

405 consists of seven fragments written in a small neat uncial hand, which is not later than the first half of the third century, and might be as old as the latter part of the second. The ordinary contractions $\overline{\theta s}$, $\overline{\chi s}$, $\overline{\eta s}$ occur; and it is clear that the use of these goes back far into the second century. Besides its early date (it is probably the oldest Christian fragment yet published), 405 is interesting on account of a quotation from St. Matthew iii. 16-7 describing the Baptism, which is indicated by wedge-shaped signs in the margin similar to those employed for filling up short lines, e. g. in Fr. (a) ll. 9 and 13.

TOP III p10-1

405.	Fr. (a) 8.3 x 4.8 cm.	PLATE I.
Col. i.	(a) Col. ii.	(b)
]. ο . [.	μαί [] . [
] . μη αθ . [.	15 του β[α]π[τ]σπ[
]που της	> ος· ανεω[χθησαν οι ουρανοι	30]αν[
]αι επιθε	> και ειδεν [το π[α] του θυ κατα	.
5] . γνωστος	>βαινον ω[σει περιστεραν	
] . [.] . η	>ερχομεν[ον επ αυτον και	(c)
]ου	20 >ιδου φω[νη εκ των ουρανων	.
]του	>λεγουσα [. ο αγα] . [
] .	>πητος []ασυ . [
10] .	γαρ τοτ . []νω[

TOP III p10-2

]του	τον [Ι]η[σ]]ο Χ[ρ]
]με	25 αλλος δε [35] . ομ[
] .	θυ σωτ[ηρ	.
.	ριευω[.
.	.	.
(d)	(e)	
]ατ[ε[.σ]	.] . [.] . . [
]πος αυτ[.]που . [
]νον αυ[.] . . . θ[ε] . .]ν κα[
] . και ο αυ[50] . [.] . [.]ντον εκκ[
40] προφητ] σ[σ]ουθησ[
]ς και υπο[] . π[
]σαγγελ[λ]ο[.	
] παρθεν[.	
] ον και το[(f)	
45]τω . [.]α . [
]α[.]ροσσο[
.	55] . . ωνος κ[
.]ητουσ . [
.]απ[

TOP III p11-1

16-22. Owing to the number of variations in the text of this passage (Matt. iii. 16-7) and the irregularities of the papyrus with regard to the ends of lines, as shown by Col. i, some of the restorations are rather doubtful. Both ουρανοι in l. 14 and ουρανων in l. 18 may have been contracted. In l. 15, if πνευμα was written out in full, τ[ε] and τ[ω], which are omitted by N and B, may have been also omitted by the papyrus; and that καί, which is found in some MSS. before ερχόμενοι, was not in the papyrus is fairly certain. The supplement in l. 17 is rather short. The only known variant which would be longer is πρ[ὸς] for ἐπ[ὶ], found in several cursives. In l. 19 there is certainly not room for the best-attested reading οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητός: either the papyrus agreed with D in reading σὶ εἰ for οὗτός ἐστιν, or else ὁ υἱός μου was omitted or placed after ἀγαπητός.

TOP p11-2

A PAPYRUS FRAGMENT OF IRENÆUS.

Deanery, Westminster, October 16th, 1903.

In their recently published volume of 'Oxyrhynchus Papyri' (Part III. p. 10) Messrs. Grenfell and Hunt give us an early Christian papyrus which they have not been able to identify. In describing it they say :—

"405 consists of seven fragments, written in a small neat uncial hand, which is not later than the first half of the third century, and might be as old as the latter part of the second..... Besides its early date (it is probably the oldest Christian fragment yet published), 405 is interesting on account of a quotation from St. Matthew iii. 16, 17, describing the Baptism, which is indicated by wedge-shaped signs in the margin."

The fact is that we have here a scrap of the lost Greek original of the third book of Irenæus *adversus hæreses*. It corresponds with the Latin of III. 9f. (Harvey, II. pp. 31f.). When we see this, we are able to piece together all the *disjecta membra* save one (which consists, however, of no more than five letters). The following provisional reconstruction may perhaps enable the editors to read a few additional letters :—

COL. I.

