gardens and other places, so as to cleanse and carry out all the filth of men, and wash away all defilement, and supply man's need of itself. Wherefore it is impossible that water should be God, but it is a work of God and a part of the world. So too those have erred not a little who thought concerning fire that it is God: for it too was created for the need of men: and in many ways it is made subject to them, in the service of food and in the preparation of ornaments and the other things of [39 which your majesty is aware: whilst in many ways it is extinguished and destroyed. And again those who have thought concerning the blast of winds that it is God, these also have erred: and this is evident to us, that these winds are subject to another, since sometimes their blast is increased and sometimes it is diminished and ceases, according to the commandment of Him who subjects them. Since for the sake of man they were created by God, in order that they might fulfil the needs of trees and fruits and seeds, and that they might transport ships upon the sea; those ships which bring to men their necessary things, from a place where they are found to a place where they are not found; and furnish the different parts of the world. Since then this wind is sometimes increased and sometimes diminished, there is one place in which it does good and another where it does harm, according to the nod of Him who rules it: and even men are able by means of well-known instruments to catch and coerce it that it may fulfil for them the necessities which they demand of it: and over itself it has no power at all; wherefore it is not possible that winds should be called gods, but a work of God.

VI. So too those have

erred who have thought concerning the sun that he is God. For lo! we see him, that by the necessity of another he is moved and turned and runs his course; and he proceeds from degree to degree, rising and setting every day, in order that he may warm the shoots of plants and shrubs, and may bring forth in the air which is mingled with him every herb which is on the earth. And in calculation the sun has a part with the rest of the stars in his course, and although he is one in his nature, he is mixed with many parts, according to the advantage of the needs of men: and that not according to his own will, but according to the will of Him that ruleth him. Wherefore it is not possible that the sun should be God, but a work of God; and in like manner also the moon and stars.

VII. But those who have thought concerning men of old, that some of them are gods, these have greatly erred: as thou, even thou, O king, art aware, that man consists of the four elements and of soul and spirit, and therefore is he even called World, and apart from any one of these parts he does not exist. He has [40 beginning and end, and he is born and also suffers corruption. But God, as I have said, has none of this in His nature, but He is unmade and incorruptible. On this account, then, it is impossible that we should represent him as God who is man by nature, one to whom

sometimes, when he looketh for joy, grief happens; and for laughter, and weeping befalls him; one that is passionate and jealous, envious and regretful, along with the rest of the other defects: and in many ways more corrupted than the elements or even than the beasts. And thence, O king, it is right for us to understand the error of the Barbarians, that, whereas they have not investigated concerning the true God, they have fallen away from the truth and have gone after the desire of their own mind, in serving elements subject to dissolution, and dead images: and on account of their error they do not perceive who is the true God.

VIII. Let us return now to the Greeks in order that we may know what opinion they have concerning the true God. The Greeks then because they are wiser than the Barbarians have erred even more than the Barbarians, in that they have introduced many gods that are made; and some of them they have represented as male and some of them as female; and in such a way that some of their gods were found to be adulterers and murderers, and jealous and envious, and angry and passionate, and murderers of fathers, and thieves and plunderers. And they say that some of them were lame and maimed; and some of them wizards, and some of them utterly mad; and some of them played on harps; and some of them wandered on mountains: and some of them died outright; and some were struck by lightning, and some were made subject to men, and some went off in flight, and some were stolen by men; and lo! some of them were wept and bewailed by men; and some, they say, went down to Hades; and some were sorely wounded, and some were changed into the likeness of beasts in order that they might commit adultery with the race of mortal women; and some of them have been reviled for sleeping with males: and some of them, they say, were in wedlock with their mothers and sisters and daughters; and they say of their gods that they committed adultery with the daughters of men, and from them was born a certain race which was also mortal. And of some of their goddesses they say that they contended about beauty and came for judgment before men. The Greeks, then, O king, have brought forward what is wicked, ridiculous and foolish concerning their gods and themselves; in that they called such like persons gods, who are no gods: and hence men have taken occasion to commit adultery and fornication, and to plunder and do everything that is wicked and hateful and abominable. For if those who are called their gods have done all those things that are written above, how much more shall men do them who believe in those who have done these things! and from the wickedness of this error, lo! there have happened to men frequent wars and mighty famines, and bitter captivity and deprivation of all things: and lo! they endure them, and all these things befall them from this cause alone: and when they endure them they do not perceive in their conscience that because of their error these things happen to them.

IX. Now let us come to

the history of these their gods in order that we may prove accurately concerning all those things which we have said above.

Before everything else the Greeks introduce as a god Kronos, which is interpreted Chiun; and the worshippers of this deity sacrifice to him their children: and some of them they burn while yet living. Concerning him they say that he took him Rhea to wife; and from her he begat many sons; from whom he begat also Dios, who is called Zeus; and at the last he went mad and, for fear of an oracle which was told him, began to eat his children. And from him Zeus was stolen away, and he did not perceive it: and at the last Zeus bound him and cut off his genitals and cast them in the

sea: whence, as they say in the fable, was born Aphrodite, who is called Astera: and he cast Kronos bound into darkness. Great then is the error and scorn which the Greeks have introduced concerning the head of their gods, in that they have said all these things about him, O king. It is not possible that God should be bound or amputated; otherwise it is a great misfortune. And after Kronos they introduce another god, Zeus; and they say concerning this one, that he received the headship and became king of all the gods; and they say concerning him that he was changed into cattle and everything else, in order that he might |42 commit adultery with mortal women, and might raise up to himself children from them. Since at one time they say he was changed into a bull on account of his passion for Europa and for Pasiphae; and again he was changed into the likeness of gold on account of his passion for Danae: and into a swan, through his passion for Leda; and into a man through his passion for Antiope; and into lightning on account of his passion for the Moon: so that from these he begat many children: for they say that from Antiope he begat Zethus and Amphion; and from the Moon, Dionysus; from Alkmena, Herakles; and from Leto, Apollo and Artemis; and from Danae, Perseus; and from Leda, Castor and Polydeuces and Helene; and from Mnemosyne he begat nine daughters, those whom he called the Muses; and from Europa, Minos and Rhadamanthus and Sarpedon. But last of all he was changed into the likeness of an eagle on account of his passion for Ganymede the shepherd.

Because of these stories, O king, much evil has befallen the race of men who are at this present day, since they imitate their gods, and commit adultery, and are defiled with their mothers and sisters, and in sleeping with males: and some of them have dared to kill even their fathers. For if he, who is said to be the head and king of their gods, has done these things, how much more shall his worshippers imitate him! And great is the madness which the Greeks have introduced into their history concerning him: for it is not possible that a god should commit adultery or fornication, or should approach to sleep with males, or that he should be a parricide; otherwise he is much worse than a destructive demon.

X. And again they introduce another god, Hephaestus; and they say of him that he is lame and wearing a cap on his head, and holding in his hand tongs and hammer; and working in brass in order that therefrom he may find his needed sustenance. Is then this god so much in need? Whereas it is impossible for a god to be needy or lame: otherwise he is very weak. And again they introduce another god and call him Hermes; and they say that he is a thief, loving avarice and coveting gains, and a magician and maimed and an athlete and an interpreter of words: whereas it is impossible for a god to be a magician, or |43 avaricious, or maimed, or coveting anything that is not his, or an athlete: and if it be found to be otherwise, he is of no use. And after him they introduce another god, Asclepius; and they say that he is a physician and prepares medicines and bandages in order that he may satisfy his need of sustenance. Is then this god in need? And he at last was struck by lightning by Zeus, on account of Tyndareus the Lacedemonian; and so he died.

If then Asclepius was a god, and when struck by lightning was unable to help himself, how is it that he was able to help others? Whereas it is an impossible thing that the divine nature should be in need, or that it should be struck by lightning. And again they introduce another god and call him Ares, and they say that he is a warrior and jealous, and covets sheep and things which do not belong to him, and acquires possessions through his weapons; and of him they say that at last he committed adultery with Aphrodite and was bound by a tiny boy Eros, and by Hephaestus the husband of Aphrodite: whereas it is impossible that a god should be a warrior or a prisoner or an adulterer. And again they say of Dionysus that he too is a god, who celebrates festivals by night and teaches drunkenness, and carries off women that do not belong to him: and at the last they say that he went mad and left his female attendants and tied to the wilderness; and in this madness of his he ate serpents; and at the last he was killed by Titan. If then Dionysus was a god, and when slain was not able to help himself; how is it that he was able to help others?

Herakles, too, they introduce, and they say of him that he is a god, a hater of things hateful, a tyrant and a warrior, and a slayer of the wicked: and of him they say that at the last he went mad and slew his children and cast himself into the fire and died. If therefore Herakles be a god and in all these evils was unable to stand up for himself, how was it that others were asking help from him? Whereas it is impossible that a god should be mad or drunken or a slayer of his children, or destroyed by fire.

XI. And after him they introduce another god and call him Apollo: and they say of him that he is jealous and changeable; and sometimes he holds a bow and a quiver, and sometimes a lyre and a plectrum; and he gives oracles to men, in order that he may receive a reward from them. Is then this god in need of reward? Whereas it is disgraceful that all these things should be found in a god. And after him they introduce Artemis a goddess, the sister of Apollo; and they say that she was a huntress; and she carried a bow and arrows, and went about on mountains leading dogs, either to hunt the deer or the wild boars. Whereas it is disgraceful that a maid should go about by herself on mountains and follow the chase of beasts. And therefore it is not possible that Artemis should be a goddess.

