

THE QUARTODECIMAN QUESTION.

AN immense cloud of dust has been raised over the Paschal Question. Or rather, over the Paschal Questions: for one source of the bewilderment has been the treatment of distinct questions as though they were one and the same. It is perhaps still necessary to repeat that in the ante-Nicene period there were at least three distinct Paschal Questions. Of the four familiar incidents—the conversation between St Polycarp and Anicetus of Rome in the middle of the 2nd cent. (Eus. *H. E.* iv 14 § 1, v 24 § 16 sq.); the discussion at Laodicea in the sixties of the century (*ib.* iv 26 § 3, vi 13 § 9); the serious dispute between the Asian and some neighbouring churches on the one side and the rest of the Church on the other in the last decade of the 2nd cent. (*ib.* v 23–25); and the divergences in usage which the Nicene Council discussed and attempted to reconcile (Eus. *V. C.* iii 14, 18–20; Socr. *H. E.* i 9)¹—of these incidents, only the first and the third are concerned with the same question, and even that has lately been disputed. This is the ‘Quartodeciman Question’, the question, that is, as between the Asian observance of the Pascha on the 14th day of the first moon of the year, and the observance of it on the following Sunday, which was the usage of the rest of the Church; and it is this question only with which the present Note is concerned. Of the other two incidents: the Laodicene dispute, for all we know about it, may have meant little more than a difference over a point of exegesis, as to whether the Last Supper was the Passover or not; and anyhow the dispute was an internal one as between the Asian Quartodecimans themselves and did not concern the Church at large; while the difficulty treated of at Nicaea was the local differences in the date at which Easter was kept in any year, resulting from different methods of calculating which was the first month and the Paschal moon.

In treating of the Quartodeciman Question the earlier of modern ecclesiastical historians, the Centuriators and Baronius, content themselves with quoting Eusebius’s account without comment. In the 17th cent. Natalis Alexander and Tillemont summarize Eusebius in their own words, Alexander apparently, and Tillemont explicitly, understanding Eusebius’s account in what seems to be its most natural sense.²

¹ Duchesne ‘La question de la Pâque au Concile de Nicée’ in *Rev. des questions historiques* xxviii (1880); *Origines du culte chrétien* pp. 226 sqq.

² Nat. Alexander *Selecta hist. eccl. capita* saec. ii pars prima, Paris 1667, Diss. v art. ii; Tillemont *Mémoires*, 1699, Saint Victor art. ii p. 172.

And Tillemont's interpretation is the more significant because he had before him a different interpretation. For the Jesuit Gabriel Daniel had proposed that the Quartodeciman observance of the '14th day' was a commemoration of the Passion, not of the Resurrection. Tillemont in an appended note considered Daniel's arguments and adhered to his own interpretation.¹ From this time onwards, for two centuries and a quarter, discussion has been reopened from time to time without final result. But it is, I suppose, since F. C. Baur's use of a certain view of the Quartodeciman position as a count against the Joannine authorship of the Fourth Gospel that the question has been discussed most frequently and at length; and a bewildering volume of theories and assumptions has been proposed. The last of these discussions is that of Dr Carl Schmidt in an excursus of 150 pages appended to his edition of the *Epistola Apostolorum* in *Texte und Untersuchungen* xliii (1919) pp. 577-725. In the present Note I am venturing to suggest that the whole matter is not quite so complicated and difficult as from the many discussions of it it may appear to be, and to question some at least of Dr Schmidt's conclusions.

The occasion of Dr Schmidt's excursus is this. On various grounds he assigns the *Epistola* to Asia as its place of origin and to 160-170 as its date. If this is right, the document springs from a Quartodeciman milieu, and if it can be shewn to imply the Quartodeciman position, his conclusion as to its date and provenance is confirmed. But in the course of the *Epistola* (pp. 52-55) our Lord, after the Resurrection, is represented as commanding the Apostles after the Ascension to observe a memorial (or a day of memorial) of His Death; and He tells them that at the Passover one of them will be thrown into prison for His Name's sake, and there will grieve that he cannot keep the Passover with the rest; but that He will send His power in the form of an angel, who will open the doors of the prison; and the prisoner will join the other Apostles and keep vigil with them until cockcrow. When the Memorial is finished and the Agape is over, he will be thrown once more into prison until he comes forth again and preaches what the Lord has commanded. Dr Schmidt's excursus aims at shewing that this describes Quartodeciman usage. And his theory is that the writer of the *Epistola* is defending and justifying that usage: in putting the command into our Lord's mouth, he is appealing behind the apostolic tradition, which, since both sides in the Quartodeciman Question laid claim to it each in support of its own usage, left the question insoluble. How far there is

¹ Tillemont *ibid.* Note I sur Saint Victor Pape. Daniel's *Dissertation* (which I have not seen) is referred to by Mosheim and Hefele as in his collected works, *Recueil de divers ouvrages* &c., Paris 1724; but it was written many years before, since Tillemont died in 1698.

anything peculiarly Quartodeciman in the description of the Paschal usage will perhaps appear lower down. As to the theory, it is ingenious, but surely as precarious as it is ingenious. It is quite possible that the writer had no controversial purpose at all; and if he had, it is surely at least as likely that it related to the dispute at Laodicea, which happened in the very decade to which Dr Schmidt assigns the *Epistola*, and that possibly, however obscurely, he was defending the view that the Last Supper was a Passover.

In considering the Quartodeciman Question, there are three questions which may be asked. I. What was the Pascha? II. In what sense did the Quartodecimans 'observe the 14th day'? III. What did their observance mean? what did it commemorate?

I.