χ^{ον} σ^{ου} [Ωμοσεν Κυρι]ο[ς τ^ω
 Δαδ ἀλ[ήθειαν, [καὶ οὐ]μὴ ἀθ[ε
 τήσει αὐ]τόν· ἐκ κ[αρ]ποῦ τῆς
 κοιλίας σου θήσ[ομαι] ἐπὶ θ[ρο
 νου σου· καὶ π[άλιν]· Γνωστὸς
 ἐν τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ ὁ θς κ[αὶ] ἐ[γεν]ή
 θη ἐν εἰρήνῃ ὁ τό[πος] αὐτοῦ
 καὶ τὸ κατοικητήριον αὐτοῦ
 ἐν Σιών. Εἰς οὖν καὶ ὁ αὐ[τὸς]
 θς ὁ καὶ ὑπὸ τῶν προφη[τῶν]
 κηρυσσόμενος καὶ ὑπὸ τοῦ
 εὐαγγελίου ἐπ[αγγελλόμε]
 νος καὶ ὁ υἱ ὁ ἐκ παρθέν[ου]
 ὁ καὶ Ἐμμανουήλ· οὐ καὶ τὸ [α
 στρον Βαλαάμ μὲν οἶ]τω[ς] ἐ
 προφήτευσεν· Ἀνατε[λ]εῖ α
 στρον ἐξ Ἰακώβ,.....

COL. II.

λίβ[ρον] δέ, ὅτι θς, ὁ καὶ
 γν[ωστὸς] ἐν τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ γε
 νόμ[ε]νος κ[αὶ] ἐμφανὴς τοῖς
 μὴ ζητοῦσιν αὐτόν. Καὶ ἐπὶ
 τοῦ βαπτ[τισμοῦ] φησὶ Ματθαῖ
 > os· Ἀνεώ[χθησαν οἱ οὐρανοί
 > καὶ εἶδεν πνεῦμα θν κατα

> βαῖνον ὡ[σεί] περιστέραν
 > ἐρχόμενον[·] εἰς αὐτόν, καὶ
 > ἰδοὺ φω[νὴ] ἐκ τῶν οὐρανῶν
 > λέγουσα· σὺ εἶ ὁ υἱς μου ὁ ἀγα
 > πητός, ἐ[ν] ᾧ[·] ἡδόκησα. Οὐ
 γὰρ τότε[·] ὁ χς [κατέβη] εἰς
 τὸν Ἰη[σοῦ]· οὔτε ἄλλος μὲν ὁ χς
 ἄλλος δὲ [Ἰησ]· ὁ δὲ λόγος τοῦ
 θν, ὁ σωτ[ήρ] πάντων καὶ κυ
 ριεύ[ων] οὐρανοῦ καὶ γῆς

Some portions of this reconstruction are, of course, hazardous; but it is plain that Irenæus read αὐτόν (= *eum* of the Latin), not αὐτήν, in Ps. cxxxi. 11, where the LXX. has both readings attested by good MSS. Moreover, it is now certain (as the editors of the papyrus had already ingeniously suggested as a possibility) that Irenæus read σὺ εἶ ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητός, ἐν ᾧ..... (as D) in Matt. iii. 17. It is true that his Latin translator follows the more familiar text, and renders "Hic est filius meus," &c.; but the tiny fragment numbered (c), which we are now able to fit into its place, actually gives us the word σὺ. Following Codex Bezae again, I have ventured to read εἰς instead of ἐπ', in order to get the additional letter required to make the line of the normal length (twenty letters).

J. ARMITAGE ROBINSON.

THE OXYRHYNCHUS PAPYRI.

Oxford, October 23th, 1903.

A RE-EXAMINATION of the text of No. 405 in Part III. of the 'Oxyrhynchus Papyri,' in the light of Dr. Armitage Robinson's extremely acute identification of it as a piece of the 1st original of Irenæus, III. 9 (*Athenaeum*, October 24th), enables us to confirm the correctness of his arrangement of the fragments and general restoration. Several of the mutilated letters which were previously uncertain or undeciphered can now be recognized, e.g., col. i. 4, *κοιλίας* is all preserved. The revised text will be given in full in an appendix to Part IV. of the 'Oxyrhynchus Papyri' next June. In the mean time the only important modifications of Dr. Armitage Robinson's provisional restorations which we wish to suggest are as follows. Col. i. 1, the reading proposed is unsuitable to the traces. It is difficult to find any restoration which will exactly agree with the Latin translation at this point, and perhaps there was a serious divergence, as in ll. 13-4. Col. ii. 6-12 (a quotation of Matthew iii. 16, 17), the small fragment (*b*) which remained unplaced belongs to ll. 7-9, and the whole passage should now be read and restored thus:—

