

העמוד הזה הוא אמת וחסד. זהו המהמור
אמת, המהמור.

කුමාරයාට ඔහුගේ පියාගේ නම ලබා දීමට අවස්ථාවක් ඇත. ඔහුගේ පියාගේ නම කුමක්ද?

המלצה:  אטום, $A \subseteq B$

קלוגמג	A CLEMENTINE NARRATIVE	המלך. חמא ה
--------	------------------------	-------------

OF THE MARTYRDOM OF

James the Brother of Jesus

١٠٠
 ١٠٠
 ١٠٠

<p>  </p>	<p>VIA SYRIAC EUSEBIUS</p>	<p>  </p>
---	----------------------------	--

היום חזרתי ללמוד בחדר הלימודים שלי

[illegible][illegible][illegible]

כאשר נכנסו, נאמר להם: "הנה אנחנו נכנסים אל ארץ זבת חלב וסוכה."

מאז למד מברכה. מלך דבא וכל מנה מאז למ

ಶಾಂತ ಮಹಿಳೆ ಕುಟುಂಬಕ್ಕೆ ಇವಳು ಕೊಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದಳು.

מחשבותי הן חסד. מחשבותי הן חסד. מחשבותי הן חסד. מחשבותי הן חסד. מחשבותי הן חסד.

מצא פנים אחדות מן התורה, וקראוהו: המלצר.

בואו המילה צימוד, וכנסו כל אחד אחד. שששש

הַיְּמֵי אֲנִי בָלֵמָה, כִּלְעֵלְעֵלָה הַשֶּׁמֶץ. הָיִיתִי לֶךְ סוֹל בְּמִכְרָה

مع قلوس. امجدك انا، امجدك.

A Clementine Narrative of the Martyrdom of James the Brother of
Jesus via Syriac Eusebius

Dedicated to Robert Eisenman

Translated by Joseph Gebhardt-Klein
2020/Revised 2021

Based on:

McLean, Norman, and William Wright, eds. *The Ecclesiastical History of Eusebius in Syriac*.
Cambridge: University Press, 1898.

Preface

This is a translation of an anecdote from early church history with a few notes about unique textual features that provide strong evidence for originality. It comes from a Syriac translation of Eusebius' *History of the Church* and recounts the life and martyrdom of James the Just, the brother of Jesus, including his vegetarianism, daily-bathing (hemerobaptism), Temple-frequenting, democratic piety, and murder at the hands of the mob. The Syriac translation of Eusebius is neglected due to obscurity, but nonetheless valuable because it was undoubtedly made in the fourth century during the lifetime of Eusebius himself, likely coming from the very locale of his native Caesarea Maritima on the Palestinian coast.¹ Although at first glance one might be tempted to discount the Syriac text due to its divergence from the standard Greek, there are reasons to think it preserves details that have escaped redaction and conformity to the official version. A few notes should suffice to make the case:

1. The main account of James' martyrdom is here not attributed to Hegesippus (the long-lost second-century Syrian author of a church history of his own), but rather twice (before and after) to "Clement" (undoubtedly the Roman Clement due to its tying his name to "Narratives," ܟܠܡܬܐ,² which is the ordinary Syriac designation for the allegedly pseudepigraphic cycle of

¹ The two manuscripts (A and B) used in McLean and Wright's edition, the St Petersburg copy and BL Add. 14639, are dated to 462 CE and the 6th century respectively. Due to their being corrupted copies, a 5th-century Armenian translation from Syriac, and the manuscripts' use of ancient grammatical forms, there is little doubt about the provenance of the original.

² ܟܠܡܬܐ is ordinarily used for the titles of historical and pseudepigraphical works, often translated as "history, narrative, account, tale," and typically followed by the author's name or serial number.