Again they say of Aphrodite that she forsooth is a goddess; and sometimes forsooth she dwells with their gods, and sometimes she commits adultery with men; and sometimes she has Ares for her lover and sometimes Adonis, who is Tammuz: and sometimes forsooth Aphrodite is wailing and weeping for the death of Tammuz: and they say that she went down to Hades in order that she might ransom Adonis from Persephone, who was the daughter of Hades. If then Aphrodite be a goddess and was unable to help her lover in his death, how is she able to help others? And this is a thing impossible to be listened to, that the divine nature should come to weeping and wailing and adultery. And again they say of Tammuz that he is a god; and he is forsooth a hunter and an adulterer; and they say that he was killed by a blow from a wild boar, and was not able to help himself, And if he was not able to help himself, how is he able to take care of the human race? And this is impossible, that a god should be an adulterer or a hunter or that he should have died by violence. And again they say of Rhea that she forsooth is the mother of their gods; and they say of

her that she had at one time a lover Atys, and she was rejoicing in corruptible men; and at the last she established lamentations, and was bewailing her lover Atys. If then the mother of their gods was not able to help her lover and rescue him from death, how is it possible that she should help others? It is disgraceful then that a goddess should lament and weep, and that she should have joy over corruptible beings. |45

Again they bring forward Kore; and they say that she was a goddess and that she was carried off by Pluto and was not able to help herself. If then she is a goddess and was not able to help herself, how is she able to help others? For a goddess who is carried off is extremely weak.

All these things, then, O king, the Greeks have introduced forward about their gods, and have invented and said concerning them: whence all men have taken occasion to do all wicked and impure things: and thereby the whole earth has been corrupted.

XII. Now the Egyptians, because they are more evil and ignorant than all peoples upon the earth, have erred more than all men. For the worship of the Barbarians and the Greeks did not suffice them, but they introduced also the nature of beasts, and said concerning it that they were gods: and also of the creeping things which are found on the dry land and in the waters, and of the plants and herbs they have said that some of them are gods, and they have become corrupt in all madness and impurity more than all peoples that are upon the earth. For of old time they worshipped Isis; and they say that she forsooth is a goddess, who had forsooth a husband Osiris, her brother; but when forsooth Osiris was killed by his brother Typhon, Isis fled with her son Horus to Byblos in Syria and was there for a certain time until that her son was grown: and he contended with his uncle Typhon and killed him, and thereupon Isis returned and went about with her son Horus, and was seeking for the body of Osiris her lord, and bitterly bewailing his death. If therefore Isis be a goddess, and was not able to help Osiris her brother and lord, how is it possible that she should help others? Whereas it is impossible that the divine nature should be afraid and flee, or weep and wail. Otherwise it is a great misfortune. But of Osiris they say that he is a god, a beneficent one; and he was killed by Typhon and could not help himself; and it is evident that this cannot be said of Deity. And again they say of Typhon, his brother, that he is a god, a fratricide, and slain by his brother's son and wife since he was unable to help himself. And how can one who does not help himself be a god?

Now because the Egyptians are more ignorant than the rest of |46 the peoples, these and the like gods did not suffice them, but they also put the name of gods on the beasts which are merely soulless. For some men among them worship the sheep, and others the calf; and some of them the pig, and others the shadfish; and some of them the crocodile, and the hawk, and the cormorant, and the kite, and the vulture, and the eagle, and the crow; some of them worship the cat, and others the fish Shibbuta; some of them the dog, and some of them the serpent, and some the asp, and others the lion, and others garlic, and onions, and thorns, and others the leopard, and the like. And the poor wretches do not perceive with regard to all these things that they are nought;

while every day they look upon their gods, who are eaten and destroyed by men, yea even by their own fellows; and some of them being burned, and some of them dying and putrifying and becoming refuse; and they do not understand that they are destroyed in many ways. And accordingly the Egyptians have not understood that the like of these are not gods, since their salvation is not within their own power; and if they are too weak for their own salvation, then as regards the salvation of their worshippers pray whence will they have the power to help them?

### XIII. The Egyptians

then have erred with a great error, above all peoples that are upon the face of the earth. But it is a matter of wonder, O king, concerning the Greeks, whereas they excel all the rest of the peoples in their manners and in their reason, how thus they have gone astray after dead idols and senseless images: while they see their gods sawn and polished by their makers, and curtailed and cut and burnt and shaped and transformed into every shape by them. And when they are grown old and fail by the length of time, and are melted and broken in pieces, how is it that they do not understand concerning them that they are not gods? And those who have not ability for their own preservation, how will they be able to take care of men? But even the poets and philosophers among them being in error have introduced concerning them that they are gods, things like these which are made for the honour of God Almighty; and being in error they seek to make them like to God as to whom no man has ever seen to whom He is like; nor is he able to see Him<sup>3</sup>; and together with these things they introduce concerning Deity as if it were that deficiency were found with it; in that they say that He accepts sacrifice and asks for burnt-offering and libation and murders of men and temples. But God is not needy, and none of these things is sought for by Him: and it is clear that men are in error in those things that they imagine. But their poets and philosophers introduce and say, that the nature of all their gods is one; but they have not understood of God our Lord, that while He is one, He is yet in all. They, then, are in error; for if, while the body of man is many in its parts, no member is afraid of its fellow, but whilst it is a composite body, all is on an equality with all: so also God who is one in His nature has a single essence proper to Him, and He is

equal in His nature and His essence, nor is He afraid of Himself. If therefore the nature of the gods is one, it is not proper that a god should persecute a god, nor kill nor do him that which is evil.

If then gods were persecuted and transfixed by gods, and some of them were carried off and some were struck by lightning; it is clear that the nature of their gods is not one, and hence it is clear, O king, that that is an error which they speculate about the nature of their gods, and that they reduce them to one nature. If then it is proper that we should admire a god who is visible and does not see, how much more is this worthy of admiration that a man should believe in a nature which is invisible and all-seeing! and if again it is right that a man should investigate the works of an artificer, how much more is it right that he should praise the Maker of the artificer! For behold! while the Greeks have established laws, they have not understood that by their laws they were condemning their gods; for if their laws are just, their gods are unjust, who have committed transgression in killing one another and practising sorcery, committing adultery, plundering, stealing and sleeping with males, along with the rest of their other doings. But if their gods excellently and as they describe have done all these things, then the laws of the Greeks are unjust; and they are not laid down according to the will of the gods; and in this the whole world has erred. [48 For as for the histories of their gods, some of them are myths, some of them physical, and some hymns and songs: the hymns and songs, then, are empty words and sound; and as to the physical, if they were done as they say, then they are not gods, since they have done these things and suffered and endured these things: and these myths are flimsy words, altogether devoid of force.

XIV. Let us come now, O

king, also to the history of the Jews and let us see what sort of opinion they have concerning God. The Jews then say that God is one, Creator of all and almighty: and that it is not proper for us that anything else should be worshipped, but this God only: and in this they appear to be much nearer to the truth than all the peoples, in that they worship God more exceedingly and not His works; and they imitate God by reason of the love which they have for man; for they have compassion on the poor and ransom the captive and bury the dead, and do things of a similar nature to these: things which are acceptable to God and are well-pleasing also to men, things which they have received from their fathers of old. Nevertheless they too have gone astray from accurate knowledge, and they suppose in their minds that they are serving God, but in the methods of their actions their service is to angels and not to God, in that they observe sabbaths and new moons and the passover and the great fast, and the fast, and

circumcision, and cleanness of meats: which things not even thus have they perfectly observed.

XV. Now the Christians, O king, by going about and seeking have found the truth, and as we have comprehended from their writings they are nearer to the truth and to exact knowledge than the rest of the peoples. For they know and believe in God, the Maker of heaven and earth, in whom are all things and from whom are all things: He who has no other god as His fellow: from whom they have received those commandments which they have engraved on their minds, which they keep in the hope and expectation of the world to come; so that on this account they do not commit adultery nor fornication, they do not bear false witness, they do not deny a deposit, nor covet what is not theirs: they honour father and mother; they do good to those who are their neighbours, and when they are judges they judge uprightly; and they do not worship idols in the form of man; and whatever they do not |49 wish that others should do to them, they do not practise towards any one<sup>4</sup>, and they do not eat of the meats of idol sacrifices, for they are undefiled: and those who grieve them they comfort, and make them their friends; and they do good to their enemies: and their wives, O king, are pure as virgins, and their daughters modest: and their men abstain from all unlawful wedlock and from all impurity, in the hope of the recompense that is to come in another world: but as for their servants or handmaids, or their children if any of them have any, they persuade them to become Christians for the love that they have towards them; and when they have become so, they call them without distinction brethren: they do not worship strange gods: and they walk in all humility and kindness, and falsehood is not found among them, and they love one another: and from the widows they do not turn away their countenance: and they rescue the orphan from him who does him violence: and he who has gives to him who has not, without grudging; and when they see the stranger they bring him to their dwellings, and rejoice over him as over a true brother; for they do not call brothers those who are after the flesh, but those who are in the spirit and in God: but when one of their poor passes away from the world, and any of them sees him, then he provides for his burial according to his ability; and if they hear that any of their number is imprisoned or oppressed for the name of their Messiah, all of them provide for his needs, and if it is possible that he may be delivered, they deliver him. And if there is among them a man that is poor or needy, and they have not an abundance of necessaries, they fast two or three days that they may supply the needy with their necessary food. And they observe scrupulously the commandments of their Messiah: they live honestly and soberly, as the Lord their God commanded them: every morning and at all hours on account of the goodnesses of God toward them they praise and laud Him: and over their food and over their drink they render Him thanks. And if any righteous person of their number passes away from the world they rejoice and give thanks to God, and they follow his body, as if he were moving from one place to another: and when a child is born to any one of them, they praise God, and if again |50 it chance to die in its infancy, they praise God mightily, as for one who has passed through the world without sins. And if again they see that one of their number has died in his iniquity or in his sins, over this one they weep bitterly and sigh, as over one who is about to go to punishment: such is the ordinance of the law of the Christians, O king, and such their conduct.