ἀνεψ[χθησαν οἱ οὐρανοὶ
καὶ εἶδεν τὸ πᾶν τοῦ θύ κατα-
βαῖνον ὡς π[εριστερὰν καὶ
ἐρχόμενον εἰς αὐτὸν καὶ
ἰδοὺ φων[ῇ] ἐκ τῶν οὐρανῶν
λέγουσα σὺ εἶ ὁ υἱ μου ὁ ἀγα-
πητὸς [ἐ]ν ᾧ [εὐδόκησα

Irenæus thus agreed with the Codex Bezae in reading not only σὺ εἶ for οὗτός ἐστιν, but also ὡς in place of ὡσεὶ, a variant found in D alone, the presence of which in this passage of Irenæus could not be inferred from the Latin translation *quasi*. These two unsuspected coincidences between Irenæus and D, of which one is misrepresented, the other inevitably obscured by the Latin translator, indicate that the extent of the agreement between Irenæus' quotations and the text of the Codex Bezae is even larger than what the imperfect evidence of the Latin translation has led critics to suppose.

B. P. GRENFELL.
A. S. HUNT.

THE OXYRHYNCHUS FRAGMENT OF IRENÆUS.

DR. ARMITAGE ROBINSON, in your issue of October 24th, has made a very interesting discovery, in which we are not only presented with an almost contemporary fragment of one of the most important of the Fathers, but are also enriched *en route* with fresh suggestions as to the antiquity of the Greek text of Codex Bezae and its relation to the text of the New Testament employed by Irenæus. In filling up, however, the blanks of the papyrus from the printed Latin text of Irenæus, Dr. Robinson has followed his supplementary authority in too servile a manner.

It will not do to restore the missing words relating to the Star that comes out of Jacob in the following manner :—

καὶ τὸ [ᾠ
στρον Βαλαάμ μὲν οὐ]τω[ς ἐ
προφήτευσεν. Ἀνατε]λ[εῖ ᾠ
στρον ἐξ Ἰακώβ κτέ]

The name of Balaam did not stand there : first, because, as the critical apparatus will show, the Clermont and Vossian copies of Irenæus read not "Balaam" but "Ysaïas" ; Harvey says, in his usual wooden manner, "by a similarity of error." Second, the very same substitution is found in Justin Martyr's 'First Apology,' at the thirty-second chapter, as follows :—

Καὶ Ἡσαίας δὲ ἄλλος προφήτης, τὰ αὐτὰ δι' ἄλλων ῥήσεων προφητεύων οὕτως εἶπεν·
Ἀνατελεῖ ἄστρον ἐξ Ἰακώβ κτέ.

The similarity of error, as Harvey would say, is sufficient to show that it is not an error at all, but that both Irenæus and Justin are quoting from a book of prophetic testimonia in which the passage was referred to Isaiah. The importance of the observation is not limited to the single case discussed ; it is well known that there are many similar confusions, some of which go back to the New Testament itself. Perhaps before long Messrs. Grenfell and Hunt will dig up for us some fragments of this lost book of testimonia. J. RENDEL HARRIS.

A revised text of Part III, no. 405 (Irenaeus, *Contra Haereses*, iii. 9).

The seven fragments of an early Christian work published as 405 were identified by Dr. J. Armitage Robinson as belonging to the lost Greek original of Irenaeus' treatise *Contra Haereseis*, which is extant only in a Latin translation, and when fitted together correspond to part of iii. 9. A provisional reconstruction was given by him in *Athenaeum*, Oct. 24, 1903; cf. our note, *ibid.*, Nov. 7, and that of Dr. Rendel Harris, *ibid.*, Nov. 14. We now print a revised text of the whole. The chief interest of the discovery lies in the resulting correspondence between the readings of Irenaeus' quotation from Matt. iii. 16-7 in ll. 23-9 and those of the Codex Bezae. The Latin translation there has the ordinary reading *Hic est (filius meus)*, whereas the original agrees with D in having (l. 28) *ὁ ἐγὼ* in place of *οὗτος ἐγώ*, and a variant peculiar to D (*ὅς* for *ὡς* before *νεκρωσάμενος*) occurs in l. 25 (Lat. *quasi*). 'These two unsuspected coincidences between Irenaeus and D, of which the one is misrepresented, the other inevitably obscured by the Latin translator, indicate that the extent of the agreement between Irenaeus' quotations and the text of the Codex Bezae is even larger than what the imperfect evidence of the Latin translation has led critics to suppose' (*Athen.*, Nov. 7).