The Paschal observance, in the most general sense, consisted of a Fast followed by a Feast. There were differences, local and perhaps also as between individuals, in the duration of the Fast: some fasted one day, some two, some forty hours, others more days than two.¹ That is to say, in terms of the Catholic² observance, apparently, some fasted only on Saturday, the Great Sabbath; some on Friday and Saturday, by the 'superposition' or 'continuation' of the usual Friday station or half-fast on to the Saturday; others from the meal which followed the Friday half-fast till after the Liturgy and Communion on Sunday morning, approximately forty hours; and others again added more or fewer of the 4 weekdays preceeding Friday. In the course of the 3rd and the early 4th centuries the 6 days' fast came to be very generally adopted (ἡ Μεγάλη Ἑβδομάς, *Hebdomada maior*, *Hebd. authentica*), Friday and Saturday being a continuous fast, the other days less rigorously observed.³ The following Feast was of 50 days, the *spatium latissimum*⁴ of the Pentecoste, during which no fasts were observed and the faithful did not kneel at prayer: in fact, a period of 50 continuous Sundays.⁵

This then being the nature of the Paschal observance in its broadest sense, the Pascha in its most specific sense is, I conceive, the point of

¹ S. Iren. ap. Eus. *H. E.* v 24.

² I use 'Catholic' as contrasted with 'Quartodeciman' only for convenience and not as reflecting on the orthodoxy of the Asians, which no one impugns, and Hippolytus and Epiphanius explicitly vindicate.

³ S. Dion. Al. *Ep. ad Basilidem*; *Didaskalia* v 14 § 17; S. Ath. *Festal Epp.*; *Ap. Const.* v 13 § 20; S. Epiph. *Expos. fid.* 22.

⁴ Tertull. *de Bapt.* 19, where surely *latissimum*, not *laetissimum*, must be right.

⁵ S. Iren. ap. [Justin] *Quaestiones* 115; Tertull. *de Bapt.* 19, *de Cor.* 3, *de Idol.* 14, *de Orat.* 18.

transition between these two periods of fast and feast, viz. the Vigil,¹ which in the Catholic usage occupied the Saturday–Sunday night, observed by the faithful in church, with the *sollemnia Paschae* (Tert. *de Uxore* ii 4), a prolonged *missa catechumenorum* followed by the baptism and confirmation of the competents and closing with the Liturgy and Communion. And it is a valuable point in the *Epistola Apostolorum*, if Dr Schmidt has placed and dated it aright, that it carries back the evidence for the Paschal Vigil some 30 years, the earliest witness for it hitherto having been Tertullian (*ibid.*), and shews that it was in use in Asia. Since in the Catholic rite the Vigil began on the Saturday night, it was natural that the name Pascha should come to be extended to the whole day; and this is the case in Tertullian, for whom Pascha seems to mean Easter Even.² Later on it was extended backwards and forwards; backwards to all the ferias of the Great Week (τὸ Πάσχα, ἡ ἑβδομὰς τοῦ Πάσχα, *Septimana paschalis*), and forwards to the Sunday, Easter day; and this latter came to be the common use of the title. The modern Nestorians apply it in particular to Maundy Thursday. But I can recall no case of its application to Good Friday in particular; and the distinction of *πάσχα στανρώσιμον* (Good Friday) and *πάσχα ἀναστάσιμον* (Easter Day), which is quoted by Suicer (*s.v.* Πάσχα) from Vossius and has frequently been used since, is, for all I have ever seen to the contrary, an invention of Vossius himself.

It is to be noted that, except in point of time—the Saturday–Sunday night of the Catholic observance being that following the 14th day of the moon, the historical date of the Passion—there is in this observance no realism; it is no reproduction of the successive events of the Passion and the Resurrection on the several days of their occurrence. In particular, except in so far as in some churches Friday was fasted, there is no Good Friday, and still less a Maundy Thursday or a Palm Sunday. The commemoration, whatever its content might be, was confined to the rite of the Vigil. Nor, so far as I know, is there any reference to Good Friday until we find it towards the end of the 4th cent. in Jerusalem, the original home and fountain-head of all this type of realism, where so far as possible all the events of the Gospel, from Palm Sunday to Low Sunday, are commemorated, in some degree dramatically, at their proper times and places, and Good Friday is already marked by the Veneration of the Cross, and the ‘Three Hours’.³ But this was, so far, unique, and it was a long time before the system was partially

¹ *Διανυκτέρευσις, παννυχίς* Eus. *H. E.* ii 17 § 21, vi 9 § 2, 34, *V. C.* iv 57: *Didaskalia* v 19: *pervigilium* Lactant. *Instt.* vii 19.

² *de Ieiun.* 13 sq., *de Orat.* 14.

³ *Aetheria Peregrinatio*. The Friday rite implied in Sozom. *H. E.* vii 19 § 9 is Palestinian.

accepted all over Christendom. It is significant that it is not till she comes to the Vigil that Aetheria notes anything as already familiar to herself and her sisters, and therefore refrains from describing it, except for one local detail; while hitherto all has been described as if new and unfamiliar. St Leo preaches the Passion only on Sunday and Wednesday, and makes no allusion to Friday; and there are very few patristic sermons belonging to Good Friday.¹ It is difficult, in fact, to say when a rite was attached to Friday; and when it was, in Rome it was probably identical with that of the preceding Wednesday, except in respect of the particular Scriptures used.² The development was of course inevitable; and no doubt the germ of it is to be seen in the local Friday fast of the 2nd cent. and in Tertullian's use of *Parasceve* (*de Jejun.* 14) as the name of the day; but it was certainly not yet any such day as the later Church became familiar with, nor is it mentioned in relation to the Quartodeciman Question, except incidentally as implied in the local two days' fast. If this is so, writers like Neander, Hefele, Duchesne, and Dr Schmidt are not justified in laying down at the outset that the Church at large, as distinguished from the Quartodecimans, celebrated the Passion on Friday.