XVI. As men who know God, they ask from Him petitions which are proper for Him to give and for them to receive: and thus they accomplish the course of their lives. And because they acknowledge the goodnesses of God towards them, lo! on account of them there flows forth the

beauty that is in the world. And truly they are of the number of those that have found the truth by going about and seeking it, and as far as we have comprehended, we have understood that they only are near to the knowledge of the truth. But the good deeds which they do, they do not proclaim in the ears of the multitude, and they take care that no one shall perceive them, and hide their gift, as he who has found a treasure and hides it<sup>5</sup>. And they labour to become righteous as those that expect to see their Messiah and receive from Him the promises made to them with great glory. But their sayings and their ordinances, O king, and the glory of their service, and the expectation of their recompense of reward, according to the doing of each one of them, which they expect in another world, thou art able to know from their writings. It sufficeth for us that we have briefly made known to your majesty concerning the conversation and the truth of the Christians. For truly great and wonderful is their teaching to him that is willing to examine and understand it. And truly this people is a new people, and there is something divine mingled with it. Take now their writings and read in them, and lo! ye will find that not of myself have I brought these things forward nor as their advocate have I said them, but as I have read in their writings, these things I firmly believe, and those things also that are to come. And therefore I was constrained to set forth the truth to them that take pleasure therein and seek after the world to come. And I have no doubt that the world stands by reason of |51 the intercession of Christians. But the rest of the peoples are deceived and deceivers, rolling themselves before the elements of the world, according as the sight of their understanding is unwilling to pass by them; and they grope as if in the dark, because they are unwilling to know the truth, and like drunken men they stagger and thrust one another and fall down.

XVII. Thus far, O king, it is I that have spoken. For as to what remains, as was said above, there are found in their other writings words which are difficult to speak, or that one should repeat them; things which are not only said, but actually done. The Greeks, then, O king, because they practise foul things in sleeping with males, and with mother and sister and daughter, turn the ridicule of their foulness upon the Christians; but the Christians are honest and pious, and the truth is set before their eyes, and they are long-suffering; and therefore while they know their error and are buffeted by them, they endure and suffer them: and more exceedingly do they pity them as men who are destitute of knowledge: and in their behalf they offer up prayers that they may turn from their error. And when it chances that one of them turns, he is ashamed before the Christians of the deeds that are done by him: and he confesses to God, saying, In ignorance I did these things: and he cleanses his heart, and his sins are forgiven him, because he did them in ignorance in former time, when he was blaspheming and reviling the true knowledge of the Christians. And truly blessed is the race of the Christians, more than all men that are upon the face of the earth.

Let the tongues of those now be silenced who talk vanity, and who oppress the Christians, and let them now speak the truth. For it is better that they should worship the true God rather than that they should worship a sound without intelligence; and truly divine is that which is spoken by the mouth of the Christians, and their teaching is the gateway of light. Let all those then approach thereunto who do not know God, and let them receive incorruptible words, those which are so always and from eternity: let them, therefore, anticipate the dread judgment which is to come by Jesus the Messiah upon the whole race of men. The Apology of Aristides the Philosopher is ended.

[Footnotes renumbered and moved to the end] 1. 1 Rom. i. 25.

2. 1 Rom. i. 23.

3. 1 1 Tim. vi. 10.

4. 1 Cf. Teaching of the Twelve Apostles,

cc. 1-4.

5. 1 Matt. xiii. 44. This text was transcribed by Roger Pearse, 2004. All material on this page is in the public domain - copy freely.

Greek text is rendered using the Scholars Press SP Ionic font, free from here.

Early Church Fathers - Additional Texts

## The Apology - Translation of the Greek and of the Syriac versions in parallel columns

---

The Apology of Aristides THE APOLOGY OF

ARISTIDES AS IT IS PRESERVED IN THE HISTORY OF BARLAAM AND JOSAPHAT.

Translated from the Greek.

I, I, O King in the providence of God came into the world; and when I had considered the heaven and the earth, the sun and the moon and the rest, I marvelled at their orderly arrangement. And when I saw that the universe and all that is therein is moved by necessity, I perceived that the mover and controller is God. For everything which causes motion is stronger than that which is moved, and that which controls is stronger than that which is controlled. The self-same being, then, who first established and now controls the universe---him do I affirm to be God who is without beginning and without end, immortal and self-sufficing, above all passions and infirmities, above anger and forgetfulness and ignorance and the rest.

Through Him too all things consist.

He requires not sacrifice and libation nor any one of the things that appear to sense; but all men stand in need of Him. THE APOLOGY OF ARISTIDES THE PHILOSOPHER.

Translated from the Syriac.

ARISTIDES.

Here follows the defence which Aristides the philosopher made before Hadrian the King on behalf of reverence for God.

. . . All-powerful Caesar Titus Hadrianus Antoninus, venerable and merciful, from Marcianus Aristides, an Athenian philosopher. 1 I, I, O King, by the grace of God came into this world; and when I had considered the heaven and the earth and the seas, and had surveyed the sun and the rest of creation, I marvelled at the beauty of the world. And I perceived that the world and all that is therein are moved by the power of another; and I understood that he who moves them is God, who is hidden in them, and veiled by them. And it is manifest that that which causes motion is more powerful than that which is moved. But that I should make search concerning this same mover of all, as to what is his nature (for it seems to me, he is indeed unsearchable in his nature), and that I should argue as to the constancy of his government, so as to grasp it fully,---this is a vain effort for me; for it is not possible that a man should fully comprehend it. I say, however, concerning this mover of the world, that he is God of all, who made all things for the sake of mankind. And it seems to me that this is reasonable, that one should fear God and should not oppress man.

I say, then, that God is not born, not made, an ever-abiding nature without beginning and without end, immortal, perfect, and incomprehensible.

Now when I say that he is "perfect," this means that there is not in him any defect, and he is not in need of anything but all things are in need of him. And when I say that he is "without beginning," this means that everything which has beginning has also an end, and that which has an end may be brought to an end. He has no name, for everything which has a name is kindred to things created. Form he has none, nor yet any union of members; for whatsoever possesses these is kindred to things fashioned.

He is neither male nor female.<sup>5</sup> The heavens do not limit him, but the heavens and all things, visible and invisible, receive their bounds from him.

Adversary he has none, for there exists not any stronger than he. Wrath and indignation he possesses not, for there is nothing which is able to stand against him. Ignorance and forgetfulness are not in his nature, for he is altogether wisdom and understanding; and in Him stands fast all that exists.

He requires not sacrifice and libation, nor even one of things visible; He requires not aught from any, but all living creatures stand in need of him.

II. Having thus spoken concerning God, so far as it was possible for me to speak of Him,<sup>2</sup> let us next proceed to the human race, that we may see which of them participate in the truth and which of them in error. For it is clear to us, O King,<sup>3</sup> that there are three<sup>4</sup> classes of men in this world; these being the worshippers of the gods acknowledged among you, and Jews, and Christians.

Further they who pay homage to many gods are themselves divided into three classes, Chaldaeans namely, and Greeks, and Egyptians; for these have been guides and preceptors to the rest of the nations in the service and worship of these many-titled deities.

II. Since, then, we have addressed you concerning God, so far as our discourse can bear upon him, let us now come to the race of men, that we may know which of them participate in the truth of which we have spoken, and which of them go astray from it. This is clear to you, O King, that there are four classes of men in this world:---Barbarians and Greeks, Jews and Christians. The Barbarians, indeed, trace the origin of their kind of religion from Kronos and from Rhea and their other gods; the Greeks, however, from Helenos, who is said to be sprung from Zeus. And by Helenos there were born Aiolos and Xuthos; and there were others descended from Inachos and Phoroneus, and lastly from the Egyptian Danaos and from Kadmos and from Dionysos. The Jews, again, trace the origin of their race from Abraham, who begat Isaac, of whom was born Jacob. And he begat twelve sons who migrated from Syria to Egypt; and there they were called the nation of the Hebrews, by him who made their laws; and at length they were named Jews. The Christians, then, trace the beginning of their religion from Jesus the Messiah; and he is named the Son of God Most High. And it is said that God came down from heaven, and from a Hebrew virgin assumed and clothed himself with flesh; and the Son of God lived in a daughter of man. This is taught in the gospel, as it is called, which a short time ago was preached among them; and you also if you will read therein, may perceive the power which belongs to it. This Jesus, then, was born of the race of the Hebrews; and he had twelve disciples in order that the purpose of his incarnation <sup>6</sup> might in time be accomplished. But he himself was pierced by the Jews, and he died and was buried; and they say that after three days he rose and ascended to heaven. Thereupon these twelve disciples went forth throughout the known parts of the world, and kept showing his greatness with all

modesty and uprightness. And hence also those of the present day who believe that preaching are called Christians, and they are become famous. So then there are, as I said above, four classes of men:---Barbarians and Greeks, Jews and Christians.

Moreover the wind is obedient to God, and fire to the angels; the waters also to the demons and the earth to the sons of men.<sup>7</sup> III. Let us see then which of them participate in truth and which of them in error. The Chaldaeans, then, not knowing God went astray after the elements and began to worship the creation more than their Creator. And of these they formed certain shapes and styled them a representation of the heaven and the earth and the sea, of the sun too and the moon and the other primal bodies or luminaries. And they shut them up together in shrines, and worship them, calling them gods, even though they have to guard them securely for fear they should be stolen by robbers. And they did not perceive that anything which acts as guard is greater than that which is guarded, and that he who makes is greater than that which is made. For if their gods are unfit to look after their own safety, how shall they bestow protection upon others?

