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TITLE: “CAN WE TRUST THE EARLY CHURCH FATHERS? CLEMENT OF ALEXANDRIA: A TEST CASE.”

CLEMENT OF ALEXANDRIA (c. 150 – c. 215)

The purpose of this appendix is to show that translations of the works of the early Church Fathers were made from very late copies of the original works, and in the case of Clement’s works, the translations were made from just one surviving Greek manuscript which is dated no earlier than the 11th century. If this situation obtains for most of the other Church Fathers, then this severely undermines using them as reliable witnesses and reliable translations.

Titus Flavius Clemens, better known as Clement of Alexandria is the earliest, extant Greek Church Father to refer to Jesus’ teaching in Matthew 5:32 and 19:9 on divorce and remarriage, which he does in his work Stromata (meaning Miscellanies or Patchwork matters). The following is an extract from the introduction to Clement’s work by Rev. B. J. Pratten, on the little that we know of this man.1

Titus Flavius Clemens, the illustrious head of the Catechetical School at Alexandria at the close of the second century, was originally a pagan philosopher. The date of his birth is unknown. It is also uncertain whether Alexandria or Athens was his birthplace.2

On embracing Christianity, he eagerly sought the instructions of its most eminent teachers; for this purpose travelling extensively over Greece, Italy, Egypt, Palestine, and other regions of the East.

Only one of these teachers (who, from a reference in the Stromata, all appear to have been alive when he wrote3) can be with certainty identified, viz., Pantaenus, of whom he speaks in terms of profound reverence, and whom he describes as the greatest of them all. Returning to Alexandria, he succeeded his master Pantaenus in the catechetical school, probably on the latter departing on his missionary tour to the East, somewhere about a.d. 189.4 He was also made a presbyter of the Church, either then or somewhat later.5 He continued to teach with great distinction till a.d. 202, when the persecution under Severus compelled him to retire from Alexandria. In the beginning of the reign of Caracalla we find him at Jerusalem, even then a great resort of Christian, and especially clerical, pilgrims. We

1 Taken from: http://www.ccel.org/ccel/schaff/anf02.txt. I have retained the footnotes given with this ET. The original ET was by Rev. Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson (series by Philip Schaff [1819–1893]).
2 Epiph., Haer., xxxii. 6.
3 Strom., lib. i. c. v.
5 Hieron., Lib. de Viris Illustribus, c. 38; Ph., Bibl., 111.
also hear of him travelling to Antioch, furnished with a letter of recommendation by Alexander, bishop of Jerusalem. The close of his career is covered with obscurity. He is supposed to have died about a.d. 220.

Among his pupils were his distinguished successor in the Alexandrian school, Origen, Alexander bishop of Jerusalem, and, according to Baronius, Combefisius, and Bull, also Hippolytus.

The above is positively the sum of what we know of Clement's history.

Three great works, The Exhortation to the Heathen (logos ho protreptikos pros Hellenas), The Instructor, or Paedagogus (paidagogos), The Miscellanies, or Stromata (Stromateis), are among the most valuable remains of Christian antiquity, and the largest that belong to that early period.

Unfortunately, only one 11th century manuscript (MS L) has survived of his Stromata. The 11th century Florence MS, which goes under the library designation Medic. Laur. Pl. v c. 3 [Laurentianae plutei 5 codex 3], and is referred to as Laur. V 3. It is better known as MS L. According to P. Mordaunt Barnard, MS L is our earliest and only authority for the Stromata.7 Another sixteenth-century manuscript, Codex Athous (also known as Codex Lawra B 113) is said to be a direct copy of the MS L, and therefore is of no value textually. There are samples of facsimiles of MS L in older works, but no photographic edition is currently available.

The earliest Latin translation of the Stromata appears to have been made in 1551 (without the Greek text) by Gentiano Herueto Aurelio [Gentian Hervet, 1499-1584], Clementis Alexandrini Omnia quae quidem extant opera, nunc primum à tenebris eruta Latinitateque donata, Gentiano Herueto

6 The reader is already acquainted (Hermas, p. 12, [13] note 9) with permissive canons, by which bishops might commend to their brethren, books fit to be read, which they sent, authenticated, not only by hand and seal, but by a clerical messenger whose duty it was (in the language of Bingham) “to go on the bishop’s embassies, with his letters or messages to foreign churches; for in those days, by reason of the persecutions, a bishop did not so much as send a letter to a foreign church, but by the hands of one of his clergy. Whence Cyprian calls them literae clericae.” Antiquities, book iii. cap. ii. 3. (The reference to ‘Bingham’ is to Joseph Bingham [1668-1723], Origines ecclesiasticae: or, the antiquities of the Christian Church; and Other Works. Revised by R. Bingham. 9 vols. London, 1829. There was an earlier edition of 10 vols. London, 1710-22.)