	Col. i.		Col. ii.
	[. . . .] . [.] χρι		[. . . . λιθ]αγ[ον δε οτι θς ο
	[στου] σου [ωμοσεν κς τω] Δ[αν		[και γν]ωστος [εν τη Ιουδαια
	[ειδ α]ληθ[εια]ν και ι ον μη αθε	20	[γεν]ομενος κ[αι εμφανης τοις
	[τ]η[σε]ι [α]ντον εκ κ[αρ]που της		μη ζητουσιν [αυτον και επι
5	κοιλιας σου θησ[ι]μι[α] επι θρο		του βαπτ[ισμου] φησι Ματθαι
	[νου σου και] π[αλιν]· γνωστος	> ος· ανεω[χθησαν οι ουρανοι	
	[εν τη Ιουδαια ο θς] και εγενη	> και ειδεν τ[ο π]να του θ[υ] κατα	
	[θη εν ειρηνη ο το]πος αυτου	25	> βαινον ως π[ερισ]τεραν και
	[και το κατοικητηρ]ιον αυτου	> ερχομενον εις αυτον και	
10	[εν Σιων εις ου]ν και ο αυ	> ιδου φωνη εκ των ουρανων	
	[τος θς ο υπο των] προφη[τ]ω	> λεγουσα συ εις ο υς μου ο αγα	
	[κηρυσσομενο]ς και υπο του	> π[ι]τος [ε]ν ω [ει]δοκησα ου	
	[ευαγγελιου .]ταγγελ[λ]ομε	30	γαρ τοτε ο χς [κατεβη εις
	[νος και ο υς εκ] παρθεν[ου]		τον Ιν ρυδ[α] αλλος μιν ο χς
15	[.] ον και το [ασ		αλλος δε Ι[σ] αλλα ο λογος του
	[τρων Ησαιας μεν ου]τως [ε		θυ ο σωτ[ηρ παντων και κυ
	[προφητευσεν ανατε]λ[ει		ριενω[ν ουρανον και γης

13. επαγγελλομενος would be expected (*annuntiatulus* Lat.), but the letter before *αγγ* is more like *τ* or *γ* than *π*.

14-5. The Latin has *et huius filius qui ex fructu ventris David, id est ex David virgine et Emmanuel, cuius et stellam &c.* The papyrus version is much shorter.

16. For Ησαίας instead of Βυλααρ cf. Rendel Harris, *Athen.*, Nov. 14.

31. The Latin has *in Iesum, neque alius quidem Christus*. The supposed ν of $\overline{\Gamma\nu}$ is more like η , but it is impossible to read $\overline{\Gamma\eta\nu}$, and for the omission of η in the earliest contractions of $\overline{\Gamma\eta\sigma\theta\upsilon\varsigma}$ cf. e. g. 1.

Comparison between a "modern" English translation, R. H. Rambaut tr, *ANF*, v.1 (1885) = *ANCL*, v.9 (1869); and the surviving Latin translation, W. Wigan Harvey ed, *Libros quinque adversus haereses*, v.2 (1857):

col i.

Irenaeus, *Against Heresies*, 3.9.2:

... David likewise speaks of Him who, from the virgin, is Emmanuel: "Turn not away the face of Thine anointed. The LORD hath sworn a truth to David, and will not turn from him. Of the fruit of thy body will I set upon thy seat." [RSV Psa. 132:10-11/OG 131:10-11]

And again: "In Judea is God known; His place has been made in peace, and His dwelling in Zion." [RSV Psa 76:1/OG 75.2]

Therefore there is one and the same God, who was proclaimed by the prophets and announced by the Gospel; and His Son, who was of the fruit of David's body, that is, of the virgin of [the house of] David, and Emmanuel; whose star also Balaam thus prophesied ...