Great then is the error into which the Chaldaeans wandered in adoring lifeless and good-for-nothing images. And it occurs to me as surprising, O King, how it is that their so-called philosophers have quite failed to observe that the elements themselves are perishable. And if the elements are perishable and subject to necessity, how are they gods? And if the elements are not gods, how do the images made in their honour come to be gods?

III. Let us begin, then, with the Barbarians, and go on to the rest of the nations one after another, that we may see which of them hold the truth as to God and which of them hold error. The Barbarians, then, as they did not apprehend God, went astray among the elements, and began to worship things created instead of their Creator;<sup>8</sup> and for this end they made images and shut them up in shrines, and lo! they worship them, guarding them the while with much care, lest their gods be stolen by robbers. And the Barbarians did not observe that that which acts as guard is greater than that which is guarded, and that every one who creates is greater than that which is created. If it be, then, that their gods are too feeble to see to their own safety, how will they take thought for the safety of men? Great then is the error into which the Barbarians wandered in worshipping lifeless images which can do nothing to help them. And I am led to wonder, O King, at their philosophers, how that even they went astray, and gave the name of gods to images which were made in honour of the elements; and that their sages did not perceive that the elements also are dissoluble and perishable. For if a small part of an element is dissolved or destroyed, the whole of it may be dissolved and destroyed.

If then the elements themselves are dissolved and destroyed and forced to be subject to another that is more stubborn than they, and if they are not in their nature gods, why, forsooth, do they call the images which are made in their honour, God?

Great, then, is the error which the philosophers among them have brought upon their followers.

IV. Let us proceed then, O King, to the elements themselves that we may show in regard to them that they are not gods, but perishable and mutable, produced out of that which did not exist at the command of the true God, who is indestructible and immutable and invisible; yet He sees all things and as He wills, modifies and changes things.

What then shall I say concerning the elements?

They err who believe that the sky is a god. For we see that it revolves and moves by necessity and is compacted of many parts, being thence called the ordered universe (Kosmos). Now the universe is the construction of some designer; and that which has been constructed has a beginning and an end. And the sky with its luminaries moves by necessity. For the stars are carried along in array at fixed intervals from sign to sign, and, some setting, others rising, they traverse their courses in due season so as to mark off summers and winters, as it has been appointed for them by God; and obeying the inevitable necessity of their nature they transgress not their proper limits, keeping company with the heavenly order. Whence it is plain that the sky is not a god but rather a work of God.

IV. Let us turn now, O King, to the elements in themselves, that we may make clear in regard to them, that they are not gods, but a created thing, liable to ruin and change, which is of the same nature as man; whereas God is imperishable and unvarying, and invisible, while yet He sees, and overrules, and transforms all things.

They erred also who believed the earth to be a goddess. For we see that it is despitefully used and tyrannized over by men, and is furrowed and kneaded and becomes of no account. For if it be burned with fire, it becomes devoid of life; for nothing will grow from the ashes. Besides if there fall upon it an excess of rain it dissolves away, both it and its fruits. Moreover it is trodden under foot of men and the other creatures; it is dyed with the blood of the murdered; it is dug open and filled with dead bodies and becomes a tomb for corpses. In face of all this, it is inadmissible that the earth is a goddess but rather it is a work of God for the use of men.

Those then who believe concerning the earth that it is a god have hitherto deceived themselves, since it is furrowed and set with plants and trenched; and it takes in the filthy refuse of men and beasts and cattle. And at times it becomes unfruitful, for if it be burnt to ashes it becomes devoid of life, for nothing germinates from an earthen jar. And besides if water be collected upon it, it is dissolved together with its products. And lo! it is trodden under foot of men and beast, and receives the bloodstains of the slain; and it is dug open, and filled with the dead, and becomes a tomb for corpses. But it is impossible that a nature, which is holy and worthy and blessed and immortal, should allow of any one of these things. And hence it appears to us that the earth is not a god but a creation of God.

V. They also erred who believed the water to be a god. For it, too, has been made for the use of men, and is controlled by them; it is defiled and destroyed and suffers change on being boiled and dyed with colours; and it is congealed by the frost, and polluted with blood, and is introduced for the washing of all unclean things. Wherefore it is impossible that water should be a god, but it is a work of God.

They also err who believe that fire is a god. For fire was made for the use of men, and it is controlled by them, being carried about from place to place for boiling and roasting all kinds of meat, and even for (the burning of) dead bodies. Moreover it is extinguished in many ways, being quenched through man's agency. So it cannot be allowed that fire is a god, but it is a work of God.

They also err who think the blowing of the winds is a goddess. For it is clear that it is under the dominion of another; and for the sake of man it has been designed by God for the transport of ships and the conveyance of grain and for man's other wants. It rises too and falls at the bidding of

God, whence it is concluded that the blowing of the winds is not a goddess but only a work of God.

V. In the same way, again, those erred who believed the waters to be gods. For the waters were created for the use of man, and are put under his rule in many ways. For they suffer change and admit impurity, and are destroyed and lose their nature while they are boiled into many substances. And they take colours which do not belong to them; they are also congealed by frost and are mingled and permeated with the filth of men and beasts, and with the blood of the slain. And being checked by skilled workmen through the restraint of aqueducts, they flow and are diverted against their inclination, and come into gardens and other places in order that they may be collected and issue forth as a means of fertility for man, and that they may cleanse away every impurity and fulfil the service man requires from them. Wherefore it is impossible that the waters should be a god, but they are a work of God and a part of the world. In like manner also they who believed that fire is a god erred to no slight extent. For it, too, was created for the service of men, and is subject to them in many ways:----in the preparation of meats, and as a means of casting metals, and for other ends whereof your Majesty is aware. At the same time it is quenched and extinguished in many ways.

Again they also erred who believed the motion of the winds to be a god. For it is well known to us that those winds are under the dominion of another, at times their motion increases, and at times it fails and ceases at the command of him who controls them. For they were created by God for the sake of men, in order to supply the necessity of trees and fruits and seeds; and to bring over the sea ships which convey for men necessaries and goods from places where they are found to places where they are not found; and to govern the quarters of the world. And as for itself, at times it increases and again abates; and in one place brings help and in another causes disaster at the bidding of him who rules it. And mankind too are able by known means to confine and keep it in check in order that it may fulfil for them the service they require from it. And of itself it has not any authority at all. And hence it is impossible that the winds should be called gods, but rather a thing made by God.

VI. They also err who believe the sun to be a god. For we see that it moves by necessity and revolves and passes from sign to sign, setting and rising so as to give warmth to plants and tender shoots for the use of man.

Besides it has its part in common with the rest of the stars, and is much smaller than the sky; it suffers eclipse of its light and is not the subject of its own laws. Wherefore it is concluded that the sun is not a god, but only a work of God. They also err who believe that the moon is a goddess. For we see that it moves by necessity and revolves and passes from sign to sign, setting and rising for the benefit of men; and it is less than the sun and waxes and wanes and has eclipses. Wherefore it is concluded that the moon is not a goddess but a work of God.

VI. So also they erred who believed that the sun is a god. For we see that it is moved by the compulsion of another, and revolves and makes its journey, and proceeds from sign to sign, rising and setting every day, so as to give warmth for the growth of plants and trees, and to bring forth into the air wherewith it (sunlight) is mingled every growing thing which is upon the earth. And to it there belongs by comparison a part in common with the rest of the stars in its course; and though it is one in its nature it is associated with many parts for the supply of the needs of men; and that not according to its own will but rather according to the will of him who rules it. And hence it is

impossible that the sun should be a god, but the work of God; and in like manner also the moon and the stars.

VII. They also err who believe that man is a god. For we see that he is moved by necessity, and is made to grow up, and becomes old even though he would not. And at one time he is joyous, at another he is grieved when he lacks food and drink and clothing. And we see that he is subject to anger and jealousy and desire and change of purpose and has many infirmities. He is destroyed too in many ways by means of the elements and animals, and by ever-assailing death. It cannot be admitted, then, that man is a god, but only a work of God.

Great therefore is the error into which the Chaldaeans wandered, following after their own desires. For they reverence the perishable elements and lifeless images, and do not perceive that they themselves make these things to be gods.

VII. And those who believed of the men of the past, that some of them were gods, they too were much mistaken. For as you yourself allow, O King, man is constituted of the four elements and of a soul and a spirit (and hence he is called a microcosm),<sup>10</sup> and without any one of these parts he could not consist.

He has a beginning and an end, and he is born and dies. But God, as I said, has none of these things in his nature, but is uncreated and imperishable. And hence it is not possible that we should set up man to be of the nature of God:---man, to whom at times when he looks for joy, there comes trouble, and when he looks for laughter there comes to him weeping,----who is wrathful and covetous and envious, with other defects as well. And he is destroyed in many ways by the elements and also by the animals. And hence, O King, we are bound to recognize the error of the Barbarians, that thereby, since they did not find traces of the true God, they fell aside from the truth, and went after the desire of their imagination, serving the perishable elements and lifeless images, and through their error not apprehending what the true God is.

