

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

PayPal

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for the *Journal of Theological Studies* (old series) can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_jts-os_01.php

pdfs are named: [Volume]_[1st page of article]

NOTES AND STUDIES

'AD DIOGNETUM xi-xii'

THE Epistle to Diognetus is incomplete, breaking off with an unfinished sentence in the course of chapter x. It was thus defective not only in the single MS in which it survived till the year 1870, but also in the parent copy from which that MS was written, for the scribe noted that therein also there was a lacuna at this point. The passage which next followed in the MS has been edited as chapters xi-xii of the Epistle; but it is recognized by most editors, and now on all hands, that this piece of text is no part of the Epistle which stands before it, but the end of some other work (it closes with a doxology) which in earlier, complete, copies followed the Epistle. The work of which '*ad Diognetum xi-xii*' is the conclusion was perhaps, like the Epistle itself and several other treatises in the same MS, attributed to Justin Martyr. To avoid all ambiguity this piece of text will be referred to in the following pages as 'the fragment', or in short as 'F', but the two parts into which it has been divided will still be called chapters xi and xii.

I have been vaguely aware for many years that Bunsen and some later German scholars have assigned the authorship of F to Hippolytus, but the only mention of this that I have noticed in any English publication is that in Shahan's translation of Bardenhewer's *Patrologie* (1908), where it is said: 'G. N. Bonwetsch has shewn that cc. 11-12 of the Letter to Diognetus belong to Hippolytus' (p. 69). In his third German edition (1910) Bardenhewer says only that several scholars attribute the fragment to Hippolytus, then referring his readers to an article by A. Frhr. Di Pauli in the *Theologische Quartalschrift*, lxxxviii, 1906. Recently I came upon this article of Di Pauli quite by chance, and there found for the first time precise references to three writers, Bunsen, Dräseke, and Bonwetsch, who have maintained that Hippolytus is the author of F. In 1852 Bunsen not only claimed the fragment for Hippolytus but expressed the opinion that it is the concluding passage of his great work against the heresies, the *Philosophumena*.¹ Bunsen's suggestion, after remaining unnoticed for fifty years, was taken up and advocated in 1902 by Dräseke,² who, however, did not carry the proof much farther ('nicht viel weiter über Bunsen hinausgeht und Klarheit

¹ *Hippolytus and his Age*; in the original English edition vol. i pp. 185 ff and 193 ff.

² The reference given by Di Pauli is 'Zeitschr. f. wissensch. Theol. xlv (1902) S. 275 ff'.

vermissen lässt'). In the same year the subject was treated independently and more thoroughly by Bonwetsch,¹ who ascribed the authorship of F to Hippolytus, but hesitated to connect it with any particular treatise. Di Pauli himself agrees with Bunsen in believing F to be the close of the *Philosophumena*, and he writes in support of that view.

Some twenty years ago, without having read a word of what others had written on the matter, and (if I remember rightly) without knowing that this view had ever been put forward, I came to the conclusion on my own account that F is the end of some work by Hippolytus, though it did not occur to me then to connect it with the *Philosophumena*. The latter idea was derived from Di Pauli's article, but I am now prepared to accept it nearly on the same terms as the Hippolytean authorship itself.

Perhaps I may explain how it was that I came to be interested in the authorship of the fragment. I had been working on the document then known as the 'Egyptian Church Order', but now generally accepted as being the *Apostolic Tradition* of Hippolytus, and I was led on to try and test the external evidence pointing to Hippolytus as author by comparing the document with his other writings.² For that purpose I had to read and re-read most of his remains, and so became familiar with his leading thoughts, literary mannerisms, and favourite words, and was left with a strong impression of his style. With my mind full of Hippolytus I chanced to read again the two chapters at the end of the Epistle to Diognetus, and somehow I felt that I was still reading Hippolytus. I then began to note familiar words and phrases and to enter in the margins of my copy of Lightfoot-Harmer's *Apostolic Fathers* cross-references to Hippolytus. But I did not proceed to gather up the results and put them into connected form. The fragment provided some interesting parallels to the *Apostolic Tradition*, but it did not seem worth while at that time to cite them at the cost of first proving that F itself was by Hippolytus. Now that the *Apostolic Tradition* is accepted the case is reversed, and we may cite that work in illustration of F.

Even now, though I have consulted the passages in Bunsen referred to by Di Pauli, I have not read either Dräseke or Bonwetsch. My apology for writing on a subject that has been treated by others without first reading what they have to say may be this: first, that I cannot at the moment consult the publications in which they have written; next, that I am writing to support, not to controvert, their views, and arguments put forward independently by more than one

¹ In 'Götting. Nachr. phil.-hist. Kl. 1902, S. 621-634'.

² See *The so-called Egyptian Church Order* (Cambridge 'Texts and Studies', 1916) pp. 160-168.

writer are likely to carry more weight than those simply copied and repeated; thirdly, I gather from Di Pauli that Bonwetsch, who has gone most carefully into the subject, has made very little use of the *Philosophumena* as a term of comparison,¹ whereas I shall have occasion to make considerable use of it. As to the parallels here drawn from other treatises of Hippolytus, it will be strange if some of them have not been already noted by Bonwetsch, and especially those from the Commentary on Daniel, which he afterwards edited.

In what follows the question of the authorship of F will be taken first, and the relation of the fragment to the *Philosophumena* then considered separately—though the two questions are so closely connected that it is difficult to keep them rigidly apart. In the text only such parallels will be alleged as appear to have clear evidential value; minor coincidences, which yet seem to deserve consideration in connexion with the other evidence, will be pointed out in the footnotes.