W. Wigan Harvey, p 31:

eum, qui munus gloriæ eis donat. Iterum autem de Angelo dicens Matthæus, ait: *Angelus Domini apparuit Joseph in somnis*; Matt. i. 20, & ii. 13. *cujus Domini, ipse interpretatur: Uti adimpleatur quod dictum* Cap. ii. 15. *est a Domino per prophetam, Ex Ægypto vocavi filium meum. Ecce* ¹ *Virgo* ² *in utero accipiet, et pariet filium, et vocabunt nomen* Cap. i. 23. *ejus Emmanuel, quod est interpretatum, Nobiscum Deus. De hoc qui est ex Virgine Emmanuel, dixit David: Non avertas faciem* Ps. cxxxi. 10, 11. *Christi tui. Juravit Dominus David veritatem, et non dispernet eum, De fructu ventris tui ponam super sedem tuam. Et iterum: Notus in Judæa Deus, et factus est in pace locus ejus, et habitaculum ejus in Sion. Unus igitur et idem Deus, qui a prophetis prædicatus est, et ab evangelio annuntiatus, et hujus Filius qui ex fructu ventris David, id est ex David Virgine, et Emmanuel: cujus et stellam* ³ *Balaam quidem sic prophetavit: Orietur stella ex* Numb. xxiv. 17. *Jacob, et surget dux in Israel.*

caus; a Luca vero narrari, quod turbis ad baptismum confluentibus penitentiam prædicaverit, porro id quoque observat: πρὸς μὲν τοὺς Φαρισαίους καὶ Σαδδουκαίους, ποιήσατε, εἰρηται ἐνικῶς, καρπὸν δέξιν τῆς μεταβολῆς· πρὸς δὲ τοὺς ὄχλους πληθυντικῶς, δέξιν καρποὺς τῆς μεταβολῆς. GRABE.

¹ The reader may consult the remarks upon this text in the editor's work upon

the *Creeeds*, p. 278.

² The Syriac ܐܡܢܐ expresses either ἐν γαστρὶ ἔξει of the N. T. or λήψεται of the LXX., which latter reading is followed by S. CYPRIAN *adv. Jud.* i. 9, S. AMBROS. *Præf. in Ps.* xxxv. LEO M., as MASSUET observes, has *concupiet. in Nat.* iii.

³ The CLERM. and VOSS. copies have *Ysaías*, by a similarity of error.

col ii.

Irenaeus *Against Heresies* Book 3.9.3:

And then, [speaking of His] baptism, Matthew says, "The heavens were opened, and He saw the Spirit of God, as a dove, coming upon Him: and lo a voice from heaven, saying, This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased." [Matt 3:16-17]

For Christ did not at that time descend upon Jesus, neither was Christ one and Jesus another: but the Word of God--who is the Saviour of all, and the ruler of heaven and earth, ...

W. Wigan Harvey, p 32:

Rom. x. 20.
ex Esai. lxxv.
1.
Matt. iii. 16
seq.

et manifestus eis qui non quærebant eum. Adhuc ait in baptis-
mate Matthæus: *Aperti sunt* ²[ei] *cœli, et vidit Spiritum Dei*
quasi columbam venientem super eum. Et ecce vox de cœlo, dicens:
Hic est Filius meus dilectus, in quo mihi ³*bene complacui.* Non
enim Christus tunc descendit in Jesum; neque alius quidem
Christus, alius vero Jesus: sed Verbum Dei, qui est Salvator om-
nium, et dominator cœli et terræ, qui est Jesus, quemadmodum

¹ *Myrrham quidem &c.* Mirum in
modum hæc mystica donorum intelligentia
Patribus universis placuit, Justino, Ter-
tulliano, Cypriano, Origeni. Celebrat
Hieronymus pulcherrimum Juveni Pres-
byteri versiculum, quo munerum istorum
sacramenta comprehendit his verbis: *Thus,*
aurum, myrrham, Regique, Hominique,
Deoque. Huic unico duos alios ex Sedu-
lio adungere non erit injucundum: *Au-*
rea nascenti fuderunt munera Regi, Thura
dedere Deo, Myrrham tribuere sepulchro.
FEUARD.

² *ei* is bracketed, as omitted in the
CLERM. and AB. MSS. The Syr. ܐܝܢ
corresponds with the Greek ἀντὶ.

³ *bene.* This word is omitted in the
CLERM. MS. and its satellite Voss.,
and the omission brings the translation
into closer connexion with the Syriac
ܐܝܢ than with the Greek εὐδό-
κησα.

⁴ c. vi.

⁵ *Non secundum gloriam, Vulg. visio-*
nem, LXX. οὐ κατὰ τῆς δόξης, as the
translation of the Hebrew, לֹא לְמַדְּתָּ
עֵינָיו, δόξα was evidently intended by
the Greek translator in the sense of
opinio, not of *gloria*. *He shall not judge*
after the sight of his eyes, is our own
accurate translation.