VIII. Let us proceed then to the Greeks, that we may see whether they have any discernment concerning God. The Greeks, indeed, though they call themselves wise proved more deluded than the Chaldaeans in alleging that many gods have come into being, some of them male, some female, practised masters in every passion and every variety of folly. [And the Greeks themselves represented them to be adulterers and murderers, wrathful and envious and passionate, slayers of fathers and brothers, thieves and robbers, crippled and limping, workers in magic, and victims of frenzy. Some of them died (as their account goes), and some were struck by thunderbolts, and became slaves to men, and were fugitives, and they mourned and lamented, and changed themselves into animals for wicked and shameful ends.]<sup>11</sup> Wherefore, O King, they are ridiculous and absurd and impious tales that the Greeks have introduced, giving the name of gods to those who are not gods, to suit their unholy desires, in order that, having them as patrons of vice, they might commit adultery and robbery and do murder and other shocking deeds. For if their gods did such deeds why should not they also do them? So that from these misguided practices it has been the lot of mankind to have frequent wars and slaughters and bitter captivities.

VIII. Let us turn further to the Greeks also, that we may know what opinion they hold as to the true God. The Greeks, then, because they are more subtle than the Barbarians, have gone further astray than the Barbarians; inasmuch as they have introduced many fictitious gods, and have set

up some of them as males and some as females; and in that some of their gods were found who were adulterers, and did murder, and were deluded, and envious, and wrathful and passionate, and parricides, and thieves, and robbers. And some of them, they say, were crippled and limped, and some were sorcerers, and some actually went mad, and some played on lyres, and some were given to roaming on the hills, and some even died, and some were struck dead by lightning, and some were made servants even to men, and some escaped by flight, and some were kidnapped by men, and some, indeed, were lamented and deplored by men. And some, they say, went down to Sheol, and some were grievously wounded, and some transformed themselves into the likeness of animals to seduce the race of mortal women, and some polluted themselves by lying with males. And some, they say, were wedded to their mothers and their sisters and their daughters. And they say of their gods that they committed adultery with the daughters of men; and of these there was born a certain race which also was mortal. And they say that some of the females disputed about beauty, and appeared before men for judgment. Thus, O King, have the Greeks put forward foulness, and absurdity, and folly about their gods and about themselves, in that they have called those that are of such a nature gods, who are no gods. And hence mankind have received incitements to commit adultery and fornication, and to steal and to practise all that is offensive and hated and abhorred. For if they who are called their gods practised all these things which are written above, how much more should men practise them----men, who believe that their gods themselves practised them. And owing to the foulness of this error there have happened to mankind harassing wars, and great famines, and bitter captivity, and complete desolation. And lo! it was by reason of this alone that they suffered and that all these things came upon them; and while they endured those things they did not perceive in their mind that for their error those things came upon them.

IX. But, further, if we be minded to discuss their gods individually, you will see how great is the absurdity; for instance, how Kronos is brought forward by them as a god above all, and they sacrifice their own children to him. And he had many sons by Rhea, and in his madness devoured his own offspring. And they say that Zeus cut off his members and cast them into the sea, whence Aphrodite is said in fable to be engendered. Zeus, then, having bound his own father, cast him into Tartaros. You see the error and brutality which they advance against their god? Is it possible, then, that a god should be manacled and mutilated? What absurdity! Who with any wit would ever say so?

Next Zeus is introduced, and they say that he was king of their gods, and that he changed himself into animals that he might debauch mortal women. For they allege that he transformed himself into a bull for Europe, and into gold for Danae, and into a swan for Leda, and into a satyr for Antiope, and into a thunderbolt for Semele. Then by these there were many children, Dionysos and Zethus and Amphion and Herakles and Apollo and Artemis and Perseus, Kastor and Helenes and Polydeukes and Minos and Rhadamanthys and Sarpedon, and the nine daughters whom they called the Muses. Then too they bring forward statements about the matter of

Ganymedes.

Hence it happened, O King, to mankind to imitate all these things and to become adulterous men and lascivious women, and to be workers of other terrible iniquities, through the imitation of their god. Now how is it possible that a god should be an adulterer or an obscene person or a parricide?

IX. Let us proceed further to their account of their gods that we may carefully demonstrate all that is said above. First of all, the Greeks bring forward as a god Kronos, that is to say Chiun 13 (Saturn). And his worshippers sacrifice their children to him, and they burn some of them alive in his honour. And they say that he took to him among his wives Rhea, and begat many children by her. By her too he begat Dios, who is called Zeus. And at length he (Kronos) went mad, and through fear of an oracle that had been made known to him, he began to devour his sons. And from him Zeus was stolen away without his knowledge; and at length Zeus bound him, and mutilated the signs of his manhood, and flung them into the sea. And hence, as they say in fable, there was engendered Aphrodite, who is called Astarte. And he (Zeus) cast out Kronos fettered into darkness. Great then is the error and ignominy which the Greeks have brought forward about the first of their gods, in that they have said all this about him, O King. It is impossible that a god should be bound or mutilated; and if it be otherwise, he is indeed miserable. And after Kronos they bring forward another god Zeus. And they say of him that he assumed the sovereignty, and was king over all the gods. And they say that he changed himself into a beast and other shapes in order to seduce mortal women, and to raise up by them children for himself. Once, they say, he changed himself into a bull through love of Europe and Pasiphae.<sup>14</sup> And again he changed himself into the likeness of gold through love of Danae, and to a swan through love of Leda, and to a man through love of Antiope, and to lightning through love of Luna,<sup>15</sup> and so by these he begat many children. For by Antiope, they say, that he begat Zethus and Amphion, and by Luna Dionysos, by Alcmena Hercules, and by Leto, Apollo and Artemis, and by Danae, Perseus, and by Leda, Castor and Polydeuces, and Helene and Paludus,<sup>16</sup> and by Mnemosyne he begat nine daughters whom they styled the Muses, and by Europe, Minos and Rhadamanthos and Sarpedon. And lastly he changed himself into the likeness of an eagle through his passion for Ganydemos (Ganymede) the shepherd. By reason of these tales, O King, much evil has arisen among men, who to this day are imitators of their gods, and practise adultery and defile themselves with their mothers and their sisters, and by lying with males, and some make bold to slay even their parents. For if he who, is said to be the chief and king of their gods do these things how much more should his worshippers imitate him? And great is the folly which the Greeks have brought forward in their narrative concerning him. For it is impossible that a god should practise adultery or fornication or come near to lie with males, or kill his parents; and if it be otherwise, he is much worse than a destructive demon.

X. Along with him, too, they bring forward one Hephaistos as a god, and they say that he is lame and wields a hammer and tongs, working as a smith for his living. Is he then badly off? But it cannot be admitted that a god should be a cripple, and besides be dependent on mankind.

Then they bring forward Hermes as a god, representing him to be lustful, and a thief, and covetous, and a magician (and maimed) and an interpreter of language. But it cannot be admitted that such an one is a god.

They also bring forward Asklepios as a god who is a doctor and prepares drugs and compounds plasters for the sake of a living. For he was badly off. And afterwards he was struck, they say, with a thunderbolt by Zeus on account of Tyndareos, son of Lacedaimon; and so was killed. Now if Asklepios in spite of his divinity could not help himself when struck by lightning, how will he come to the rescue of others?

Again Ares is represented as a god, fond of strife and given to jealousy, and a lover of animals and other such things. And at last while corrupting Aphrodite, he was bound by the youthful Eros and by Hephaistos.

How then was he a god who was subject to desire, and a warrior, and a prisoner and an adulterer?

They allege that Dionysos also is a god who holds nightly revels and teaches drunkenness, and carries off the neighbours' wives, and goes mad and takes to flight. And at last he was put to death by the Titans. If then Dionysos could not save himself when he was being killed, and besides used to be mad, and drunk with wine, and a fugitive, how should he be a god?

They allege also that Herakles got drunk and went mad and cut the throats of his own children, then he was consumed by fire and so died.

Now how should he be a god, who was drunk and a slayer of children and burned to death? or how will he come to the help of others, when he was unable to help himself?

X. Again they bring forward as another god Hephaistos. And they say of him, that he is lame, and a cap is set on his head, and he holds in his hands firetongs and a hammer; and he follows the craft of iron working, that thereby he may procure the necessaries of his livelihood. Is then this god so very needy? But it cannot be that a god should be needy or lame, else he is very worthless. And further they bring in another god and call him Hermes. And they say that he is a thief,<sup>17</sup> a lover of avarice, and greedy for gain, and a magician and mutilated and an athlete, and an interpreter of language. But it is impossible that a god should be a magician or avaricious, or maimed, or craving for what is not his, or an athlete. And if it be otherwise, he is found to be useless. And after him they bring forward as another god Asklepios. And they say that he is a physician and prepares drugs and plaster that he may supply the necessaries of his livelihood. Is then this god in want? And at length he was struck with lightning by Dios on account of Tyndareos of Lacedaemon, and so he died. If then Asklepios were a god, and, when he was struck with lightning, was unable to help himself, how should he be able to give help to others? But that a divine nature should be in want or be destroyed by lightning is impossible. And again they bring forward another as a god, and they call him Ares. And they say that he is a warrior, and jealous, and covets sheep and things which are not his. And he makes gain by his arms. And they say that at length he committed adultery with Aphrodite, and was caught by the little boy Eros and by Hephaistos the husband of Aphrodite. But it is impossible that a god should be a warrior or bound or an adulterer. And again they say of Dionysos that he forsooth! is a god, who arranges carousals by night, and teaches drunkenness, and carries off women who do not belong to him. And at length, they say, he went mad and dismissed his handmaidens and fled into the desert; and during his madness he ate serpents. And at last he was killed by Titanos. If then Dionysos were a god, and when he was being killed was unable to help himself, how is it possible that he should help others?