I. *The authorship of F.*

1. In the proem to his *Philosophumena*, after saying that he now intends to expose (*ἐξεικεῖν*) even the secret teachings of the heretics, which he had forborne to do in an earlier treatise against them, Hippolytus proceeds thus:—

ἀλλ' ἐπεὶ ἀναγκάζει ἡμᾶς ὁ λόγος εἰς μέγαν βυθὸν διηγῆσεων ἐπιβῆναι, οὐχ ἡγούμεθα σιγᾶν, ἀλλὰ τὰ πάντων δόγματα κατὰ λεπτὸν ἐκθέμενοι οὐδὲν σιωπήσομεν. δοκεῖ δέ, εἰ καὶ μακρότερος ἔσται ὁ λόγος, μὴ καμῆν. οὐδὲ γὰρ μικρὰν τινα βοήθειαν τῷ τῶν ἀνθρώπων βίῳ καταλείβομεν πρὸς τὸ μηκέτι πλανᾶσθαι φανερώς πάντων ὁρώντων τὰ κρύφια αὐτῶν καὶ ἄρρητα ὄργια, ἃ ταμιευόμενοι μόνοις τοῖς μύσταις παραδιδόασιν. ταῦτα δὲ ἕτερος οὐκ ἐλέγξει ἢ τὸ ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ παραδοθὲν ἅγιον πνεῦμα, οὗ τυχόντες πρότεροι οἱ ἀπόστολοι μετέδοσαν τοῖς ὀρθῶς πεπιστευκόσιν· ὧν ἡμεῖς διάδοχοι τυγχάνοντες τῆς τε αὐτῆς χάριτος μετέχοντες ἀρχιερατείας τε καὶ διδασκαλίας καὶ φρουροὶ τῆς ἐκκλησίας λελογισμένοι οὐκ ὀφθαλμῶ νυστάζομεν οὐδὲ λόγον ὀρθὸν σιωπῶμεν, ἀλλ' οὐδὲ πάσῃ ψυχῇ καὶ σώματι ἐργαζόμενοι κάμνομεν ἄξια ἀξίως θεῷ τῷ εὐεργέτῃ ἀναποδιδόνα πειρώμενοι, καὶ οὐδ' οὕτως κατ' ἄξίαν ἀμειβόμενοι, πλὴν ἐν οἷς πεπιστεύμεθα μὴ ἀτονούντες, ἀλλὰ τοῦ ἰδίου καιροῦ τὰ μέτρα ἐπιτελοῦντες καὶ ὅσα παρέχει τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα πᾶσιν ἀφθόνως κοινωνοῦντες· οὐ μόνον ἀλλότρια δι' ἐλέγχον εἰς φανερόν ἄγοντες, ἀλλὰ καὶ ὅσα ἢ ἀλήθεια ὑπὸ τῆς τοῦ πατρὸς χάριτος παραλαβοῦσα ἀνθρώποις διηκόνησε, ταῦτα καὶ διὰ λόγον σημειούμενοι καὶ διὰ γραμμάτων ἐμμαρτυρούμενοι ἀνεπαισχύντως κηρύσσομεν. (And lower

¹ 'Leider hat Bonwetsch in seinen Untersuchungen die *Philosophumena* fast gar nicht beigezogen.'

down) ἔστι μὲν οὖν πόνου μεστὸν τὸ ἐπιχειρούμενον καὶ πολλῆς δεόμενον ἱστορίας, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἐνδεήσομεν ὕστερον γὰρ εὐφρανεῖ ὡς ἀθλητὴν μετὰ πολὺν πόνου¹ στεφάνου τυχόντα ἢ ἔμπορον μετὰ μέγαν θαλάσσης σάλον κερδάναντα ἢ γεωργὸν μετὰ ἰδρώτα προσώπου καρπῶν ἀπολαύσαντα ἢ προφήτην μετὰ ὀνειδισμοῦς καὶ ὕβρεις ὀρώντα τὰ λαληθέντα ἀποβαίνοντα.

Thus at the outset Hippolytus stands forward as a champion of the truth and presents his credentials as a teacher. He realizes that the work he has undertaken will be long and arduous, but he is confident that he has the necessary qualifications for it. He is a successor of the Apostles, and as such lays claim to the same 'grace' (χάρις, here practically equivalent to χάρισμα²), high-priesthood,³ and authority to teach (διδασκαλία) as they had; for he has by succession the same Holy Spirit, which the Apostles first receiving imparted to those who had 'rightly believed', and which has passed on to the Church; and whatsoever this Holy Spirit bestows upon him he will communicate without stint to all.

Towards the end of his work he strikes a similar note, addressing himself now to all nations and inviting all to come and learn of him:—

μάθετε Ἕλληνες, Αἰγύπτιοι, Χαλδαῖοι καὶ τὸ πᾶν γένος ἀνθρώπων . . . παρ' ἡμῶν τῶν φίλων τοῦ θεοῦ (*Philos.* x 31 *fin.*).

Then after expounding in the next two chapters his theory of the origin of the universe and his doctrine of the Divine Logos, he makes a still more impressive address:—

τοιούτος ὁ περὶ τὸ θεῖον ἀληθῆς λόγος, ὃ ἄνθρωποι Ἕλληνές τε καὶ βάρβαροι, Χαλδαῖοί τε καὶ Ἀσσύριοι, Αἰγύπτιοί τε καὶ Λίβυες, Ἰνδοί τε καὶ Αἰθίοπες, Κελτοί τε καὶ οἱ στρατηγούντες Λατῖνοι, πάντες τε οἱ τὴν Εὐρώπην Ἀσίαν τε καὶ Λιβύην κατοικοῦντες οἷς σύμβουλος ἐγὼ γίνομαι, φιλανθρώπου λόγου ὑπάρχων μαθητῆς⁴ καὶ φιλάνθρωπος, ὅπως προσδραμόντες διδαχθῆτε παρ' ἡμῶν τίς ὁ ὄντως θεὸς καὶ ἡ τούτου εὐτακτος δημιουργία (*Philos.* x 34 *init.*).

'Friend of God', 'disciple of the Logos', and (by clear implication, though not in express terms) *Doctor gentium*: such is Hippolytus's further account of himself towards the close of his great work. Can

¹ So Wendland emends; the MSS, followed by Duncker-Schneidewin, have πολλοῦ πόνου, which may be right after all: see p. 7 below.