Aurelio interprete. (Florentiae: Laur. Torrentius, 1551). It would appear that the translation was made from the manuscript in the Medicea bibliotheca (Florence) by Hervet in January 1550 (see page 4), and his translation became the standard that was followed by all the succeeding diglots of Clement’s Stromata.

The earliest publication of the Stromata in Greek (without any Latin translation) was by Petrus Victorius, ΚΛΗΜЕНΤΟΣ ΑΛΕΞΑΝΔΡΕΩΣ ΣΑ ΕΥΡΙΣΚΟΜΕΝΑ ΑΠΑΝΤΑ. Ex Bibliotheca Medicea (1550).

The earliest publication of the Stromata in Greek and Latin appears to have been made in 1616 by Friedrich Sylburg [1536-1596] Clementis Alexandrini Opera graece et Latine quae extant/Daniel Heinsius textum graecum recensuit . . . à Friderico Sylburgio collectae; cum tribus locu pletibus, auctorum, rerum, verborum & phraseon indicibus (Lugduni Batavorum: Ionnes Patius, pro Bibliopolio Commeliniano, 1616).

The standard followed by most studies on Clement’s writings tended to follow John Potter’s edition, ΚΛΗΜΕΝΤΟΣ ΑΛΕΞΑΝΔΡΕΩΣ ΣΑ ΕΥΡΙΣΚΟΜΕΝΑ. Clementis Alexandrini Opera, quae extant (Venetiis, 1757 [Oxford, 1715]). It would appear that textual scholars, like Tischendorf and Tregelles, relied on Potter’s edition as the most accurate transcription of Clement’s Greek text (see §1.4. above). I have not been able to examine the 11th century Florence MS directly, but if the 16th century MS is an exact copy of it, then this creates confusion over what exactly Clement did write.

Sylburg’s Latin translation of Stromata Book II. Chap. 23. sect. 145 [p. 506 in Potter] reads:


---

8 Cambridge University Library, shelf no. 3.15.22.
9 Cambridge University Library, shelf no. 3.15.21, and Adv. a. 19.1.
12 Where Hervet and Potter differ from Sylburg, these are embedded in Sylburg’s translation. Where the difference might cause confusion, the differences are given in the footnotes.
13 In place of: multos domus exitus custodiat: Potter has: è domo saepe non exeat.
dimiserit uxorem, moechatur ipsam, hoc est, cogit eam moechari. Non solūm autem, qvi dimisit, est ejus causa, sed etiam qvi eam suscepit, praebens mulieri peccandi occasionem: si enim non suscipiat, revertetur ad virum.

P. Mordaunt Barnard collected three references to Matthew 5:32 in Clement’s Stromata.14 The three are given under Matthew 5:32 (p. 7).

QUOTATION 1. Όυκ ἁπόλυσες γυναῖκα πλὴν εἰ μὴ ἐπὶ λόγῳ πορνείας (Strom II. XXIII. 145.3 [Potter 506; Victorius 168 line 18]). Non dimitte uxorem, praeterqvim propter fornicationem (Potter). ‘You shall not put away the wife, except for the cause of fornication . . . ’ (Wilson 8215).

QUOTATION 2. Ὅ δὲ ἁπολευμένην λαμβάνων γυναῖκα μοιχάται, φησίν (Strom II. XXIII. 146.2 [Potter 506; Victorius 168 line 23]) Barnard links Mt 5:32 with Mt 19:9 and Lk 16:18. Qui autem dimissam accipit uxorem, moechatur inquit: (Potter 506). ‘He that taketh a woman that has been put away, it is said . . . ’ (Wilson 82). Under Mark 10:11 Barnard gives another quotation from Clement (p. 32), but this is the continuation of quotation 2:

‘Εάν γάρ τις ἁπόλυσες γυναῖκα μοιχάται αὐτήν,16 τοιτέστιν, ἀναγκαζείν μοιχευθῆναι. (Strom II. XXIII. 146.2 [Potter 507; Victorius 168 line 24]). si quis enim dimiserit uxorem, moechatur ipsam, hoc est, cogit eam moechari. (Potter) “For, if, say, one divorces a wife

QUOTATION 3. Ποτε ο ἁπόλυσων τὴν γυναῖκα χωρὶς λόγω πορνείας ποιεὶ αὐτὴν μοιχευθῆναι (Strom Book III. Chap. VI section 47.2 [Potter 533; Victorius 178 line 29]). Quare qui dimittit uxorem, praeterqvam fornicationis causa, facit eam moechari (Potter).

QUOTATION 4. ὁ θεὸς συνεξευξαῖν, ἂνθρωπος μὴ χωριζέω, “whom God has joined together, let not man separate.” This is an exact quotation of Matthew 19:6 apart from the necessary omission of οὖν.

To put quotations 1 and 2 in their context, I give Philip Schaff’s translation (with Greek text in places):

145.3. Now that the Scripture counsels marriage, and allows18 no release (οὐδὲ ἁφίστασθαι19) from the union,20 is expressly2122 contained in the law, “Thou shalt not put away


15 William Wilson, The Writings of Clement of Alexandria. Vol. 2. (Ante-Nicene Christian Library. Translations of the Writings of the Fathers down to A.D. 325. Edited by Alexander Roberts & James Donaldson. Vol. XII. Clement of Alexandria. [Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1869]). Unfortunately this volume lacks an ET for Book III, which a footnote on I. 84 explains: “After much consideration, the Editors have deemed it best to give the whole of this Book in Latin” It is said in II. 244, of chap. 10 in Bk 2 of the Paed. “For obvious reasons, we have given the greater part of this chapter in the Latin version.” This, no doubt, was due to the sensitive matter of husbands having sex with menstruating wives.

16 MS I. was published by Petrus Victorius (Florentiae: L. Torrentinus, 1550), which read αὐτήν, but MS L reads αὐτή.

17 The page number refers to Potter’s edition.
thy wife, except (πλὴν ἐν μη) for the cause of fornication (ἐπὶ λόγῳ πορνείας);" and it regards as fornication the marriage of those separated (κεχωρισμένων) while the other is alive.

146.1. Not to deck and adorn herself beyond what is becoming, renders a wife free of calumnious suspicion, while she devotes herself assiduously to prayers and supplications; avoiding frequent departures from the house, and shutting herself up as far as possible from the view of all not related to her, and deeming housekeeping of more consequence than impertinent trifling.

146.2. “He that taketh a woman that has been put away, it is said, committeth adultery (μοιχότατοι); and if one puts away his wife, he makes her an adulteress (μοιχεύσατε),” that is, compels her to commit adultery (μοιχεύσατε).

146.3. And not only is he who puts her away (ἀπολύσατε) guilty of this, but he who takes her, by giving to the woman the opportunity of sinning; for did he not take her, she would return to her husband.

147.1. What, then, is the law? In order to check the impetuosity of the passions, it commands the adulteress (μοιχευσάσα) to be put to death, on being convicted of this [Lev 20; Dt 22:22]; and if of priestly family, to be committed to the flames [Lev 21:9]. And the adulterer (ὁ μοιχὸς) also is stoned to death, but not in the same place, that not even their death may be in common.

147.2. And the law is not at variance with the Gospel, but agrees with it. How should it be otherwise, one Lord being the author of both? She who has committed fornication (πορνεύσασα) liveth in sin, and is dead to the commandments; but she who has repented, being as it were born again by the change in her life, has a regeneration of life; the old harlot (τῇς πόρνῃς τῇς παλαιάς) being dead, and she who has been regenerated by repentance having come back again to life.

147.3. The Spirit testifies to what has been said by Ezekiel, declaring, “I desire not the death of the sinner, but that he should turn.” Now they are stoned to death; as through hardness of heart dead to the law which they believed not. But in the case of a priestess the punishment is increased, because “to whom much is given, from him shall more be required.” Chapter XXIII.—On Marriage.

The context of quotation 4 is:

---

18 Present ind. act. 3 pers. sg. from ἐπιπρέπω (ἐπὶ + τρέπω), meaning to permit, allow; to yield, submit, comply; to commit, intrust, deliver to (Groves 239).