II.

The Pascha proper being the celebration of the Vigil, the Paschal Question with which we are concerned may be defined as the question how the date of the Vigil was to be adjusted to the one realistic consideration which conditioned it—viz. the date of the full moon. And we know that the Church in general adjusted it to the Sunday which followed the full moon, keeping the Vigil on Saturday–Sunday night; whereas the Quartodecimans adjusted it to the day of the full moon itself. But how exactly?

The original authorities we possess are two.

1. St Hippolytus, who has a chapter on the Quartodecimans in the *Philosophumena* (viii 18); and here he is followed by Epiphanius. He also treated of them in the *Syntagma*, of which we possess only a single fragment of half a dozen lines in the *Paschal Chronicle* (preface); and again in the *de Pascha* of which only a single fragment (*ibid.*) has survived.

2. Eusebius (*H. E.* v 23–25), who had before him the *dossier* of the controversy, including the decisions of the Councils which considered the question, and the correspondence of St Irenaeus and other bishops

¹ Certainly not S. Chrys. *Hom. in Coemeterio et de Cruce*, in spite of Montfaucon; see § 3. There is one sermon of St Augustine assigned to Good Friday, none of St Leo.

² See Duchesne *Origines du culte chrétien*, p. 224.

on the crisis, some of which he quotes verbatim. Eusebius is followed by Socrates (*H. E.* v 22), who refers to him for details, and apparently also by Theodoret (*Haer. fab.* iii 4), whose few lines tell us nothing that he might not have derived from Eusebius, though he repeats it in a form which is significant for our purpose.

In one respect these two groups of authorities differ from each other. For whereas Eusebius and his followers describe, not only the Quartodeciman idiosyncrasy, but also the contrasted Catholic usage, which helps to define the Quartodeciman (though in the case of Socrates I suspect that the definition is mistaken); Hippolytus, with Epiphanius, describes only the Quartodeciman usage, and that in quite general terms (though here Epiphanius, too, has perhaps misunderstood his authority).

To begin with Eusebius: his summary of the question (*H. E.* v 23) is as follows:—

‘When no small question was raised because the dioceses of all Asia, on the alleged ground of an ancient tradition, were of opinion that they ought to observe the 14th day of the moon at the saving feast of the Pascha, on which day the Jews were commanded to sacrifice the sheep, holding that by all means it is on this day that they ought to bring their fastings to an end, on whatever day of the week it might fall; whereas it was not the custom with the churches of all the rest of the world to celebrate the feast after this sort, since they observed the custom which by apostolic tradition had held good hitherto, to the effect that it was not fitting to end the fasts on any other day than that of the Resurrection of our Saviour’—this is the protasis of the portentous sentence; the apodosis proceeds: ‘so, synods and meetings of bishops were assembled and all with one consent communicated by letter to the [faithful] everywhere an ecclesiastical decree to the effect that the mystery of the Lord’s Resurrection from the dead should never be celebrated on any other day than the Sunday and that it is on this day only that we should observe the ending of the Paschal fasts.’

There are here three main statements, viz. that of the Quartodeciman usage, that of the general usage, and that of the consentient decisions of the councils.

The first and third of these statements consist of two component clauses, one as to the day observed, the other as to the ending of the fast. But the middle statement has only a single clause, relating only to the ending of the fast, while the day observed is left to be understood.

The three main statements are obviously parallel to one another. The first and third are parallel clause by clause; but the parallelism between the first and second and that between the second and third are formally lopsided through the absence of a first clause in the second statement.

The relation of the statements can be tabulated thus :

<i>Quartodeciman usage.</i>	<i>General usage.</i>	<i>Conciliar decrees.</i>
1. The 14th day observed.	Sunday to be observed.
2. Fast ended on the 14th.	Fast ended on Sunday.	Fast to be ended on Sunday.

As for the missing clause in the second column, I conceive that it will not be disputed that if Eusebius had inserted it, it would have been to the effect that all the Church, except the churches of Asia and some of their neighbours, 'observed the Sunday'. And it follows that, according to Eusebius, in respect both of the day observed and of the ending of the fast, the Sunday in the one use and the 14th day of the moon in the other are simply parallel the one to the other: what Sunday is to the general observance, the 14th day of the moon is to the Quartodeciman.

But there are three points in Eusebius's statement which at first sight may appear to be ambiguous and have in fact occasioned different interpretations of his meaning.

(a) He relates that the Councils decreed that '*the mystery of the Lord's Resurrection should be celebrated only on Sunday*', while of the Quartodecimans he says that '*at the saving feast of the Pascha the 14th day of the moon was observed*'. Whether this difference of expression implies any difference in the significance of the days—as Dr Schmidt (p. 379) puts it, '*Dort Passah, hier Ostern!*'—will perhaps become clearer as we proceed. Meanwhile, to me at least, the run of the sentences suggests that the emphasis is laid on 'the 14th day of the moon' and 'Sunday', while on the rest there is no stress; so that to observe the 'feast of the Pascha' and to 'celebrate the mystery of the Resurrection' are only two ways of saying the same thing, and the variation is only rhetorical. And I do not know that any one has suggested that elsewhere Eusebius even hints that there was any distinction in point of observance or of meaning between the Sunday of the one usage and 'the 14th day' of the other.