² Compare *Philos.* viii 19, where he says of the Montanists: ὑπὲρ δὲ ἀποστόλων καὶ πᾶν χάρισμα ταῦτα τὰ γυναῖκα δοξάζουσι.

³ ἀρχιερατεία here no doubt denotes the episcopal office: so Lightfoot and others understand it.

⁴ Cf. *com. in Dan.* ii 22: οἱ τρεῖς παῖδες ἐν Βαβυλῶνι (μαθηταὶ τοῦ λόγου ὄντες)—'Jünger des Wortes seiend' (Old Slavonic).

such lofty personal pretensions, or the pontifical manner in which these are stated, be paralleled from any other writer of the second or third century? Yet both are echoed to the full in the fragment at the end of the *ad Diognetum*, which begins thus:—

οὐ ξένα ὁμιλῶ οὐδὲ παραλόγως ζητῶ, ἀλλὰ ἀποστόλων γενόμενος μαθητῆς γίνομαι διδάσκαλος ἔθνων. . . . τίς γὰρ ὀρθῶς διδαχθεὶς καὶ λόγῳ προσφιλεῖς γενηθεὶς οὐκ ἐπιζητεῖ σαφῶς μαθεῖν τὰ διὰ λόγου δειχθέντα φανερώς μαθηταῖς; οἷς ἐφάνερωσεν λόγος φανείς, παρρησία λαλῶν, ὑπὸ ἀπίστων μὴ νοοῦμενος, μαθηταῖς δὲ διηγούμενος, οἱ πιστοὶ λογισθέντες ὑπ' αὐτοῦ ἔγνωσαν πατρὸς μυστήρια (xi 1-2).

And lower down we read:—

ὅσα γὰρ θελήματι τοῦ κελεύοντος λόγου ἐκινήθημεν ἐξειπεῖν μετὰ πόνου, ἐξ ἀγάπης τῶν ἀποκαλυφθέντων ἡμῖν γινόμεθα ὑμῖν κοινωνοὶ (xi 8; and the next words are) οἷς ἐντυχόντες καὶ ἀκούσαντες μετὰ σπουδῆς εἰσεσθε ὅσα παρέχει ὁ θεὸς τοῖς ἀγαπῶσιν ὀρθῶς (xii 1).

The writer of these passages puts forward the same claim to personal Divine guidance and virtual infallibility as does Hippolytus. If Hippolytus claims to be a successor of the Apostles and 'disciple of the Logos', and to speak what is given him by the Holy Spirit to speak, this writer styles himself a 'disciple of the Apostles'—themselves disciples of the Logos—and refers to the things 'revealed' to him and which he has been 'moved to utter' by the Logos. If Hippolytus invites all peoples and nations to come and be taught by him, this writer openly assumes the title 'Teacher of the Gentiles' (1 Tim. ii 7).

These correspondences lie on the surface, though they can hardly be described as superficial. Let us now examine the above passages from F more in detail.

With πιστοὶ λογισθέντες (xi 2) compare φρουροὶ τῆς ἐκκλησίας λελογισμένοι (*Philos.* proem, *ut supra*). In the passive sense λογίζεσθαι occurs again in F xi 5, there of the Logos: οὗτος ὁ αἰεὶ, (ὁ) σήμερον υἱὸς λογισθεὶς. In these passages the verb seems to exceed its ordinary sense of esteemed, accounted, reputed, and to have the force almost of approved, found to be.

The expression πατρὸς μυστήρια, but with the articles (τὰ τοῦ πατρὸς μυστήρια), is found in the *com. in Dan.* ii 32, and the *Blessings of Jacob* (in *Texte u. Untersuch.* 3 R. viii 1, p. 13).

The passage F xi 8-xii 1 recalls Hippolytus in almost every word. We have seen that in the proem to the *Philos.* Hippolytus speaks of the task before him as πόνου μεστόν, but says that when it is accomplished he will be like an athlete receiving the crown μετὰ πολλοῦ πόνου (or μετὰ πολὺν πόνον, as Wendland emends). In *Philos.* ix 31 he recurs to this

thought with the words *διὰ πάντων ὄν διαδραμόντες καὶ μετὰ πολλοῦ πόνου ἐν ταῖς ἐννέα βίβλοις τὰ πάντα δόγματα ἐξεπιόντες κτλ.* Can it be by chance that in F also (xi 8) we have the words *ὅσα . . . ἐκινήθημεν ἐξειπεῖν μετὰ πόνου?*¹ The verb *ἐξειπεῖν* is not a very common one; it is not found in the Old or the New Testament and occurs only three times in the Apostolic Fathers; but it is a favourite word with Hippolytus, e.g. *Philos.* proem (4 times), i 26, iv 8, 46, v 23, vi 37, x 13; *c. Noet.* 16 (*bis*); *in Dan.* i 31, ii 30, 34, iv 8, 17; *de Antichr.* cc. 2 and 50.

The next words in F (xi 8) are *ἐξ ἀγάπης*² τῶν ἀποκαλυφθέντων ἡμῖν γινόμεθα ὑμῖν κοινωνοί. Compare *Philos.* proem (*u.s.*): *καὶ ὅσα παρέχει τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα πᾶσιν ἀφθόνως κοινωνοῦντες.* And here the words *ὅσα παρέχει τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα* send us on to those which immediately follow in F (xii 1): *οἷς ἐντυχόντες*³ . . . εἰσεσθε ὅσα παρέχει ὁ θεὸς τοῖς ἀγαπῶσιν ὁρθῶς. With which again compare the prologue to the *Apost. Trad.* of Hippolytus: '*quanta quidem Deus . . . praestitit hominibus*', where the Apostolic Constitutions preserve the Greek: *ὅσαπερ ὁ θεὸς . . . παρέσχευ ἀνθρώποις.* And lower down in the same prologue we have: '*praestante sancto spiritu perfectam gratiam eis qui recte credunt*', no doubt rendering *παρέχοντος ἀγίου πνεύματος τελείαν χάριν τοῖς ὁρθῶς πιστεύουσιν (or πεπιστευκόσιν).*⁴ The verb *παρέχειν* has already occurred in F xi 5—*παρέχουσα νοῦν*—where the subject is *χάρις*: compare *in Dan.* iii 2, *χάρις . . . παρέχουσα τὸν ἑαυτῆς πλοῦτον τοῖς ἀξίως.*