Clementine literature).³ If these attributions are more authentic readings—and there's no good reason to doubt it or to suspect its tampering—then the details in this martyrdom of James can be more securely attributed by Eusebius to a lost first-century Clementine source, rather than the second-century Hegesippus. In support of this claim is the unique way that the Syriac text then goes on to cite Hegesippus not as the originator for this previously quoted “Clementine” material, but only as corroborating evidence for its veracity. There is no otherwise feasible explanation for such a blatant anomaly. In the fourth century the *Clementine* literature was increasingly viewed as spurious (due to its heterodoxy, and not on any appreciable historical-critical grounds), and thus changing the attribution from Hegesippus to Clement would not have bolstered the narrative's credibility before the newly established Nicene Orthodoxy. There is otherwise no discernable motive for posthumous tampering, yet every reason to doubt it, and the converse is actually more plausible—that the *Clementine* attribution was altered to the less ‘suspect’ source of Hegesippus.

2. Hegesippus is afterward given only a supportive role to Clement's narrative, testifying that James was indeed called “the Just,” or “Righteous,” as a popular name. The proximity of James' murder to the Roman capture of Jerusalem is then only reinforced by Hegesippus' report that even many Jews outside of the Nazarene movement believed that James' murder was the precipitating cause for the capture of Jerusalem. However, much of this would be redundant if the previously quoted material were also from Hegesippus instead of Clement—and surprisingly this redundancy has gone

³ The first page of the second famous manuscript of the Syriac *Clementine Recognitions* (containing only the letter of Rec. 1–3) bears the name ܡܬܠܡܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ, or “The Narrative of Clement,” in its title: British Library Add. MS 14609, fol. 123r (6th century CE).

seemingly unnoticed in the standard Greek text of Eusebius' history: how many times must he say that James was righteous and tied to the destruction of Jerusalem? How many times are we to be told that the same material comes from Hegesippus?! The repetitious material and redundant attribution to Hegesippus does not stand to reason, not from commonsense, nor from the standpoint of historiography. The Syriac, however, furnishes a more fitting role for Hegesippus, not as the originator for the narrative of James, but as a confirmer and expander of certain details originally related by Clement, which is notably parallel to Eusebius' subsequent usage of Josephus. So, not only is the redundancy of these details eliminated in the Syriac, but the Syriac is more consistent with Eusebius' historical use of different source materials.

3. Lastly, our Syriac source cites Josephus for the life of James, and his account too is presented as corroborating evidence for the truth of the original narrative. However, despite the fact that this passage appears to be a faithful Syriac translation of the common Greek, it also bears a hallmark of originality independent of the later received texts of Eusebius and even Josephus himself. This can be seen in its realistic direct quotation of the people's plea to Albinus, and not just a paraphrase like the standard Greek text of Josephus contains: the people themselves refer to Albinus in the second person and not the third, a phenomenon which would be awkward unless the Syriac translator was aiming for a literal rendering and had a more primitive text before him in his version of Eusebius' *History of the Church* than later editions—including later surviving editions of Josephus' *Antiquities*—one which quoted the actual voice of the people. This is a most fitting use of direct quotation in context for James, whose humble democratic piety is earlier stated to have publicly earned him the cognomen

“the Fortification of the People.” Without doubt, this is the more natural reading, and more likely original, versus an inexplicable hypothesis of unfaithful and inventive translation.

In summary, these remarkable differences in the Syriac reveal a more primitive text of Eusebius. The sheer number of Greek copies of Eusebius and their uniformity is no argument against these readings; in fact, it is just the opposite because we would not expect such variants if the Syriac were merely a translation from the received text. Due to (1) the improbable motive and means for tampering in the Syriac version, (2) its greater consistency with Eusebius’ usage of different source material, (3) its elimination of awkward redundancies, and (4) its greater realism, it is more likely that there were differing texts of Eusebius’ *History of the Church* circulating in his native Palestine, one original and one expunged of heterodox references, and that the Syriac translation owes itself to an original text that cited the *Clementines* as authoritative prior to Eusebius’ well-known ingratiation with Nicene Christology. Then, as the *Clementine* cycle of writings came under greater suspicion in the fourth century due to prevalence of *homousian* theology, these references to Clement were expunged and replaced with the less suspect authorship of Hegesippus (whose writings also revealingly suffered a like fate centuries later—in other words, the trajectory is manifestly on the side of orthodox tampering).