(b) What is meant by 'the ending of the fasts' on a given day (*τὰς τῶν ἀσπιῶν ἐπιλύσεις ποιῆσθαι, τὰς νηστείας ἐπιλύεσθαι, τῶν νηστεῶν φυλάττεσθαι τὰς ἐπιλύσεις*)? Does it mean that the day was partially fasted and the fast was discontinued at some time in the course of the day? or that the day was not fasted at all? By most modern writers it appears to be interpreted, in so far as it refers to the Quartodeciman usage, in the first sense. I cannot supply any pertinent example in Greek¹: but in English at least if we say that we 'discontinue' or 'give

¹ The *Festal Epistles* of St Athanasius and St Cyril are useless for this purpose because they specify a point in the day at which the fast is to cease (*περιλύειν, καταπαύειν*), viz. late in the evening (*βαθεῖα ἑσπέρα*).

up' or 'drop' this or that on a certain day, unless some moment in the day is specified or obviously implied, we mean that we do not do the thing at all on that day, not that we do it for a part of the day and then stop. If I say I give up fires on May 15, I mean that I do not light them at all on that day and onwards, not that I light them on the morning of the 15th and let them go out in the course of the day. So in Latin, St Augustine's 'post quem diem [paschalem] per dies quinquaginta ieiunia relaxamus' (*Serm.* ccx 2) means that we do not fast for any part of any of the days; and still more unambiguously, the 27th canon of the first Council of Orleans, 'Rogationes, id est litanias, ante Ascensionem Domini ab omnibus ecclesiis placuit celebrari, ita ut praemissum triduanum ieiunium in dominicae Ascensionis festivitate solvatur' (*Bruns Canones* ii p. 165), means that we are to fast on the three Rogation Days and are not to fast on Ascension Day. But in fact there is surely no real ambiguity in Eusebius; for he says of the 14th day of the Quartodeciman usage precisely what he says of the Sunday of the general usage; and since in the latter case we know that his words mean that the day was a feast and not a fast, it is impossible to suppose that, in reference to the Quartodecimans, they mean that their day was even a half-fast.

(c) Eusebius says that the Church in general, apart from the Quartodecimans, thought it fitting 'to end the fasts' on no other day than 'that of the Resurrection of our Saviour' (τὴν τῆς Ἀναστάσεως τοῦ Σωτῆρος ἡμῶν ἡμέραν), and this phrase has by some writers been taken not to be merely a rhetorical periphrasis, natural in the context, for 'Sunday', but to mean 'Easter Sunday'. If this were so, it would obviously be implied that the Sunday as the celebration of the Resurrection was common to the two usages, and the difference between them was only that, whereas the Church at large fasted up to the Vigil and then observed the Sunday, the Quartodecimans discontinued their fast on the 14th of the moon, for whatever exact reason, and then, if the 14th did not fall on Saturday or Sunday, either resumed the fast on the 15th and continued it till Saturday,¹ or, without fasting, simply waited for Sunday, to celebrate the Resurrection. But if so, why should Eusebius represent the Councils as ruling that 'the mystery of the Lord's Resurrection should never be celebrated on any other day than Sunday'? If the Quartodecimans were not in fact celebrating the Resurrection on some other day than Sunday, this negatively expressed decision seems to be gratuitous and unintelligible.

I conclude, therefore, that according to the account of Eusebius—and Eusebius had before him at least the principal documents relating to the controversy, and, if he was wrong in his account, we know very

¹ So Mosheim *Commentaries* (Eng. tr. London 1813) ii p. 379.

little about the matter and it is of little use to discuss it—according to the account of Eusebius, as the churches in general first fasted for a day or more, and then observed the Paschal Vigil on the Saturday–Sunday night following the 14th day of the moon and so began the seven festal weeks of the Pentecoste; so the Asians and their neighbours kept their fast, of whatever length, and then observed the Vigil on the night of the 13th–14th of the moon and began their Pentecoste. In other words, the two usages differed in point of date, as between the 14th of the moon and the following Sunday, but were otherwise identical.

As for Hippolytus: his notice of the Quartodecimans in *Philosophumena* (viii 18), to the effect that they maintain that the Pascha ought to be observed ‘on the 14th day of the 1st month, according to the prescription of the Law, on whatever day of the week it falls’, is so general that at first sight it would appear to be consistent, not only with Eusebius’s account, but with any possible interpretation of the situation. But in the fragment of the *Syntagma* preserved in the *Paschal Chronicle*, Hippolytus cites an opponent, apparently a Quartodeciman who held that the Last Supper was a Passover, as saying, ‘At that time Christ kept the Passover on the day on which He suffered: therefore I also must do as the Lord did’: and this implies that the speaker reckoned the day as from sunset to sunset, and not as from midnight to midnight, since only so would the Last Supper and the Passion fall on the same day. Thus the 14th day includes the night of the 13th–14th of the moon: and if the ‘14th day’ is used in the same sense in the *Philosophumena*, the account there given agrees simply with that of Eusebius. The fragment of the *de Pascha* has nothing to the present purpose and refers only to Hippolytus’s rejection of the view that the Last Supper was the Passover.

But it has been already suggested that Epiphanius who follows Hippolytus, and Socrates who follows Eusebius, have both misunderstood their authorities.