2. The next passage in F which I select for comment is xi 3-5:—

ὁδὸν χάριν ἀπέστειλε λόγον, ἵνα κόσμῳ φανῆ, ὃς ὑπὸ λαοῦ ἀτιμασθεῖς, διὰ

¹ We shall have to refer to this point again in considering the question whether F is not the end of the *Philosophumena*; for if the phrase *ἐξειπεῖν μετὰ πόνου* serves to connect the fragment with Hippolytus, it obviously suggests something more.

² With this use of *ἐξ ἀγάπης*—'out of (our) love'—cf. the *de Antichr.* 67: *ταῦτά σοι . . . ἐξ ἀγάπης τῆς πρὸς τὸν κύριον ἀρυσάμενος.* Cf. also the prologue to the *Apost. Trad.*: '*ex caritate quam in omnes sanctos ¶ habuit¶*', where the translator should have supplied 'habemus', not 'habuit' (see *J.T.S.* xxiii p. 360); the phrase is modelled on Eph. i 15: *καὶ τὴν ἀγάπην τὴν εἰς πάντας τοὺς ἁγίους*—in this case 'your love'. As Hippolytus owes so much to Irenaeus, we may refer to the latter's preface to his first book *contra Haereses*: *ἀγάπης δὲ ἡμᾶς προτροπομένης σοί τε καὶ πᾶσιν τοῖς μετὰ σου μηνῆσαι τὰ μέχρι νῦν κεκρυμμένα* (*sc.* the secret tenets of the heretics).

³ Here it is to be noted that *οἷς* refers to the preceding *ὅσα . . . ἐκινήθημεν ἐξειπεῖν μετὰ πόνου*, while *ἐντυχόντες* (which Harmer renders 'confronted with') certainly means 'reading', and refers to a foregoing written treatise. In the *Philos.* Hippolytus uses *οἱ ἐντυχάνοντες* practically in the sense of 'my readers' (e.g. proem *ad fin.*, iv 46 *init.*, v 6); while the aorist *ἐντυχόντες* (with dative) means 'when (or if) they read'; e.g. iv 45, vi 42 *init.* (*οἷς ἐντυχόντες*, just as F above), and x 32, where we have *εἰσονται ἐντυχόντες ἡμῶν βίβλῳ . . .* (*cf.* *ἐντυχόντες . . . εἰσεσθε* in F above).

⁴ Cf. *Philos.* proem (*u.s.*), *οἱ ἀπίστολοι μετέδωσαν τοῖς ὁρθῶς πεπιστευκόσιν.*

ἀποστόλων κηρυχθείς, ὑπὸ ἔθνῶν ἐπιστεύθη. οὗτος ὁ ἀπ' ἀρχῆς, ὁ καινὸς φανεὶς καὶ παλαιὸς εὐρεθείς καὶ πάντοτε νέος ἐν ἀγίων καρδίαις γεννώμενος· οὗτος ὁ αἰί, (ὁ) σήμερον υἱὸς λογισθείς.

Here in the second sentence we have distinctive Hippolytean thought and expression in regard to the Sonship of the Logos. According to Hippolytus it was only by the Incarnation that the Divine Logos was 'shewn to be', or even in a sense *became*, 'perfect Son of God'. His underlying thought may have been that the relation of the Logos to the Father was defined and revealed as that of 'sonship' only through His becoming also Son of Man, whereby were fulfilled the prophecies which spoke of Him as 'a Son of man' and as 'the Servant (παῖς) of the Lord'. Thus for Hippolytus the full humanity of Christ, upon which he so insists, is as it were a necessary complement even of His Divine Sonship. The most striking passages bearing on this subject are found in the *contra Noetum* and have been cited elsewhere;¹ here it will be enough to give some examples of the language employed:—

ἔστι μὲν οὖν σὰρξ ἡ ὑπὸ τοῦ λόγου τοῦ πατρῴου προσενεχθεῖσα δῶρον, ἡ ἐκ πνεύματος καὶ παρθένου τέλειος υἱὸς θεοῦ ἀποδεδειγμένος (c. *Noet.* 4).—τὸ δὲ πᾶν πατήρ, ἐξ οὗ δύναμις λόγος. οὗτος δὲ νοῦς, ὃς προβάς ἐν κόσμῳ ἐδείκνυτο παῖς θεοῦ (c. 11).—οὔτε γὰρ ἄσαρκος καὶ καθ' ἑαυτὸν ὁ λόγος τέλειος ἦν υἱὸς (καίτοι τέλειος λόγος ὢν μονογενής), οὐθ' ἡ σὰρξ καθ' ἑαυτὴν δίχα τοῦ λόγου ὑποστήναι ἠδύνατο διὰ τὸ ἐν λόγῳ τὴν σύστασιν ἔχειν. οὕτως οὖν εἰς υἱὸς τέλειος θεοῦ ἐφανερῶθη (c. 15).—ἐφανέρωσεν ἑαυτὸν ἐκ παρθένου καὶ ἀγίου πνεύματος καινὸς ἄνθρωπος γενόμενος (c. 17).