Joseph Gebhardt-Klein, M.A.

8/16/2020

History of the Church, Book 2, Chapter 23

הַכְּסִיף הַלְּלִיף. הַאֲבִיב אַשְׁמִיָּה The Twenty-Third: How Yaaqub (James),
 חֲסִיד. מִן הַחֲלִידִים אַשְׁמִיָּה, who was called the brother of our Lord,
 הָיָה. was martyred.

מִתְּהִיב הָיָה בִּי יוֹם אֶלֶם The Yehudites then—when Paulus called for
 חֲלִידִים, הַכְּסִיף אַשְׁמִיָּה the appeal of Caesar and was sent to Rome
 לְתִימְכָא מִן אֶשְׁמִיָּה בִּי יוֹם by Festus after having fallen from the
 מִן, מַשְׁכִּיחַ הַכֵּל device of trickery that they were devising
 הַחֲלִידִים מִן אֶשְׁמִיָּה חֲלִידִים against him—turned themselves against
 לְמִי חֵל חֲסִיד אַשְׁמִיָּה, הָיָה. Yaaqub the brother of our Lord, who had
 מִן הַכֵּל מִן מִן הָיָה received from the Apostles the Throne of
 הַכְּסִיף אַשְׁמִיָּה the Episcopate in Urishlem (Jerusalem).
 הַכְּסִיף. מִתְּהִיב הָיָה Their effrontery against him was thus: they
 הַכֵּל, מִן מִן אַשְׁמִיָּה, brought him into their midst and were
 לְחִידִים. אֶשְׁמִיָּה מִן הַכֵּל wanting him to deny the faith of the
 מַשְׁכִּיחַ הַכֵּל לְחִידִים Mashiah before the sight of all the people.
 חֵל. מִן הָיָה לְחִידִים But he, apart from the desire and
 אַשְׁמִיָּה הַכֵּל. חֵל expectation of them all, in a loud voice in
 חֲלִידִים לְחִידִים חֵל boldness before the sight of all the people
 הָיָה מִן הַכֵּל אֶשְׁמִיָּה professed that the Son of God is our
 חֵל חֲסִיד. אֶשְׁמִיָּה Savior, the Lord Yeshua the Mashiah. And
 הַכְּסִיף אַשְׁמִיָּה when they were unable to bear his
 הַכֵּל חֲסִיד מִן הַכֵּל testimony—because everyone believed he
 חֲסִיד אַשְׁמִיָּה was righteous because of the perfection

הסבחוהו והגלוהו אלמא מן הכח
 אנטומה, מאן. אצטא ממה למא
 חזי וכו' לעלמא דלמא מא
 למא מהכח. מלא הכח וכו'
 מלא מא למא צמחא כמא.
 מהל דא אמהכח אנטומה
 מאח מצינא אהא דהא.
 אצטא דא העלמא העכח.
 א צה מא פהא אמהכח
 אצטא העלמא, העכח. דא
 חא העכח אמהכח, אכמא
 חא לעלמא. אהא דא
 אצח אמהכח, אצטא העכח.
 דא למא חא פהא חא
 אצטא. אמהכח אמהכח.

of wise customs and the fear of God that
 was in him—they found themselves indeed a
 time for authority that was unaccustomed
 for themselves, because at that time
 Festus died in Yehud, and the government
 there was without chiefs and rulers. But
 the example of the end of Yaaqub, even up
 to now we have formerly made known from
 the narratives of the words of Qlimis
 (Clement), that they threw him from the
 wing of the Temple and with a stick beat
 him to death. But he accurately spoke
 about him in the fifth narrative, which he
 clearly received early from the Apostles,
 and it is narrated about him accordingly:

החל למא חא אצטא
 אמהכח, העכח. מא הוהכח
 אמהכח מא חא חא.
 אמהכח, העכח אמהכח לחא.
 חא העכח אמהכח מא
 אמהכח. מא דא חא חא
 דא חא חא מא. אמהכח
 אמהכח לחא אמהכח, אמהכח
 חא חא לחא חא. אמהכח חא
 חא לחא חא. אמהכח לחא חא.
 אמהכח לחא חא. אמהכח לחא חא.