In the 50th article of the *Panarium* ‘Against the Quartodecimans’ Epiphanius treats, not very lucidly, of two groups of people. The first are apparently the original Quartodecimans; and here he merely reproduces Hippolytus, only adding that the Quartodecimans ‘keep one day’. The other group (ἑτέροι δὲ ἐξ αἰρώων), apparently Epiphanius’s contemporaries, were not Quartodecimans of the original type at all, but kept a fixed Pascha on March 25, which according to the *Acts of Pilate* was the date of the Passion, and consequently the day of the solar year on which the 14th of the moon happened to fall in the year of the Passion. But Epiphanius’s argument, such as it is, is apparently directed against the two groups in common; and it is quite possible that he confuses them and attributes to the original Quartodecimans

what was only true, if so it was, of the later group. Consequently when he says of the original Quartodecimans that 'once a year they keep the Passover for one day', viz. the 14th of the moon, and later on in arguing against both groups implies that both of them fasted on the day observed, it is possible that he is attributing to the Quartodecimans of the 2nd cent. what was only true of his contemporary quasi-Quartodecimans. But however this may be, for Epiphanius the association of τὸ Πάσχα is with the Paschal *fast*, the Great Week (*Panar.* lxxv 6, lxx 12), and the argument of his article 'Against the Quartodecimans', so far as it affects the character of the Paschal observance, is wholly concerned with the fast.¹ When therefore he found Hippolytus saying that the Quartodecimans observed the Pascha on the 14th day of the moon it was quite natural that he should suppose that the 14th day was the Quartodeciman fast, and that the Asians 'kept the Pascha for one day' only, i. e. observed only one day of fasting, instead of the 6 days observed in Epiphanius's own time.

In the other group of authorities, led by Eusebius, Socrates (*H. E.* v 22) describes the Quartodecimans as 'observing the 14th and ignoring the *Saturday*', thus understanding Eusebius to mean that the Quartodeciman 14th of the moon corresponded, not to Easter Day, but to Easter Even, the Great Sabbath. That it is possible to understand, or to misunderstand, Eusebius in this sense, seems plain from the fact that most modern writers on the subject seem so to have understood, or misunderstood, him, in so far as they have placed the specific Paschal observance of the Quartodecimans on the night of the 14th-15th of the moon instead of on that of the 13th-14th. But Socrates's interpretation of Eusebius can be explained in the same way as Epiphanius's interpretation of Hippolytus: τὸ Πάσχα immediately suggested to him the Great Sabbath, on the evening of which the great Paschal observance began; and if he nowhere calls the Saturday simply τὸ Πάσχα, yet he says of those who ignored the Nicene synodical letter that 'they observed the Sabbath of the Feast, but differed as touching the month' (v 22), and in describing the practice of *Sabbatius* the Novatian he says that he 'fasted and then by keeping vigil (*νυκτερεύων*) celebrated the accustomed day of the Sabbath' (v 2).

But Theodoret, if he is following Eusebius, does not so understand him. He says of the Quartodecimans (*Haer. fab.* iii) that 'they say that the Evangelist John, preaching in Asia, taught them to celebrate the feast of the Pascha on the 14th of the moon; and wrongly understanding the apostolic tradition they do not wait for the day of the Lord's Resurrection, but celebrate the memorial of the Passion some-

¹ Dr Schmidt (p. 635) attributes this, not to a mistake on Epiphanius's part, but to an 'Advokatenkniff'! Surely not a very plausible 'trick'.

times on Tuesday, sometimes on Thursday, sometimes on Saturday, or 'however it may fall out'. On the language of this passage something will be said lower down; for the moment it is enough to note that, according to Theodoret, in observing the 14th of the moon the Quartodecimans fail to wait—not for the Saturday—but for the Sunday. The Quartodeciman 14th corresponds to the Catholic Easter Day.

I have not read more than a fraction of the modern discussions of the Paschal Question: but I gather that most writers have reached a conclusion very different from this. In particular, there seems to be a very general agreement that the Quartodecimans fasted on the 14th day of the moon and celebrated their specific Paschal observance, the Eucharist, on the evening of that day. These writers, that is, accept as true of the original Quartodecimans Epiphanius's statement about his second group, that 'they keep the same one day and fast the same one day and celebrate the Mysteries'. Dr Carl Schmidt, with the help of his new *datum*, the *Epistola Apostolorum*, has elaborated this representation in some respects, and has proposed a very clean-cut reconstruction of the Quartodeciman observance.

His reconstruction, as I understand it, is this. The Asian Quartodecimans began their 'day' abruptly on the 14th of the moon, reckoned apparently as from midnight to midnight. They fasted on the day till 3 o'clock in the afternoon, the time of our Lord's Death, or till 6 o'clock, the hour of His Burial. Then perhaps they broke their fast; and later on they assembled for a vigil which lasted till cockcrow the next morning, being concluded by the Eucharist and the Agape; and with this all was ended. There was no Easter.

This representation includes three main points: (1) The Quartodecimans observed only one day without preface or sequel, without, that is, either preliminary fast or subsequent festal season; (2) This day was mainly a fast; (3) It was followed by a Vigil.

1. (a) 'Only one day was observed.' In so far as this is concluded from Epiphanius's 'they keep the Pascha for one day', it is surely a mistake, since, as I have already pointed out, Epiphanius is speaking, not of the Quartodeciman observance as a whole, but only of the *fast* of one day as contrasted with the Catholic six days. But Dr Schmidt (p. 582), if I rightly understand him, finds the 'only one day' also in the words of the letter of Polycrates (Eus. *H. E.* v 24 § 2) ἡμεῖς οὐκ ἀραδιούργητον ἀγομεν τὴν ἡμέραν, μήτε προστιθέντες, μήτε ἀφαιρούμενοι, apparently understanding the last words to mean 'neither adding other days nor curtailing the observance of the day itself'. But may not the words equally well or better be regarded as a stereotyped conventional phrase meaning something like 'without making any change' and so merely explaining ἀραδιούργητον and anticipating μηδὲν