19 Present middle/passive infinitive from ἀφίστημι (fr. ἀπό from and ἴστημι to set), meaning, to separate, sever, disjoint, disunite, to put away, place at a distance, break off (so John Groves, A Greek and English Dictionary comprising all the words in the writings of the most popular Greek authors; in the Septuagint and the New Testament . . . with an English and Greek Vocabulary. All the inflections in the New Testament, and many of the more difficult that occur in other Greek writings . . . (8th ed.; London: Cowie, Jolland & Co., 1840), p. 105.

20 The ‘union’ is συζυγίας, from σύν together, and ζευγνύμιν to join; meaning, a joining together, a yoke, pair; marriage (Groves 532). Literally, “Now that the Scriptures recommend to marry, but not to separate when, indeed, the marriage is permitted, is sanctioned by law [when set] over against, ‘You shall not divorce a wife, except

21 The adverb διὰκριθήκας (see Acts 20:15) means opposite, over against; to the other side, through and through; clearly, openly, decidedly, expressly, against all opposition (Groves 54).

22 The verb means to enact laws, legislate; to promulgate or publish a law; to ordain or sanction by law; to instruct in the law (Groves 408).

23 This is a wrong translation of μοιχεύσαν. Read ‘adultery’ in place of ‘fornication.’
There are those who say openly that marriage is fornication. They lay it down as a dogma that it was instituted by the devil . . . .

Next, they do not know the reason why the Lord did not marry. In the first place, he had his own bride, the Church. Secondly, he was not a common man to need a physical partner. Further, he did not have an obligation to produce children; he was born God’s only Son and survives eternally. It is this very Lord who says, “Let no human being part that which God has joined together

STROMATA, BOOK III. CHAP. VI. SECTION 146 [Page 533 in Potter]

"Ωστε ὁ ἀπόλύων τὴν γυναῖκα χωρὶς λόγου πορνείας ποιεὶ αὐτὴν μοιχεύθημαι (Strom Book III. Chap. VI section 47 [Potter 533]).

John Potter, ΚΛΗΜΕΝΤΟΣ ΑΛΕΞΑΝΔΡΕΩΣ ΤΑ ΕΥΠΙΣΚΟΜΕΝΑ. Clementis Alexandrini Opera, quae extant (Venetiis, 1757 [Oxford, 1715]).

The quote from Matthew 5:32 reads: "Ωστε ὁ ἀπόλύων τὴν γυναῖκα χωρὶς λόγου πορνείας ποιεὶ αὐτὴν μοιχεύθημαι (p. 533). The Latin of Potter reads:

Nam quanam ratione dicit Paulus Apostolus esse sanctificatam mulierem à viro, aut virum à muliere? Quid est autem, quod Dominus quoque dixit iis, qui interrogaabant de divorcio, An liceat uxorem dimittere, cum Moses id permiserit? Ad duritiam cordis vestri, inquit, Moses haec scripsit. Vos autem non legisistis, quod protoplasto Deus dixit, Eritis duo in carne una? [Sylburg and Hervet omit the question mark] Quare qui dimittit uxorem, praeterquam fornicationis causa, facit eam mochari. Sed post resurrectionem, inquit, nec uxorem ducent, nec nubunt.

The same Latin translation is given in Sylburg (p. 446) and Hervet (p. 95).

The phrase ἐπὶ πορνεία occurs with reference to Matthew 19:9 at Strom. III. VI. 50.3 Dindorf, II. 275 (lines 2-5)(Potter 534) in the following context:

tούτο γὰρ οἱ πυθανόμενοι μαθεῖν ἠβουλήθησαν, εἰ δυσχωρεῖ καταγγειλθείσης ἐπὶ πορνεία γυναικὸς καὶ ἐκβληθείσης έτέραν γῆμαι.

Ferguson has translated this as: ‘Those asking the question wanted to find out whether, when a wife had been condemned for sexual misconduct (ἐπὶ πορνεία) and removed, there was any advantage in marrying another.

I discovered  Ἰούαννης at Strom. III. VI. Dindorf, II. 27 (line 10)(Potter 535), p. 277 (line7), πορνεία occurs at III. XII. 82 (Dindorf II. p. 294 line 15. P. 299 (sect. 89) line 13, 15, 17 (and μοιχεία)(Potter 552)

Bk III. XVIII, 108 (Dindorf, II. 311, line 25 deals with 1 Cor 7, “a man is not to release (ἀφεῖναι) a wife.”