C. Noet. 15 is the only place in which Hippolytus says quite openly that the pre-existent Logos was *not yet* 'perfect Son of God'; but it justifies us in assuming that the same idea underlies the less explicit passages in the same treatise and elsewhere; and it is surely present in the words of *F xi 4-5*: οὗτος ὁ ἀπ' ἀρχῆς, ὁ καινὸς φανεὶς καὶ παλαιὸς εὐρεθείς . . . οὗτος ὁ αἰί, (ὁ) σήμερον υἱὸς λογισθείς.² In illustration of this language let me quote a single further passage. In the *de Antichristo* c. 3 Hippolytus asks 'Theophilus' (to whom the treatise is addressed) to pray,

ὅπως ἂ πάλαι τοῖς μακαρίοις προφήταις ἀπεκάλυψεν ὁ τοῦ θεοῦ λόγος, νῦν αὐτὸς πάλιν ὁ τοῦ θεοῦ παῖς, ὁ πάλαι μὲν λόγος ὢν, νυνὶ δὲ καὶ ἄνθρωπος δι' ἡμᾶς ἐν κόσμῳ φανερωθείς, σαφηνίσθη σοι ταῦτα δι' ἡμῶν.

But this is not all. The same passage of *F (xi 4, after παλαιὸς*

¹ In *The so-called Egyptian Church Order* pp. 164-165.

² Some such idea is perhaps latent in Justin *Dial.* c. 81 *fin.*, and in Iren. *Demonstr.* c. 43 (on which see Dr Robinson's notes); but in its developed form it is, so far as my knowledge goes, peculiar to Hippolytus.

εὐρεθείς) has the words, referring to the Logos: καὶ πάντοτε νέος ἐν ἀγίων καρδίαις γεννώμενος, and in the *de Antichr.* 61, commenting on Apoc. xii 2 (καὶ ἐν γαστρὶ ἔχουσα κράζει, ὠδίνουσα καὶ βασανιζομένη τεκεῖν), Hippolytus writes:—

ὅτι δεῖ οὐ πάντως ἡ ἐκκλησία γεννώσα ἐκ καρδίας τὸν λόγον, καίτοι ἐν κόσμῳ ὑπὸ ἀπίστων διωκομένη.¹ . . . ὃν δεῖ τίκτουσα ἡ ἐκκλησία διδάσκει πάντα τὰ ἔθνη.²

The same far from commonplace idea is found again in the *com. in Dan.* i 10, where the Greek is wanting but the Old Slavonic version reads, as translated by Bonwetsch: 'Es hat des Vaters Mund hervorgehen lassen ein reines Wort aus sich, ein zweites Wort wiederum erscheint geboren aus den Heiligen beständig, die Heiligen gebärend wird es auch selbst wieder von den Heiligen geboren.'

3. In F xii the writer begins by promising his readers that if they will hearken to the truths which he has been moved by the Logos to impart to them, they will become 'a paradise of delights' and be 'adorned with various fruits'.³ From this he goes on to speak of the original Paradise, or the Church which it signifies, in which 'a tree of knowledge is planted and a tree of life'. It is not, he says, the tree of knowledge which kills, but disobedience: 'For neither is there life without knowledge, nor sure knowledge without the true life. . . . Discerning this, and blaming the knowledge which is exercised apart from the precept of the truth,⁴ the Apostle says: Knowledge puffeth up, but charity edifieth (1 Cor. viii 1).⁵ For he, who thinks that he knows anything apart from the true knowledge which is testified by the life, has not known: he is deceived by the serpent, loving not life' (xii 4-6).

The probable significance of these allusions to a true and false

¹ Cf. F xi 2 (just before the passage under comment): ὑπὸ ἀπίστων μὴ νοούμενος.

² Note again 'the Gentiles', of whom the writer of F claims to be the 'teacher', whom he mentions again in xi 4 (ὑπὸ ἔθνῶν ἐπιστεύθη), and whom Hippolytus so solemnly addresses in *Philos.* x 31 and 34.

³ ποικίλοις καρποῖς κεκοσμημένοι. The adj. ποικίλος is another favourite word with Hippolytus.

⁴ ἀνευ ἀληθείας προστάγματος. Harmer renders 'apart from the truth of the injunction'. In any case the πρόσταγμα probably refers to the command not to eat of the tree of knowledge, and the writer's meaning appears to be that knowledge (*gnosis*) is not to be sought by forbidden ways, but according to the rule of faith and the guidance of the Church.

⁵ The same words are quoted twice over by Irenaeus *Haer.* ii 39. 1: 'et ideo Paulus clamavit, Scientia inflat, caritas autem aedificat: non quia veram scientiam de Deo culparet. . . sed quia sciebat quosdam sub occasione scientiae elatos excidere a dilectione Dei.' He is speaking of the Gnostics.

Gnosis will be considered further on ; here we are concerned only with their poetical setting and the words which follow them, viz. :—

ἦτω σοι καρδία γνῶσις, ζωὴ δὲ λόγος ἀληθής, χωρούμενος. οὐ ξύλον φέρων καὶ καρπὸν αἰρῶν τρυγήσεις αἰεὶ τὰ παρὰ θεῷ ποθούμενα, ὧν ὄφει οὐχ ἄπτεται οὐδὲ πλάνη συγχρωτίζεται· οὐδὲ εὖα φθείρεται, ἀλλὰ παρθένος πιστεύεται¹ (xii 7–8).

If we now turn to the early part of the commentary on Daniel, we find the garden of Susanna likened by Hippolytus to Paradise, which in turn represents the Church. Here also there is mention of ‘the tree of knowledge and the tree of life’² (in *Dan.* i 17). Then the two elders hiding in the garden are compared to the serpent in Eden :—

ὡσπερ γὰρ τότε ἐν τῷ παραδείσῳ ἐνεκρύβη ὁ διάβολος ἐν τῷ ὄφει, οὕτω καὶ νῦν ἐν τοῖς πρεσβυτέροις ἐγκρυβεῖς τὴν ἑαυτοῦ ἐνεκίσσησεν ἐπιθυμίαν, ἵνα πάλιν ἐκ δευτέρου διαφθείρη τὴν εὖαν (*ib.* c. 18).

4. F ends with a doxology, in this form :—

καὶ διδάσκων ἀγίους ὁ λόγος εὐφραίνεται, δι’ οὐ πατὴρ δοξάζεται· ᾧ ἢ δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας. ἀμήν.