παρεκβαίνοντες below (§ 6): 'We keep the day untampered with, as we always have done, neither more nor less'? Dr Schmidt himself (p. 583) disallows an interpretation proposed by Drews on the ground that the words are 'nothing more than a literary phrase'—a ground which seems equally valid against his own interpretation. In the absence of other evidence for the single-day observance, the three words of Polycrates, of doubtful interpretation, are scarcely sufficient to outweigh what Eusebius implies to the contrary. For (*β*) that the Quartodecimans observed a preliminary fast, before the 14th, is, as we have seen, implied in Eusebius's statement that they 'brought their fasts to an end' on that day (pp. 260 sq. above). (*γ*) Those who hold that the Asian '14th day' corresponded to the Catholic Good Friday, assumed to be primitive, differ among themselves as to when the Quartodecimans kept their Easter, or else give it up as an insoluble question: e.g. Duchesne says 'Comment, après cela, les Asiates s'arrangeaient-ils pour fêter la Résurrection? Lui consacraient-ils le surlendemain du 14 ou le dimanche suivant? en faisaient-ils même une commémoration spéciale? Nous n'en savons rien' (*Hist. anc. de l'église* i p. 287). Dr Schmidt maintains boldly that they did not keep an Easter at all. But, as we have seen, according to Eusebius the Councils all alike decreed that 'the mystery of the Lord's Resurrection should never be kept on any day but the Sunday'. They countered the Quartodeciman practice, that is, by decreeing, not that Easter should be kept, but that it should not be kept otherwise than on Sunday. The celebration of the Resurrection is taken for granted; the only question is as to the date of it.

2. The view that the 14th day was fasted until the afternoon or the evening results from the combination of the *a priori* assumption that the day, being historically that of the Lord's Passion, could not be a feast (of which something will be said below) and of Epiphanius's assertion that it was a fast (which we have seen reason to believe to be a mistake) with Eusebius's assurance that the Quartodecimans 'brought their fast to an end' on the 14th, understood, mistakenly, to mean that they ended the fast late *in the course* of the 14th day.

3. 'The day was concluded by a vigil.' But this would mean a very curious day, and one quite unexampled, so far as I know. For the Vigil, as we know it, is always the beginning, not the end, of a day or a period; and it may be supposed that the vigil-system is founded on the conception of the day as beginning at sunset, and presupposes it. The ancient great Catholic Vigils, of Epiphany, Easter, Pentecost, however in current language they may be spoken of as occurring on the night of the previous day, belong to, and are the inauguration of, the feasts themselves. When Athanasius's church was attacked by Syrianus and his

Arians on the February night of 356, he was keeping vigil with his people because there was to be a synaxis on the morrow (*Hist. Ar.* 81; *Apol. ad Const.* 25; *de Fuga* 24). The Μεσονυκτικόν, *Vigiliae nocturnae*, of Divine Service represents the ascetic and monastic daily vigil, and is not the last, but the first of the Canonical Hours, or rather the third, since the day begins with Vespers followed by Compline. But it is unnecessary to labour this point.¹ It seems to me that the very existence of the Vigil shews that the Quartodeciman 'day' cannot have been such as Dr Schmidt describes it to have been.

III

What did the Quartodecimans mean by their observance? What did their 'day' commemorate?

For it is quite commonly contended or assumed by modern writers that the Quartodeciman Pascha meant something different from the Catholic Pascha. It was a mere heritage from Judaism, a continuation of the Passover, without any definite Christian meaning; or it was a commemoration of the Last Supper and the Institution of the Eucharist; and so on²: but most generally it is represented, as Mgr Batiffol, e. g., conceives it: 'Pour les Asiates, la fête de Pâques était l'anniversaire de la mort du Christ; pour les autres, l'anniversaire de sa résurrection' (*L'Église naissante* p. 267). Dr Schmidt accepts this view in its most definite and exclusive shape. For him the Quartodeciman 14th day was the commemoration of the Death of the Lord and of Redemption therein completed (described as the Pauline and Johannine doctrine), without regard to the Resurrection.³

Apart from any *a priori* assumption which may influence his view, Dr Schmidt rests his conclusion chiefly on two passages from ancient authors, by which he illustrates the language of the *Epistola Apostolorum* in order to shew that it implies the Quartodeciman usage.

The passages in question are these.

1. In a fragment of his *de Pascha* preserved in the preface to the *Paschal Chronicle*, St Peter I of Alexandria reports one Tricentius (who appears to be identical with the Crescentius of Epiph. lxx 9) as saying: 'Whether the Jews, mistaken as they are as to the course of the moon, keep their Passover' in one month or another 'is a matter of indifference to us. For what we are concerned with is nothing else, than to keep the commemoration of His Passion, and at this time, *as they delivered it to us who from the beginning were eyewitnesses*, before ever Egyptians

¹ Cp. St Augustine's remarks in one of his Paschal Vigil sermons (*Serm.* ccxxi), which by their very fancifulness shew how clear and fixed was the conception of a vigil as a beginning, not an end.

² See Dr Schmidt's summary of various views, pp. 597 sqq.

³ *Ibid.* p. 74.

became Christians.' For the Jewish error of calculation is no new thing: 'for it is clear that from the first and before the Coming of Christ, they have always done as they do now. And hence it is that God said, charging them by the Prophet, *And I said, They do alway err in their hearts.*' In other words the contention of Tricentius is: 'It does not matter to me and my fellows whether the Jews are right or wrong in their calculation as to which is the true Paschal moon in any year. They are, in fact and of course, wrong: but then, they always were wrong—before the Advent and long before there were any Alexandrine Christians to put them right in their astronomy. But it remains that our Lord suffered at the *Jewish* Passover, at the time at which it *was* kept, not at that at which it *ought to have been* kept. We keep it in relation to its actual historical circumstances, not to its ideal circumstances.' Now Dr Schmidt argues that his allusion to 'Egyptians' shews that Tricentius was not himself an Egyptian, and concludes, not very convincingly, that he was an Asian Quartodeciman. What is plain is that, whether an Egyptian or not, he was one of those who followed the Jewish and Antiochene computation of the date of the Paschal moon, and rejected the Alexandrine. But in the Quartodeciman dispute there was no question of astronomical computations: the question was only between the 14th of the moon, however computed, and the following Sunday. There is therefore no reason whatsoever to suppose that Tricentius was a Quartodeciman: he merely represents the difficulty which was discussed by the Nicene Council. Consequently his words are irrelevant to Dr Schmidt's purpose.