“For clearly Yaaqub the brother of our
 Lord received the assembly from the
 Apostles. He was surnamed ‘the Righteous’
 (Zaddiqa) by everyone, from the days of
 our Lord and until us, because many were
 called Yaaqub. But this one was holy from
 the womb of his mother, and he drank
 neither wine nor liquor, and did not eat
 anything that had a spirit in it (i.e. animals).
 And he did not lift a razor over his head,
 and did not anoint with oil, and did not need

[illegible]

a bath. To him alone it was permitted to enter into the Holy of Holies, for he did not even wear wool, but linen. And he alone entered into the Temple, and they found him sitting on his knees and asking for forgiveness on behalf of the people, until his knees were hardened like a camel because he was continually kneeling and worshiping God. And because of the virtue of his righteousness, he was called 'the Righteous,' and 'the Fortification of the People,' and 'their Righteousness,' as the prophets say about him. Therefore, some people—from those seven heresies who were with the people that I formerly spoke about in those narratives—were asking him, 'What is the door of Yeshua?' He then said to them, 'That one is the Savior.' And some of them believed that Yeshua was the Mashiah, but those aforesaid heresies did not believe, neither that he arose from the among the dead, nor that he comes to recompense everyone according to their works. And those who believed had believed because of Yaaqub. But when even many of the chiefs of the people started believing, there was a tumult of the Yehudites, and

[illegible]

of the Scribes and Pharisees, who were saying, 'It is incumbent for all of the people to expect Yeshua the Mashiah.' They then assembled, even saying to Yaaqub, 'We request of you: restrain the people because they go astray with Yeshua as if being the Mashiah. We request of you: persuade all of those who have come on the day of Passover concerning Yeshua, for all of us are persuaded by you. For we and all the people testify that you are the righteous one and do not respect the person of anyone. You, therefore, persuade this crowd not to go astray because of Yeshua, for even all the people and all of us are persuaded by you. Stand yourself up, therefore, on the wing of the Temple to be seen up above, and your words will be heard by all the people, for all of the tribes among the people have come because of Passover.' They stood him up, therefore—those who we formerly said were Scribes and Pharisees—on the wing of the Temple, and cried out and said to him, 'Righteous one, by whom it is fitting for us all to be persuaded, because the people go astray after Yeshua who was crucified, tell

[illegible]

us what is the door of Yeshua.' And he answered in a loud voice and said, 'Why do you ask me about the Son of man? Even he sits in heaven at the righthand of the Great Power, and he is about to come on the clouds of heaven.' And when many were confirmed and were praising the testimony of Yaaqub and saying, 'Oshana, to the Son of David!' Then furthermore, the Scribes and Pharisees were saying to one another, 'We have done badly, for we have accordingly given him this testimony to Yeshua. But let us go up and cast him down, and they will be afraid and not believe in him.' And they cried out, saying, 'Oh, oh, the righteous one has gone astray after him,' and they fulfilled what is written by Eshaya: 'We will throw away the righteous one because he is not useful to us; wherefore they will eat the work of their hands.' (Isa. 3:10) And they were saying to one another, 'Let us stone Yaaqub the righteous.' And they began stoning him, because after he fell down he was not dead, but turned and set down a knee and said, 'I request of you, LORD God, Father of All, forgive them, for they know not what they do.' (Cf. Luke

[illegible]

23:34) And while they were accordingly stoning him, one of the priests of the sons of Rekhav, a son of the Rekhavites—of those about whom Eramya the prophet testified—cried out and was saying, ‘Cease! What are you doing? The righteous one inclines to prayer for your sake!’ And one of them who was a fuller took the stick with which he was beating out clothes and struck it on the head of the righteous one, and he was accordingly martyred. And they buried him at his place beside the Temple. Therefore, this one was a true witness to the Yehudites and the pagans that Yeshua is the Mashiah. And immediately Vespasian captured them.” Qlimis (Clement) spoke these things widely.