Herakles next they bring forward and say that he is a god, who hates detestable things, a tyrant,<sup>18</sup> and warrior and a destroyer of plagues. And of him also they say that at length he became mad and killed his own children, and cast himself into a fire and died. If then Herakles is a god, and in all these calamities was unable to rescue himself, how should others ask help from him? But it is impossible that a god should be mad, or drunken or a slayer of his children, or consumed by fire.

XI. They represent Apollo also as a jealous god, and besides as the master of the bow and quiver, and sometimes of the lyre and flute, and as divining to men for pay? Can he then be very badly off? But it cannot be admitted that a god should be in want, and jealous, and a harping minstrel.

They represent Artemis also as his sister, who is a huntress and has a bow with a quiver; and she roams alone upon the hills with the dogs to hunt the stag or the wild boar.

How then should such a woman, who hunts and roams with her dogs, be a divine being?

Even Aphrodite herself they affirm to be a goddess who is adulterous. For at one time she had Ares as a paramour, and at another time Anchises and again Adonis, whose death she also laments, feeling the want of her lover. And they say that she even went down to Hades to purchase back Adonis from Persephone. Did you ever see, O King, greater folly than this, to bring forward as a goddess one who is adulterous and given to weeping and wailing? And they represent that Adonis is a hunter god, who came to a violent end, being wounded by a wild boar and having no power to help himself in his distress. How then will one who is adulterous and a hunter and mortal give himself any concern for mankind?

All this and much more of a like nature, and even far more disgraceful and offensive details, have the Greeks narrated, O King, concerning their gods;---details which it is not proper either to state or for a moment to remember. And hence mankind, taking an impulse from their gods, practised all lawlessness and brutality and impiety, polluting both earth and air by their awful deeds.

XI. And after him they bring forward another god and call him Apollon. And they say that he is jealous and inconstant, and at times he holds the bow and quiver, and again the lyre and plectron. And he utters oracles for men that he may receive rewards from them. Is then this god in need of rewards? But it is an insult that all these things should be found with a god. And after him they bring forward as a goddess Artemis, the sister of Apollo; and they say that she was a huntress and that she herself used to carry a bow and bolts, and to roam about upon the mountains, leading the hounds to hunt stags or wild boars of the field. But it is disgraceful that a virgin maid should roam alone upon the hills or hunt in the chase for animals. Wherefore it is impossible that Artemis should be a goddess.

Again they say of Aphrodite that she indeed is a goddess. And at times she dwells with their gods, but at other times she is a neighbour to men. And once she had Ares as a lover, and again Adonis who is Tammuz. Once also, Aphrodite was wailing and weeping for the death of Tammuz, and they say that she went down to Sheol that she might redeem Adonis from Persephone, who is the daughter of Sheol (Hades). If then Aphrodite is a goddess and was unable to help her lover at his death, how will she find it possible to help others? And this cannot be listened to, that a divine nature should come to weeping and wailing and adultery. And again they say of Tammuz that he is a god. And he is, forsooth! a hunter and an adulterer. And they say that he was killed by a wound from a wild boar, without being able to help himself. And if he could not help himself, how can he take thought for the human race? But that a god should be an adulterer or a hunter or should die by violence is impossible.

Again they say of Rhea that she is the mother of their gods. And they say that she had once a lover Atys, and that she used to delight in depraved men. And at last she raised a lamentation and mourned for Atys her lover. If then the mother of their gods was unable to help her lover and

deliver him from death, how can she help others? So it is disgraceful that a goddess should lament and weep and take delight in depraved men.

Again they introduce Kore and say that she is a goddess, and she was stolen away by Pluto, and could not help herself. If then she is a goddess and was unable to help herself how will she find means to help others? For a god who is stolen away is very powerless.

All this, then, O King, have the Greeks brought forward concerning their gods, and they have invented and declared it concerning them. And hence all men received an impulse to work all profanity and all defilements; and hereby the whole earth was corrupted.

XII. The Egyptians, again, being more stupid and witless than these have gone further astray than all the nations. For they were not content with the objects of worship of the Chaldaeans and the Greeks, but in addition to these brought forward also brute creatures as gods, both land and water animals, and plants and herbs; and they were defiled with all madness and brutality more deeply than all the nations on the earth. For originally they worshipped Isis, who had Osiris as brother and husband. He was slain by his own brother Typhon; and therefore Isis with Horos her son fled for refuge to Byblus in Syria, mourning for Osiris with bitter lamentation, until Horos grew up and slew Typhon. So that neither had Isis power to help her own brother and husband; nor could Osiris defend himself when he was being slain by Typhon; nor did Typhon, the slayer of his brother, when he was perishing at the hands of Horos and Isis, find means to rescue himself from death. And though they were revealed in their true character by such mishaps, they were believed to be very gods by the simple Egyptians, who were not satisfied even with these or the other deities of the nations, but brought forward also brute creatures as gods. For some of them worshipped the sheep, and some the goat; another tribe (worshipped) the bull and the pig; others again, the raven and the hawk, and the vulture and the eagle; and others the crocodile; and some the cat and the dog, and the wolf and the ape, and the dragon and the asp; and others the onion and the garlic and thorns and other created things. And the poor creatures do not perceive about all these that they are utterly helpless. For though they see their gods eaten by men of other tribes, and burnt as offerings and slain as victims and mouldering in decay, they have not perceived that they are not gods.

XII. The Egyptians, moreover, because they are more base and stupid than every people that is on the earth, have themselves erred more than all. For the deities (or religion) of the Barbarians and the Greeks did not suffice for them, but they introduced some also of the nature of the animals, and said thereof that they were gods, and likewise of creeping things which are found on the dry land and in the waters. And of plants and herbs they said that some of them were gods. And they were corrupted by every kind of delusion and defilement more than every people that is on the earth. For from ancient times they worshipped Isis, and they say that she is a goddess whose husband was Osiris her brother. And when Osiris was killed by Typhon his brother, Isis fled with Horos her son to Byblus in Syria, and was there for a certain time till her son was grown. And he contended with Typhon his uncle, and killed him. And then Isis returned and went about with Horos her son and sought for the dead body of Osiris her lord, bitterly lamenting his death. If then Isis be a goddess, and could not help Osiris her brother and lord, how can she help another? But it is impossible that a divine nature should be afraid, and flee for safety, or should weep and wail; or else it is very miserable. And of Osiris also they say that he is a serviceable god. And he was killed

by Typhon and was unable to help himself. But it is well known that this cannot be asserted of divinity. And further, they say of his brother Typhon that he is a god, who killed his brother and was killed by his brother's son and by his bride, being unable to help himself. And how, pray, is he a god who does not save himself? As the Egyptians, then, were more stupid than the rest of the nations, these and such like gods did not suffice for them. Nay, but they even apply the name of gods to animals in which there is no soul at all. For some of them worship the sheep and others the calf; and some the pig and others the shad fish; and some the crocodile and the hawk and the fish and the ibis and the vulture and the eagle and the raven.

Some of them worship the cat, and others the turbot- fish, some the dog, some the adder, and some the asp, and others the lion; and others the garlic and onions and thorns, and others the tiger and other such things. And the poor creatures do not see that all these things are nothing, although they daily witness their gods being eaten and consumed by men and also by their fellows; while some of them are cremated, and some die and decay and become dust, without their observing that they perish in many ways. So the Egyptians have not observed that such things which are not equal to their own deliverance, are not gods. And if, forsooth, they are weak in the case of their own deliverance, whence have they power to help in the case of deliverance of their worshippers?

Great then is the error into which the Egyptians wandered;----greater, indeed, than that of any people which is upon the face of the earth.

XIII. So the Egyptians and the Chaldaeans and the Greeks made a great error in bringing forward such beings as gods, and in making images of them, and in deifying dumb and senseless idols. And I wonder how they saw their gods sawn out and hacked and docked by the workmen, and besides aging with time and falling to pieces, and being cast from metal, and yet did not discern concerning them that they were not gods. For when they have no power to see to their own safety, how will they take forethought for men? But further, the poets and philosophers, alike of the Chaldaeans and the Greeks and the Egyptians, while they desired by their poems and writings to magnify the gods of their countries, rather revealed their shame, and laid it bare before all men. For if the body of man while consisting of many parts does not cast off any of its own members, but preserving an unbroken unity in all its members, is harmonious with itself, how shall variance and discord be so great in the nature of God? For if there had been a unity of nature among the gods, then one god ought not to have pursued or slain or injured another. And if the gods were pursued by gods, and slain, and kidnapped and struck with lightning by them, then there is no longer any unity of nature, but divided counsels, all mischievous. So that not one of them is a god.

It is clear then, O King, that all their discourse on the nature of the gods is an error. But how did the wise and erudite men of the Greeks not observe that inasmuch as they make laws for themselves they are judged by their own laws? For if the laws are righteous, their gods are altogether unrighteous, as they have committed transgressions of laws, in slaying one another, and practising sorceries, and adultery and thefts and intercourse with males. If they were right in doing these things, then the laws are unrighteous, being framed contrary to the gods. Whereas in fact, the laws are good and just, commending what is good and forbidding what is bad. But the deeds of their gods are contrary to law. Their gods, therefore, are lawbreakers, and all liable to the punishment of death; and they are impious men who introduce such gods. For if the stories about

them be mythical, the gods are nothing more than mere names; and if the stories be founded on nature, still they who did and suffered these things are no longer gods; and if the stories be allegorical, they are myths and nothing more.

It has been shown then, O King, that all these polytheistic objects of worship are the works of error and perdition. For it is not right to give the name of gods to beings which may be seen but cannot see; but one ought to reverence the invisible and all-seeing and all-creating God.