2. The second of the passages on which Dr Schmidt chiefly relies is that already quoted from Theodoret: *Φασὶ τὸν εὐαγγελιστὴν Ἰωάννην ἐν τῇ Ἀσίᾳ κηρύξαντα διδάξαι αὐτοὺς ἐν τῇ ἰδ' τῆς σελήνης ἐπιτελεῖσαι τοῦ Πάσχα τὴν ἑορτὴν· κακῶς δὲ τὴν ἀποστολικὴν νενοηκότες παράδοσιν τὴν τῆς Κυριακῆς Ἀναστάσεως οὐκ ἀναμένουσιν ἡμέραν ἀλλὰ ποτὲ μὲν τρίτῃ, ποτὲ δὲ πέμπτῃ, ποτὲ δὲ σαββάτῳ ἢ ὅπως ἂν τύχη πανηγυρίζουσι τοῦ Πάθους τὴν μνήμην*: where Dr Schmidt understands that the last words indicate that the Quartodeciman Pascha commemorated the Passion as contrasted with the commemoration of the Resurrection in the Catholic observance. But it seems to me that these last words merely repeat in different language the *ἐπιτελεῖσαι τοῦ Πάσχα τὴν ἑορτὴν* a few lines above; and that the rhythm of the concluding sentence does not for a moment suggest that Theodoret is laying any stress on *πανηγυρίζουσι τοῦ Πάθους τὴν μνήμην*, as he would do if he were contrasting the significance of the Quartodeciman celebration with another and a different one.

But that neither the expression of Tricentius (*τὴν ἀνάμνησιν τοῦ Πάθους αὐτοῦ ποιῆσθαι*) nor that of Theodoret (*πανηγυρίζουσι τοῦ Πάθους τὴν μνήμην*) has any peculiar appropriateness as applied to the Quarto-

decimans is evident from the fact that it is the customary language of the Church at large; and in fact for the ante-Nicene period I do not recall any instance of any other way of defining the Paschal commemoration.¹ Tertullian *de Baptismo* 19 'diem baptismo sollempniorem Pascha praestat, cum et Passio Domini, in quam tinguimur, adimpleta est': ps.-Cyprian *de Paschae computo* 2 'in commemorationem Passionis Filii Dei Pascha celebramus: Eusebius *H. E.* ii 17, describing the Paschal Vigil, ἄς [ἀσκήσεις] διαφερόντως κατὰ τὴν τοῦ σωτηρίου Πάθους ἑορτὴν ἐν ἀσιταίαις καὶ διανυκτερεύσεσιν προσοχαῖς τε τῶν θείων λόγων ἐκτελεῖν εἰώθαμεν: *Vita Constantini* iii 18 (ep. Constantini) μίαν γὰρ ἑορτὴν τὴν τῆς ἡμετέρας ἐλευθερίας ἡμέραν, τουτέστι τὴν τοῦ ἀγνωτάτου Πάθους, ὃ ἡμέτερος παρέδωκε Σωτήρ: S. Chrysostom *de s. Pentecoste* i 1 τοῦ Πάσχα ἡ ἑορτὴ τί βούλεται; τίς ἡ ὑπόθεσις αὐτῆς; τὸν Θάνατον τοῦ Κυρίου καταγγέλλομεν τότε καὶ τοῦτό ἐστι τὸ Πάσχα: *de B. Philogonio* 3. εἰ γὰρ μὴ ἐτέχθη κατὰ σάρκα ὁ Χριστὸς οὐκ ἂν ἐβαπτίσθη, ὅπερ ἐστὶ τὰ Θεοφάνια: οὐκ ἂν ἐσταυρώθη, ὅπερ ἐστὶ τὸ Πάσχα: οὐκ ἂν τὸ Πνεῦμα κατέπεμψεν, ὅπερ ἐστὶν ἡ Πεντηκοστή: S. Augustine *Ep.* lv *ad Ianuariam* 1 'quaeris quae causa sit cur anniversarius dies celebrandae Dominicae Passionis non ad eandem redeat anni diem sicut dies qua traditur natus'; and Augustine answers by expounding the significance of the Pascha: Socrates *H. E.* v 22, speculating on the origin of festivals in general and of the Pascha in particular, ὅθεν ἐπειδὴ φιλοῦσι τὰς ἑορτὰς οἱ ἄνθρωποι διὰ τὸ ἀνίστασθαι τῶν πόνων ἐν αὐταῖς, ἕκαστοι κατὰ χώρας ὡς ἐβουλήθησαν τὴν μνήμην τοῦ σωτηριώδους Πάθους ἐξ ἔθους τινὸς ἐπετέλεσαν: and the Preface of the Roman Paschal Vigil mass (*Sacr. Gelas.* I xlv) 'Vere dignum nocte iustius praedicare quum Pascha nostrum immolatus est Christus'.