The four books on Daniel each end with a short doxology, of the same type but variously introduced. The *de Antichristo* has a similar one, which must here be quoted with its introductory words :—

προσδεχόμενος τὴν μακαρίαν ἐλπίδα καὶ ἐπιφάνειαν τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ σωτήρος ἡμῶν (Tit. ii 13), ἐν ᾗ ἀναστήσας τοὺς ἀγίους ἅμα σὺν αὐτοῖς εὐφρανθήσεται δοξάζων πατέρα, ᾧ ἢ δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας. ἀμήν.

Here, before the actual doxology is reached (which is identical in both passages), we have three points of agreement with F which can hardly be accidental : the mention of ‘the saints’, i.e. the faithful ; the ‘rejoicing’ of the Son (or Logos) over them ; and the ‘glorifying’ of the Father by the Son.³

5. *Vocabulary and style.* We have already noticed the appearance in F of the familiar Hippolytean verb ἐξειπεῖν, and this in connexion, as in *Philos.* ix 31, with μετὰ πόνου. There is one other verb which calls for

¹ Cf. Iren. *Haer.* iii 32. 1 : ‘Eva vero inobediens ; non obaudivit enim adhuc cum esset virgo.’

² Cf. the ξύλον γνῶσεως καὶ ξύλον ζωῆς of F xii 2. In Gen. ii 9 we have : καὶ τὸ ξύλον τῆς ζωῆς ἐν μέσῳ τῷ παραδείσῳ, καὶ τὸ ξύλον τοῦ εἰδέναι γνωστὸν καλοῦ καὶ πονηροῦ.

³ The ‘glorifying’ of God, and His desire to be glorified, are thoughts often met with in Hippolytus. Cf. c. *Noet.* 14 *fin.* (διὰ γὰρ τῆς τριάδος ταύτης πατὴρ δοξάζεται) ; in *Dan.* ii 9 (ἀνθρώπου ἀγίου ὁ θεὸς προσάγει ἑαυτῷ, δι’ ὧν εἰς πάντα τὸν κόσμον δοξασθήναι) ; *Apost. Trad.*, in the prayer over a bishop (εὐδοκήσας ἐν οἷς ἡρετίσω δοξασθῆναι).

special remark, *συνετίζειν* (καὶ ἀπόστολοι συνετίζονται, xii 9). This is a Septuagint word, employed several times to render the Heb. verb *יָדַע* in the *Hiph'il* form in which it means 'give understanding, make to understand, teach'. It is not found in the N.T., and in the Apost. Fathers it occurs only in *Hermas Mand.* iv 2. 1; but it is used a number of times by Hippolytus: in *Dan.* iii 2 (οἱ μακάριοι προφήται ὑπὸ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος αἰὲ συνετίζόμενοι), iii 6 (ἡ χάρις τοῦ θεοῦ ἀφθόνως συνετίζει τὸν ἄνθρωπον), iii 17 (of Daniel instructing the king), iv 39 (ὑπὸ τοῦ ἀγγέλου Γαβριὴλ συνετίσθη). But the most striking passage is *c. Noet.* 14, where this verb describes a characteristic operation of the Holy Spirit: ὁ γὰρ κελεύων πατῆρ, ὁ δὲ ὑπακούων υἱός, τὸ δὲ συνετίζον ἅγιον πνεῦμα.

We must note also the use in F of ἅγιοι, 'the saints', in the sense of the faithful (xi 4, 5, xii 9). Outside the N.T. ἅγιοι as equivalent to πιστοί is found in *Ep. Barnab.* xix 10 (in the parallel passage of the *Didache*, iv 2, it is given another meaning), and a fair number of times in *Hermas*; but it hardly occurs elsewhere in the Apost. Fathers, and I have not remarked this use in Justin or Irenaeus. By the end of the second century it was an archaism, yet it is met with constantly in Hippolytus: examples have occurred in passages already quoted, and they could easily be multiplied.

And here we may take note of the phrase ἂ λόγος ὁμλεῖ δι' ὧν βούλεται, ὅτε θέλει in F xi 7. That God works how and when He pleases is a thought found more than once in Hippolytus, who has probably taken it from Irenaeus. A couple of examples may suffice: πάντα ποιῶν ὡς (so Migne, but ? ἂ) θέλει, καθὼς θέλει, ὅτε θέλει (*c. Noet.* 8); and in the tenth chapter: ὅτε ἠθέλησεν, καθὼς ἠθέλησεν, ἔδειξε τὸν λόγον αὐτοῦ. Cf. Irenaeus *Haer.* iv 11. 5: 'filius . . . revelat omnibus (*i. hominibus*) patrem, quibus vult, et quando vult, et quemadmodum vult pater'; and iv 34. 5: 'Ille autem volens videtur ab hominibus, a quibus vult, et quando vult, et quemadmodum vult'.

Lastly, attention must be drawn to two points of mere style. The first of these is the rhetorical use of series of short 'and'-clauses. We find two such series in F:—

εἶτα φόβος νόμου ᾄδεται, καὶ προφητῶν χάρις γινώσκειται, καὶ εὐαγγελίων πίστις ἰδρύεται, καὶ ἀποστόλων παράδοσις¹ φυλάσσεται, καὶ ἐκκλησίας χάρις σκιρτᾷ (xi 6).

And again:—

καὶ σωτήριον δείκνυται, καὶ ἀπόστολοι συνετίζονται, καὶ κυρίου πάσχα

¹ It is perhaps worth while to recall that on the chair of Hippolytus we have mention of a work entitled Ἀποστολικὴ παράδοσις (his *Apostolic Tradition*), and another called Ἀπόδειξις χρόνων τοῦ πάσχα, as to which see the next note.

προέρχεται,¹ καὶ κλήροι (?) συνάγονται, καὶ (πάντα) μετὰ κόσμον (?) ἀρμόζεται, καὶ διδάσκων ἁγίους ὁ λόγος εὐφραίνεται (xii 9).