XIII. But it is a marvel, O King, with regard to the Greeks, who surpass all other peoples in their manner of life and reasoning, how they have gone astray after dead idols and lifeless images. And yet they see their gods in the hands of their artificers being sawn out, and planed and docked, and hacked short, and charred, and ornamented, and being altered by them in every kind of way. And when they grow old, and are worn away through lapse of time, and when they are molten and crushed to powder, how, I wonder, did they not perceive concerning them, that they are not gods? And as for those who did not find deliverance for themselves, how can they serve the distress of men? But even the writers and philosophers among them have wrongly alleged that the gods are such as are made in honour of God Almighty. And they err in seeking to liken (them) to God whom man has not at any time seen nor can see unto what He is like.

Herein, too (they err) in asserting of deity that any such thing as deficiency can be present to it; as when they say that He receives sacrifice and requires burnt-offering and libation and immolations of men, and temples. But God is not in need, and none of these things is necessary to Him; and it is clear that men err in these things they imagine.

Further their writers and their philosophers represent and declare that the nature of all their gods is one. And they have not apprehended God our Lord who while He is one, is in all. They err therefore. For if the body of a man while it is many in its parts is not in dread, one member of another, but, since it is a united body, wholly agrees with itself; even so also God is one in His nature. A single essence is proper to Him, since He is uniform in His nature and His essence; and He is not afraid of Himself. If then the nature of the gods is one, it is not proper that a god should either pursue or slay or harm a god. If, then, gods be pursued and wounded by gods, and some be kidnapped and some struck dead by lightning, it is obvious that the nature of their gods is not one. And hence it is known, O King, that it is a mistake when they reckon and bring the natures of their gods under a single nature. If then it becomes us to admire a god which is seen and does not see, how much more praiseworthy is it that one should believe in a nature which is invisible and all-seeing? And if further it is fitting that one should approve the handiworks of a craftsman, how much more is it fitting that one should glorify the Creator of the craftsman? For behold! when the Greeks made laws they did not perceive that by their laws they condemn their gods. For if their laws are righteous, their gods are unrighteous, since they transgressed the law in killing one another, and practising sorcery, and committing adultery, and in robbing and stealing, and in lying with males, and by their other practises as well. For if their gods were right in doing all these things as they are described, then the laws of the Greeks are unrighteous in not being made according to the will of their gods. And in that case the whole world is gone astray. For the narratives about their gods are some of them myths, and some of them nature-poems (lit: natural---fusikai/), and some of them hymns and elegies. The hymns indeed and elegies are empty words and noise. But these nature-poems, even if they be made as they say, still those are not gods who do such things and

suffer and endure such things. And those myths are shallow tales with no depth whatever in them.

XIV. Let us proceed then, O King, to the Jews also, that we may see what truth there is in their view of God. For they were descendants of Abraham and Isaac and Jacob, and migrated to Egypt. And thence God brought them forth with a mighty hand and an uplifted arm through Moses, their lawgiver; and by many wonders and signs He made known His power to them. But even they proved stubborn and ungrateful, and often served the idols of the nations, and put to death the prophets and just men who were sent to them.

Then when the Son of God was pleased to come upon the earth, they received him with wanton violence and betrayed him into the hands of Pilate the Roman governor; and paying no respect to his good deeds and the countless miracles he wrought among them, they demanded a sentence of death by the cross. And they perished by their own transgression; for to this day they worship the one God Almighty, but not according to knowledge. For they deny that Christ is the Son of God; and they are much like to the heathen, even although they may seem to make some approach to the truth from which they have removed themselves. So much for the Jews.

XIV. Let us come now, O King, to the history of the Jews also, and see what opinion they have as to God. The Jews then say that God is one, the Creator of all, and omnipotent; and that it is not right that any other should be worshipped except this God alone. And herein they appear to approach the truth more than all the nations, especially in that they worship God and not His works. And they imitate God by the philanthropy which prevails among them; for they have compassion on the poor, and they release the captives, and bury the dead, and do such things as these, which are acceptable before God and well-pleasing also to men,----which (customs) they have received from their forefathers.

Nevertheless they too erred from true knowledge. And in their imagination they conceive that it is God they serve; whereas by their mode of observance it is to the angels and not to God that their service is rendered:----as when they celebrate sabbaths and the beginning of the months, and feasts of unleavened bread, and a great fast; and fasting and circumcision and the purification of meats, which things, however, they do not observe perfectly.

XV. Now the Christians<sup>19</sup> trace their origin from the Lord Jesus Christ. And He is acknowledged by the Holy Spirit to be the son of the most high God, who came down from heaven for the salvation of men. And being born of a pure virgin, unbegotten and immaculate, He assumed flesh and revealed himself among men that He might recall them to Himself from their wandering after many gods. And having accomplished His wonderful dispensation, by a voluntary choice He tasted death on the cross, fulfilling an august dispensation. And after three days He came to life again and ascended into heaven. And if you would read, O King, you may judge the glory of His presence from the holy gospel writing, as it is called among themselves. He had twelve disciples, who after His ascension to heaven went forth into the provinces of the whole world, and declared His greatness. As for instance, one of them traversed the countries about us, proclaiming the doctrine of the truth. From this it is, that they who still observe the righteousness enjoined by their preaching are called Christians. And these are they who more than all the nations on the earth have found the truth. For they know God, the Creator and Fashioner of all things through the only-begotten Son and the Holy Spirit<sup>21</sup>; and beside Him they worship no other God.

They have the commands of the Lord Jesus Christ Himself graven upon their hearts; and they observe them, looking forward to the resurrection of the dead and life in the world to come. They do not commit adultery nor fornication, nor bear false witness, nor covet the things of others; they honour father and mother, and love their neighbours; they judge justly, and they never do to others what they would not wish to happen to themselves; they appeal to those who injure them, and try to win them as friends; they are eager to do good to their enemies; they are gentle and easy to be entreated; they abstain from all unlawful conversation and from all impurity; they despise not the widow, nor oppress the orphan; and he that has, gives ungrudgingly for the maintenance of him who has not.

If they see a stranger, they take him under their roof, and rejoice over him as over a very brother; for they call themselves brethren not after the flesh but after the spirit. And they are ready to sacrifice their lives for the sake of Christ; for they observe His commands without swerving, and live holy and just lives, as the Lord God enjoined upon them. And they give thanks unto Him every hour, for all meat and drink and other blessings.

XV. But the Christians, O King, while they went about and made search,<sup>20</sup> have found the truth; and as we learned from their writings, they have come nearer to truth and genuine knowledge than the rest of the nations. For they know and trust in God, the Creator of heaven and of earth, in whom and from whom are all things, to whom there is no other god as companion, from whom they received commandments which they engraved upon their minds and observe in hope and expectation of the world which is to come. Wherefore they do not commit adultery nor fornication, nor bear false witness, nor embezzle what is held in pledge, nor covet what is not theirs. They honour father and mother, and show kindness to those near to them; and whenever they are judges, they judge uprightly. They do not worship idols (made) in the image of man; and whatsoever they would not that others should do unto them, they do not to others; and of the food which is consecrated to idols they do not eat, for they are pure. And their oppressors they appease (lit: comfort) and make them their friends; they do good to their enemies; and their women, O King, are pure as virgins, and their daughters are modest; and their men keep themselves from every unlawful union and from all uncleanness, in the hope of a recompense to come in the other world. Further, if one or other of them have bondmen and bondwomen or children, through love towards them they persuade them to become Christians, and when they have done so, they call them brethren without distinction. They do not worship strange gods, and they go their way in all modesty and cheerfulness. Falsehood is not found among them; and they love one another, and from widows they do not turn away their esteem; and they deliver the orphan from him who treats him harshly. And he, who has, gives to him who has not, without boasting. And when they see a stranger, they take him in to their homes and rejoice over him as a very brother; for they do not call them brethren after the flesh, but brethren after the spirit and in God. And whenever one of their poor passes from the world, each one of them according to his ability gives heed to him and carefully sees to his burial. And if they hear that one of their number is imprisoned or afflicted on account of the name of their Messiah, all of them anxiously minister to his necessity, and if it is possible to redeem him they set him free. And if there is among them any that is poor and needy, and if they have no spare food, they fast two or three days in order to supply to the needy their lack of food. They observe the precepts of their Messiah with much care, living justly and soberly as the Lord their God commanded them. Every morning<sup>22</sup> and every hour they give thanks and

praise to God for His loving-kindnesses toward them; and for their food and their drink they offer thanksgiving to Him. And if any righteous man among them passes from the world, they rejoice and offer thanks to God; and they escort his body as if he were setting out from one place to another near. And when a child has been born to one of them, they give thanks to God; and if moreover it happen to die in childhood, they give thanks to God the more, as for one who has passed through the world without sins. And further if they see that any one of them dies in his ungodliness or in his sins, for him they grieve bitterly, and sorrow as for one who goes to meet his doom.

XVI. Such, O King, is the commandment of the law of the Christians, and such is their manner of life. As men who know God, they ask from Him petitions which are fitting for Him to grant and for them to receive. And thus they employ their whole lifetime. And since they know the loving-kindnesses of God toward them, behold! for their sake the glorious things which are in the world flow forth to view. And verily, they are those who found the truth when they went about and made search for it; and from what we considered, we learned that they alone come near to a knowledge of the truth. And they do not proclaim in the ears of the multitude the kind deeds they do, but are careful that no one should notice them; and they conceal their giving just as he who finds a treasure and conceals it. And they strive to be righteous as those who expect to behold their Messiah, and to receive from Him with great glory the promises made concerning them. And as for their words and their precepts, O King, and their glorying in their worship, and the hope of earning according to the work of each one of them their recompense which they look for in another world,---- you may learn about these from their writings. It is enough for us to have shortly informed your Majesty concerning the conduct and the truth of the Christians. For great indeed, and wonderful is their doctrine to him who will search into it and reflect upon it. And verily, this is a new people, and there is something divine (lit: a divine admixture) in the midst of them.