The Catholic Pascha then is the commemoration of the Passion. But not only that; it includes also that of the Resurrection; the one commemoration passes over into the other. It is the commemoration neither of the Passion nor of the Resurrection, but of both: of 'Christ Who died, yea rather is risen again', Who 'laid down His life in order that He might take it again', Who 'died for our sins, and was raised for our justification'. In short, it is the commemoration of the Redemption. Consequently it can be spoken of in three several ways. (a) As the celebration of the Passion, as we have just seen: and at Antioch in the 4th cent., 'in the public festival when men and women, and just everybody, are present in all their multitude at the Great Evening of the Pascha', the Passion according to St Matthew xxvii 'is read' (S. Chrys. *Hom.* lxxxvii [lxxxviii] *in Matt.* 1). Or (b) as the celebration of the Resurrection, 'the Sacred Night in which the yearly festival in commemoration of the Resurrection of Christ is celebrated' (Sozomen

¹ Except in what is implied in 'the celebration of the mystery of the Lord's Resurrection', p. 260 above.

H. E. viii 21); and in Egypt in the 4th cent. the Gospel of the Resurrection was read; 'for on the evening of that Saturday we hear the angel's message *Why seek ye the Living among the dead? He is risen*' (S. Ath. *Festal Ep.* iii 6). Or again (*c*) as the commemoration of both the Passion and the Resurrection. In the West St Leo begins one of his Vigil sermons: 'The lesson from the Gospel, dearly beloved, has set before us the whole Paschal Mystery . . . since the text of the divinely inspired history has shewn us with what impiety the Lord Jesus Christ was betrayed, with what judgement He was doomed, with what savagery He was crucified, and with what glory He was raised'; and he proceeds to preach on the Passion and the Resurrection (*Serm.* lxx 1). In the East, Theodore of Petra in his *Life of St Theodosius*, in describing a certain incident which happened on Holy Saturday, says: 'it was a feast, and a feast which is the acropolis of all feasts, I mean the Pascha, in which the whole Christian world is used to celebrate the Death by the Cross and the Burial and also the saving Resurrection of the true Resurrection: so, when the Sacred Night was now at the doors, I mean, to use the words of the Gospel, *late on the sabbath as it began to dawn toward the first day of the week*' and so on (*Vita S. Theodosii*, ed. Usener, p. 24). And between East and West, Maximinus the Goth in his sermon *In Pentecoste* (*J. T. S.* xvi p. 174) has 'tertiaque [sc. after Christmas and Pentecost] et magna celebratur solemnitas Passionis et Resurrectionis eiusdem Domini Salvatoris: hoc sanctum Pascha nominatur'. See also St Augustine's exposition alluded to above (*Ep.* lv *ad Ianuar.* 1).

All this of course is of later date than the Quartodeciman controversy. But it is all we have to go upon. Nor is there any reason to suppose that any change had come about in the conception of the Paschal celebration; or rather, in so far as any change had happened, it was in a direction away from what is implied in these passages. The growth of realism represented by the development of Good Friday and Maundy Thursday tended to eliminate the Passion from the commemorations of the Paschal Vigil, so that already in the earliest extant Latin ritual books it has but little place, if any at all; and it is the same with the printed Greek books.

And it is the same growth of realism, I suppose, which makes it difficult for the modern to adjust his mind to the thought of the historical day of the Passion being kept as a festival, as I conceive it was by the Asian Quartodecimans. But—'Christ our Passover was sacrificed for us: therefore let us keep festival.' And this was the ancient feeling about the celebration of the Passion, even during the fast. 'Let us therefore keep festival, my brethren, keeping it not at all as an occasion of distress and mourning . . . For we do not

bring in days of mourning and sorrow, as some consider these of the Pascha to be, but we keep festival, being filled with joy and gladness' (S. Ath. *Festal Ep.* xi 13: cp. xiii 7, xx 1, S. Chrys. *adv. Jud.* iii 4, *de Cruce et Latrone* i 1, ii 1). For St Leo the Holy Week is the *festivitas dominicae passionis* (*Serm.* lx 1); and he says 'But now that by the acceptance of weakness His power has been glorified, the Paschal solemnity must not be darkened by any grief on the part of the faithful, nor must the order of events be recalled with sorrow, since the Lord has so used the malice of the Jews that by their criminal purpose has been fulfilled the will of the Pitier. And if, *when Israel came out of Egypt*, the blood of the lamb was the restoration of liberty, and a most sacred festivity was held, which by the offering of a beast turned away the wrath of the destroyer: how great joys ought to be felt by the Christian peoples for whom the Father Almighty *spared not His only-begotten Son*' (*Serm.* lviii 2).

I have tried, however lamely, to put the case for the older interpretation—at any rate Tillemont's—of the Quartodeciman position. The three points in which Dr Schmidt regards the *Epistola Apostolorum* as supporting his thesis are, I suppose, (1) that the Vigil is on the night of the Jewish Passover (14th–15th of the moon): (2) that it is described as a commemoration of the Lord's Death: (3) that the Apostle's return to prison after the Vigil suggests that all was over. The second point has been, I think, sufficiently disposed of above; the third is scarcely serious. The question that remains, therefore, is whether the apparent dating of the Vigil on the night of the 14th–15th in such a document as the *Epistola*—even if we assume that the writer had any polemical purpose, and was thinking of the Jewish Passover and not really all the while of the Christian Pascha—is sufficient to outweigh all that can be said for the night of the 13th–14th as that of the Quartodeciman Vigil.

F. E. BRIGHTMAN.

THE CODEx BEZAE AND LYONS.

THE origin of the Codex Bezae remains one of the outstanding problems of biblical criticism. We are little nearer a definite solution to-day than we were ten years ago, when the present writer ventured—perhaps a little more boldly than he would to-day—the theory 'that the Codex Bezae was a provincial product, that it originated in a non-Italian centre, that Greek tradition prevailed in that centre, that from the time of its execution to about A. D. 800 the Codex was preserved in a centre (or centres) where Greek was the literary and ecclesiastical language; and that from about 800 onwards it existed in some western