These passages, which are nearer poetry than prose, can be matched by many written in a similar vein by Hippolytus. It may suffice to quote one specimen from the last chapter but one of the *Philosophumena* (x 33 fin.):—

καὶ κάματον ὑπέμεινε, καὶ πεινῆν ἠθέλησε, καὶ διψῆν οὐκ ἤρνήσατο, καὶ ὑπνῷ ἠρέμησε, καὶ πάθει οὐκ ἀντείπε, καὶ θανάτῳ ὑπήκουσε, καὶ ἀνάστασιν ἐφανέρωσεν.²

The other feature referred to is similarly rhetorical, the omission of the article where in plain prose it would be expected. Such omission is very noticeable in F, and particularly in c. xi. Hippolytus likewise frequently drops the article when he adopts the rhetorical style, which he tends to do in theological argument; in the *c. Noet.*, for example, he omits it as often as not before such words as θεός, πατήρ, υἱός, λόγος. But especially he tends to omit it in passages of the kind described in the foregoing paragraph; thus the long series of 'and'-clauses at the end of the *c. Noet.* is wholly anarthrous, and so, or nearly so, are several other passages referred to in the last footnote.

This closes the case, so far as I can present it, for Hippolytus as the author of 'ad Diognetum xi-xii'. For my own part I am satisfied that we have here the conclusion of some considerable work by Hippolytus, and this result I shall venture to assume in what now follows.

II. *F and the Philosophumena.*

It remains to consider Bunsen's view that F is the lost ending of the *Philosophumena*. He states his argument briefly thus:—

'We want an end for our great work in ten books, and a winding-up worthy of the grand subject, of the author's high standing and pre-

¹ If Hippolytus be the author of our fragment, the words 'the passover of the Lord goes forward' are capable of explanation as an allusion to his own paschal cycle; otherwise they remain obscure. And the two clauses which follow would come naturally from one who had written a special treatise on 'church order': that is, if the reading κλήροι, for κηροι of the MS (?), be right; some editors have adopted καιροί.

² Cf. the eucharistic prayer in the *Apost. Trad.*: 'qui cumque traderetur voluntariae passioni, ut mortem solvat, et vincula diaboli dirumpat, et infernum calcet, et iustos inluminet, et terminum figat, et resurrectionem manifestet.' The following are references to other examples: in *Dan.* i 33 (end of the book), iii 31 (end of the book), iv 15 (a highly poetical passage based on Eccles. xii 3-6), iv 51 *init.*, iv 58 (cf. also *de Antichr.* 64); *c. Noet.* 18 (final chapter; and there is a nearly identical passage in the fragment on Ps. ii 7); *Blessings of Jacob* p. 13 (in *Texte u. Untersuch.* 3 R. viii 1). Hippolytus is apt to fall into this mannerism especially at the close of a treatise, book, or argument; and F is the end of a treatise.

tensions, and with the solemnity of a concluding address. Now we find such a concluding fragment, which wants a beginning and an author. Whether we consider its contents, or its style, if it is not, it might very well be, the close of our work' (*op. cit.* i p. 193).

He promises to shew in his next 'letter', i.e. chapter, 'the unity, not of doctrine only, but also of style and language, between our book and the fragment'. This promise is not fulfilled; but in any case proof that F is by Hippolytus is not in itself proof of its connexion with the *Philosophumena*. For this we may begin by mentioning two arguments urged by Di Pauli in the article already referred to.

1. When the writer of F describes himself as *διδάσκαλος ἐθνῶν*, are not the 'Gentiles' here mentioned those whom Hippolytus has so solemnly addressed in *Philos.* x 31 and 34?

Here it is interesting to recall a conjecture of Lightfoot's in his essay on Hippolytus appended to his *Clement of Rome* (vol. ii pp. 382-383). As is well known, Lightfoot was for a time strongly tempted to identify the Roman presbyter Gaius with Hippolytus. To Gaius Photius (*Bibl.* 48) ascribes a work which he calls the *Labyrinth*, but which, as Lightfoot has shewn (*ib.* p. 379), was evidently the tenth book of the *Philosophumena*; and he goes on to say that this Gaius, who lived at Rome in the time of Popes Victor and Zephyrinus, is stated to have been appointed 'bishop of the Gentiles' (*χειροτονηθῆναι δὲ αὐτὸν καὶ ἐθνῶν ἐπίσκοπον*). Taking Gaius to be Hippolytus, Lightfoot says that this statement—'otherwise not very intelligible'—would harmonize well with the fact that 'Hippolytus in the *Refutation* [i.e. *Philos.*] speaks of himself as holding the episcopal office, and addresses the Gentiles more than once as though they were his special charge.' And he adds in a footnote: '*In the close of the treatise, which is wanting, he may have alluded to his episcopate more directly, in connexion with the Gentiles to whom this peroration is addressed*' (my italics). By 'this peroration' Lightfoot alludes to the passages in *Philos.* x 31 and 34, already quoted in this paper. He then continues in the text: 'If the designation "bishop of the Gentiles" is not strictly correct, it was at least a very easy inference from his language in this work.' May we not say that the inference would be more natural still if in the text of *Philos.* x, as read by Photius, F was included, in which the writer describes himself as 'teacher of the Gentiles'? At any rate, on this assumption Lightfoot's conjecture in his footnote would come very near to being verified.¹

2. Di Pauli's second argument is this: the last chapter of the *Philos.*,

¹ It is to be remarked, however, that further on Lightfoot takes the phrase 'bishop of the Gentiles' more seriously and uses it in support of his suggestion that Hippolytus was 'a sort of episcopal Chaplain-general of the Forces' at Portus and of the miscellaneous population there (*op. cit.* p. 434).

as we now have it, ends with the great paradox that man, by becoming an 'imitator' of God, may *become* God—οὐ προστάγμασιν ὑπακούσας σεμνοῖς καὶ ἀγαθοῦ ἀγαθὸς γενόμενος μιμητῆς, ἔση ὁμοῖος (? ὁμοίως) ἢ αὐτοῦ τιμηθεῖς. οὐ γὰρ πτωχεύει θεὸς καὶ σὲ θεὸν ποιήσας εἰς δόξαν αὐτοῦ.¹ But the first words of F imply that something in the nature of a paradox has just been propounded: οὐ ξένα ὁμιλῶ οὐδὲ παραλόγως ζητῶ, ἀλλὰ ἀποστόλων γενόμενος μαθητῆς γίνομαι διδάσκαλος ἔθνων. How aptly these words would follow, if not immediately upon, at least but shortly after those above.