XVI. Verily then, this is the way of the truth which leads those who travel therein to the everlasting kingdom promised through Christ in the life to come. And that you may know, O King, that in saying these things I do not speak at my own instance, if you deign to look into the writings of the Christians, you will find that I state nothing beyond the truth. Rightly then, did thy son<sup>23</sup> apprehend, and justly was he taught to serve the living God and to be saved for the age that is destined to come upon us. For great and wonderful are the sayings and deeds of the Christians; for they speak not the words of men but those of God. But the rest of the nations go astray and deceive themselves; for they walk in darkness and bruise themselves like drunken men.

Take, then, their writings, and read therein, and lo! you will find that I have not put forth these things on my own authority, nor spoken thus as their advocate; but since I read in their writings I was fully assured of these things as also of things which are to come. And for this reason I was constrained to declare the truth to such as care for it and seek the world to come. And to me there is no doubt but that the earth abides through the supplication of the Christians. But the rest of the nations err and cause error in wallowing before the elements of the world, since beyond these their mental vision will not pass. And they search about as if in darkness because they will not recognize the truth; and like drunken men they reel and jostle one another and fall.

XVII. Thus far, O King, extends my discourse to you, which has been dictated in my mind by the Truth.<sup>25</sup> Wherefore let thy foolish sages cease their idle talk against the Lord; for it is profitable for

you to worship God the Creator, and to give ear to His incorruptible words, that ye may escape from condemnation and punishment, and be found to be heirs of life everlasting.

XVII. Thus far, O King, I have spoken; for concerning that which remains, as is said above,<sup>24</sup> there are found in their other writings things which are hard to utter and difficult for one to narrate,----which are not only spoken in words but also wrought out in deeds.

Now the Greeks, O King, as they follow base practises in intercourse with males, and a mother and a sister and a daughter, impute their monstrous impurity in turn to the Christians. But the Christians are just and good, and the truth is set before their eyes, and their spirit is long-suffering; and, therefore, though they know the error of these (the Greeks), and are persecuted by them, they bear and endure it; and for the most part they have compassion on them, as men who are destitute of knowledge. And on their side, they offer prayer that these may repent of their error; and when it happens that one of them has repented, he is ashamed before the Christians of the works which were done by him; and he makes confession to God, saying, I did these things in ignorance. And he purifies his heart, and his sins are forgiven him, because he committed them in ignorance in the former time, when he used to blaspheme and speak evil of the true knowledge of the Christians. And assuredly the race of the Christians is more blessed than all the men who are upon the face of the earth.

Henceforth let the tongues of those who utter vanity and harass the Christians be silent; and hereafter let them speak the truth. For it is of serious consequence to them that they should worship the true God rather than worship a senseless sound. And verily whatever is spoken in the mouth of the Christians is of God; and their doctrine is the gateway of light. Wherefore let all who are without the knowledge of God draw near thereto; and they will receive incorruptible words, which are from all time and from eternity. So shall they appear before the awful judgment which through Jesus the Messiah is destined to come upon the whole human race. The Apology of Aristides the Philosopher is finished.

1. 1 The superscription seems to be duplicate in the Syriac. It is absent from the Greek as we have it; the Armenian has " To the Emperor Caesar Hadrian from Aristides." Various explanations are offered,
  - (a) Both emperors, as colleagues, may be meant. In support of this the Syriac adjectives for "venerable and merciful" are marked plural; the phrase "Your majesty" occurring later has a plural suffix; and two Imperatives, "Take and read," are plural. On the other hand "O King" occurs constantly in the singular; and the emperors were colleagues only for a few months in the year A.D. 138.
  - (b) The longer heading is the true one----the shorter being due perhaps to a scribe who had a collection of works to copy. In that case the word "Hadrian"

has been selected from the full title of Antonine, and the two adjectives "venerable and merciful" are proper names, Augustus Pius. (Harris.)

(c) The shorter heading has the support of Eusebius and the Armenian version; and the translator into Syriac may have amplified.

[Syriac] Almighty is separated from the word for "God" by a pause, and is not an attribute which a Christian would care to apply to a Roman emperor. *pantokra&twr* may have been confounded with *au)tokra&wr*. Raabe supplies [Syriac] giving the sense "qui Imperium (poetatem) habet," as an epithet of Caesar. If ... [Syriac] = "Renewed, or dedicated again to. . . Antoninus Pius," could be read, both headings might be retained.

2. 1 The Greek might be rendered, "so far as there was room for me to speak of Him," i.e., the attributes of the Deity are not further relevant to the discussion----as the translator into Syriac takes it. The Armenian adopts the other meaning, viz., the theme is beyond man's power to discuss. As translated by F. C. Conybeare, the Armenian is in these words: "Now by the grace of God it was given me to speak wisely concerning Him. So far as I have received the faculty I will speak, yet not according to the measure of the inscrutability of His greatness shall I be able to do so, but by faith alone do I glorify and adore Him."

3. 2 The "King" in the Greek is Abenner, the father of Josaphat; in the Syriac, as in the Greek originally, he is the Roman Emperor. Hadrian.

4. 3 The Armenian and Syriac agree to giving four races, which was probably the original division. To a Greek, men were either Greeks or Barbarians: to a Greek Christian it would seem necessary to add two new peoples, Jews and Christians. The Greek calls the Barbarians "Chaldaeans." This change of classification is probably the cause of the omission in the Greek of the preliminary accounts of the four classes. The Greek blends the summaries with the fuller

accounts.

5. 4 The Armenian adds, "For that which is subject to this distinction is moved by passions."

6. 1 Literally: "a certain dispensation of his." The Greek term *oikonomi/a*, "dispensation," suggests to the translator into Syriac

the idea of the Incarnation, familiar, as it seems, by his time. Professor Sachau reads the equivalent of *qaumasth* instead of [Syriac] (*tij*). In the translation given [Syriac] is taken adverbially=*aliquamdiu*.

7. 2 This irrelevant sentence is found in the Armenian version also, and therefore was probably in the original Greek. It seems to be an obiter dictum. Men fall into four groups, and, by the way, so do the elements, air, fire, earth, and water; and the powers that govern them. One quaternion suggests others.

8. 3 Cf. Rom. i. 25 and Col. ii. 8.

9. 1 "I do not think it out of place here to mention Antinous of our day [a slave of the Emperor Hadrian], whom all, notwithstanding they knew who and whence he was, yet affected to worship as a god."----Justin Martyr quoted in Eusebius Hist.

Bk. IV., c. 8.

10. 2 Or "and hence the world also gets its name *kosmos*." The Syriac is the equivalent of the Greek "*diō kai kosmos kaleitai*," which occurs (Chap. IV.) in discussing the supposed divinity of the sky or heaven.

11. 1 The passage in brackets occurs earlier in "Barlaam and Josaphat," and is restored to its place by J. A. Robinson.

12. 2 Professor Nöldeke's emendation, [Syriac], in place of [Syriac] = "they were reviled," is adopted in the translation given.

13. 3 Cf. Amos v. 26, "Chiun, your star god," and Acts vii.

43.

14. 1 Pasiphae's unnatural passion for Taurus is not in the Greek mythology charged to Zeus.

15. 2 The visit of Zeus to Semele (not Selene) is evidently referred

to. Selh&nh Luna would give the Syriac [Syriac]

16. 3 Professor Rendel Harris pronounces "Paludus" a vox nihili, and explains its presence as due to a corrupt repetition of the pre- ceding Polydeuces. The Syriac word in the text suggests Pollux----the Latin equivalent of Polydeuces. Clytemnestra is the name re- quired.

17. 4 Adopting Professor Harris's emendation [Syriac] =

kle/pthj

instead of [Syriac] =vir.

18. 1 Tyrant," [Syriac] seems out of place when connected with Herakles. Perhaps [Syriac] =ebrius, which occurs at the close of the paragraph, should be read here. Cf. also the Greek.

19. 1 This, the "Christological" passage, occurs earlier

in the Syriac. Chap. ii.

20. 2 The same two words are used of Isis. The Christians are unlike

her in finding what they sought.

21. 1 The Armenian agrees with the Greek against the Syriac. "Una

cum Spiritu Sancto " Arm.

22. 2 Cf. Pliny's letter to the Emperor Trajan, A.D. 112, " The Christians are wont to meet at dawn on an appointed day, and to sing a hymn to Christ as God."

23. 1 The reference is to Josaphat, son of Abenner, who was taught

to be a Christian by the monk Barlaam.

24. 1 The Christian Scriptures are previously referred to as a source

of information, not as containing difficulties. cf 2 Peter iii. 16.

25. 2 Nachor, the fictitious monk who represented Barlaam, intended to make a weak defence of Christianity, but, according to the story, he was constrained to speak what he had not intended. It is evidently the author's intention to make it an instance of "suggestio verborum" or plenary inspiration, in the case of the fictitious monk.

# *Grow in Your Walk with Christ*

---

Listen and read messages that will stir your heart for Christ and point you to deeper repentance and devotion.

- 50,000+ Sermons from speakers past and present
- 3,900+ Classic Christian Books freely readable online
  - 1,200+ Bible Translations and Commentaries
- Over 450k forum posts — Join our vibrant online Christian forum

**[www.sermonindex.net](http://www.sermonindex.net)**