הַעֲלֵךְ הָיָה לְשֵׁלֵךְ בְּחֵי אֶפְרַיִם
מִלְּפָנֶיךָ יְיָ. הַמִּלֵּךְ לֹד אֶתְּכֵם
מִמֶּנּוּ אֶפְרַיִם לֹד אֶתְּכֵם מִמֶּנּוּ
מִמֶּנּוּ כֹהֵנֵיכֶם בְּעֵינֵיכֶם. אֲנִי
הָאֵף מִן מִלְּפָנֶיךָ אֲנִי הָאֵף
מִמֶּנּוּ כֹהֵנֵיכֶם מִמֶּנּוּ אֲנִי
מִמֶּנּוּ. הַמִּלֵּךְ מִלְּפָנֶיךָ הַמִּלֵּךְ
מִן מִלְּפָנֶיךָ מִלְּפָנֶיךָ מִלְּפָנֶיךָ
מִלְּפָנֶיךָ. אֲנִי מִלְּפָנֶיךָ אֲנִי

However, completing these things even Hegesippus said, "For thus clearly it was astonishing even to everyone, as he was denominating Yaaqub with righteousness. Accordingly, even some of those Yehudites who had knowledge were likewise holding that this was the cause that immediately after his testimony Urishlem was to be captured. And it did not happen to them

[illegible]

because of anything else, but because they were insolent against him.” But then even Josephus did not neglect to testify even this with writings by these words: “These things clearly happened to the Yehudites as on account of vengeance for Yaaqub the righteous who was the brother of Yeshua, who was called the Mashiah, on account that he was righteous and the Yehudites killed him.” (Cf. Jos. Wars 4.5.2) And he again, while also on account of his death, demonstrated it by these words, “When clearly Caesar heard about the death of Festus, he sent Albinus as prefect over Yehud. But Ananus, the youth about whom we said that he received the chief priesthood, was harsh and exceedingly daring. And he was from the heresies of the Zadduqites (Sadducees)—those who were harsh in judgment more than all of the Yehudites—as we formerly said. And because Ananus was accordingly such, he thought that he found himself an occasion which was suitable, because Festus was dead, and Albinus was still on the road. And he made the assembly of judges sit down and brought up there the brother of

Yeshua who was called the Mashiah, whose name was Yaaqub, and certain other people. And he produced against them an accusation, as if they had done wrong to the people, and delivered them over to be executed. But to all of the lowly who were in the city who were holding themselves to the Law accurately, this deed was offensive to their intimations. And they sent to the king in secret and were requesting of him to send to Ananus that he should not henceforth accordingly do such things, for he was not even since before this acting rightly. But some people of them, when Albinus came from Alexandria, met him and taught him about Ananus, that ‘it was not permitted for him to make the assembly of judges sit down without your commandment.’ He, even being persuaded by them, also wrote to Ananus in anger and threatened him that he would take vengeance of him. And wherefore even the king Agrippa took away from him the chief priesthood, after his being established in it for three months, and he established in place of him Yeshua the son of Demi.” (Jos. Antiq. 20.9.1) These things

המחלסות. ואלה הם ההגות
האבות. לה חזקת
אבות. מהם. אלה
המחלסות. האבות. חזקת
אבות. מהם. אלה
המחלסות. חזקת
אבות. מהם. אלה
המחלסות. חזקת
אבות. מהם. אלה

were said about Yaaqub, whose is said to be
that first Catholic epistle. But it is not for
us then to know whether it is not to be
received, for not many of the ancients
mention it, nor even that called Yehuda, for
even it is one of those Catholic seven. But
nevertheless, we know that even these with
those others are read in many assemblies.

Bibliography

McLean, Norman, and William Wright, eds. *The Ecclesiastical History of Eusebius in Syriac*. Cambridge: University Press, 1898.