To Di Pauli's arguments we may add two others, which have already been foreshadowed in the discussion of the Hippolytean authorship of F. The first is that F xii is a discussion—and apparently with allusion to something that has gone before—of true and false *Gnosis* (see pp. 9–10 above). It would appear, therefore, that the work which this fragment concludes was concerned in part with Gnosticism, and if so with heresy in general.

Next, as already observed (pp. 6–7), at the beginning of the *Philos.* Hippolytus speaks of his undertaking as πόνου μεστόν, but comforts himself with the reflexion that in the end he will be like an athlete receiving the crown μετὰ πολὺν πόνον, or as the MSS read μετὰ πολλοῦ πόνου. Also at the end of the ninth book he speaks of himself as having now 'with much toil' exposed the teachings of all the heretics: μετὰ πολλοῦ πόνου . . . τὰ πάντα δόγματα ἐξειπόντες. And in connexion with these expressions, and especially the last, attention was called to the phrase in F xi 8, ὅσα γὰρ θελήματι τοῦ κελύοντος λόγου ἐκινήθημεν ἐξειπεῖν μετὰ πόνου. Have we not here a decisive link, not only with Hippolytus, but with the largest and most laborious work upon which he ever embarked?² As he explains at the outset, it involved not only a far more elaborate exposure of the doctrines of the heretics than he had previously undertaken, but also an analysis of many of the philosophers,

¹ Bunsen argues that such a work as the *Philos.* could not have ended thus abruptly and without a doxology, and Lightfoot, as we have seen, assumes that the close of the treatise is wanting. Here it may be noted in passing that in the Epistle to Diognetus itself (x 4) the 'imitating God' is spoken of as a seeming paradox: ἀγαπήσας δὲ μιμητῆς ἔση αὐτοῦ τῆς χρηστότητος. καὶ μὴ θαυμάσης εἰ δύναται μιμητῆς ἀνθρώπος γενέσθαι θεοῦ· δύναται θέλοντος αὐτοῦ.

² For further allusions to the labour and pains involved in this work cf. *Philos.* ix 6, where he comes to speak of the more modern heretics, as he regards Noetus and Callistus: πολλοῦ τοίνυν τοῦ περὶ πάσων αἱρέσεων γενομένου ἡμῖν ἀγῶνος . . . περιλείπεται νῦν ὁ μέγιστος ἀγών. Similarly in ix 17 *fin.* he speaks of τὸν πολὺν ἀγῶνα τοῦ κατὰ πωσῶν αἱρέσεων λόγου. Already, in iv 45, he had spoken of the pains he had been to in summarizing the tenets of the philosophers: οἱ ἐντυχόντες τῇ γεγενημένῃ ἡμῶν πολυμερμυρία καὶ τὸ σπουδιῶν θαυμάσουσι καὶ τὸ φιλόπονον οὐκ ἐξουθενήσουσι, and in v 6 he says: πάνυ νομίζω πεπονημένως τὰ δόξαντα πᾶσι τοῖς καθ' Ἑλληνίας τε καὶ βαρβάρους . . . ἐκτεθεῖσθαι.

with the object of shewing on which of them each heresiarch had based his system. Little wonder, therefore, that in the course of this work he speaks more than once, or twice, of the toil which it cost him. With the ninth book he had completed his refutation of the heretics; but realizing that many might be deterred from wading through so long and tedious a work, he determined to undertake the additional labour of adding in a tenth book a summary of all that had gone before, together with an exposition of the true teaching; and the chances are that before he reached the end of this further task he would allude once again to the toil of it all. The words last quoted from F xi 8 supply such an allusion, and in characteristic Hippolytean phrase.

Convinced that the fragment is by Hippolytus, I believe also that it is the closing passage of his great work against the heresies. As such it would be, in the words of Bunsen, 'a winding-up worthy of the grand subject, of the author's high standing and pretensions, and with the solemnity of a concluding address'. The dithyrambic rhetoric of the passage is that of Hippolytus at his highest pitch, and no ordinary occasion suffices to explain it.

It remains to deal with an objection which is bound to occur to many readers. F is part of a treatise which in all probability once stood complete in a MS volume which contained a number of other writings, most of them wrongly attributed to Justin Martyr. But it is evident that the *Philosophumena* is far too long a work to have been included in its entirety in such a collection. It is not necessary, however, to suppose that *the whole* of that work, or any large proportion of it, was included, for Lightfoot has pointed out that 'there is every reason to believe that the Summary comprising the tenth book of the *Philosophumena* was circulated separately from the main portion of the treatise, and fell into the hands of some who were unacquainted with the rest'; and also that it was evidently the tenth book alone which was known to Photius (*Bibl.* 48) under the name of the *Labyrinth* (*op. cit.* p. 379). That Photius makes Gaius of Rome the author does not matter, for it is demonstrable that the treatise he refers to was the tenth book of the *Philosophumena*.

One last word. I have already made the suggestion that Hippolytus is the author of a treatise written in a very different style from that of F—the Epistle to Diognetus itself (*J. T. S.* Oct. 1935). If the first part at least of the present paper has proved what it pretends to prove, we have now the datum that the *ad Diognetum* once formed part of a volume in which it stood immediately before a work of Hippolytus. Was it perhaps the case that the compiler of the (mainly) pseudo-Justin collection found these two pieces together in an ancient codex which did not supply their author's name?

R. H. CONNOLLY.