F. C. Birkitt in his Introduction to Barnard’s work concluded that, “Clement’s quotations have a fundamentally ‘Western’ character. His allies are not B and the Coptic versions, but D and

---

24 It would appear that this work is basically a reissue of Sylburg’s 1688 work.

the Old Latin." 27 In Clement’s quotation of Matthew 11:16-17 in Paed 1. v. 13, 3 (Potter 105; Marcovich28 10), he notes that there are “no less than three agreements of Clement with the ‘Received Text’ against the better mss, viz. the position of καθημένως, the omission of the article before ἁγοράς, and the addition of καὶ before λέγουσιν.” 29 However, Burkitt noted that when the best Greek and the best Latin mss disagree, Clement more often than not agrees with the Old Latin (often in company with D) than with the best Greek mss, which, for Burkitt, are Ν and B.

In the case of Luke 9:62, however, Burkett makes the point, “Moreover, the reading of D and Clement is obviously wrong; and it is companionship in error which shows real affinity of text. As a working hypothesis, therefore, we have good grounds for treating the text used by Clement as a branch of the ‘Western’ text not akin to the Old Syriac Version; in other words, as a text really and geographically Western.” 30 He notes the number of striking agreements between Clement and the Old Syriac which inclines him to believe that they both go back to an ancient confluence.

In Clement the text of John 17:24-26 agrees with the TR, but Burkitt dismisses it with the comment, ‘I should not be inclined to lay much stress upon the agreement of Clement with the ‘Received Text’ in Jn xvii 24—26, except so far as it discredits the eccentric reading of D in this passage.” 31 This is a curious way to handle textual issues. The text reads as follows, with NA28 and RP variants placed in square brackets: 32 Πάτερ, οὐς ἔδωκας [ὁ δέδωκας] /RP = οὐς δέδωκας] μοι, θέλω γὰρ ὅπου εἰμὶ ἐγώ κάκεινοι ὡσὶ μετ᾽ ἐμοί. ἵνα θεωρῶ τὴν δόξαν τὴν ἐμὴν [RP ἐμὴν/NA28 = ἐμὴν], ἣν ἔδωκας [δέδωκας] μοι, ὧτι παρέπτωμαι με πρὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου. Πάτερ δίκαιε, καὶ ὁ κόσμος σε οὐκ ἔγνω, ἐγὼ δὲ σε ἐγνώκα, κάκεινοι [καὶ σύτω/= RP] ἐγνώθαν ὅτι σὺ με ἀπέστειλας καὶ ἐγνώρισα αὐτός τὸ ὅρισμα σου καὶ γνώρισα. (Paed I. viii. 71,2) Burkitt noted that the main problem concerns ὅ and οὖς. He notes that ὅ has the support of folio Bohairic, but ‘for οὖς we have all other MSS and versions, including the Latin and the Sahidic. In spite of this opposing array there is much to be said for the reading of folio, seeing that with κάκεινοi following in the same sentence there was more reason to change ὅ in οὖς than vice versa.” 33

This last point is to no avail because the RP text reads the same.

Jerome gives the following list of Clement’s works (chiefly taken from Eusebius): 34

26 By ‘Western’ Burkitt means readings which are at once non-Alexandrian [Egyptian] and non-Antiochian [Byzantine].


28 The most accurate Greek text of Clement’s Paedagogus (The Instructor) is that by M. Marcovich, Clementis Alexandrini Paedagogus (Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2002). The Greek text is given

29 Burkitt, idem. p. xii.

30 Burkitt, idem. xiii. (see p. 61 for the Gk text). Clement’s text occurs in Paed i. viii. 71, 2 (Potter 14; Marcovich p. 44).

31 Burkitt, idem. p. xvi.

32 Differences with the Robinson & Pierpont text are specifically noted with RP. The introductory words are: ὃτι δὲ ὁ αὐτὸς μόνος ἦν θεὸς καὶ δικαίος ἐστιν ὁ αὐτὸς καὶ μόνος ὁ ἄνω ἐν τῷ ἄνω μαρτυρισεί κύριος ἑσαυγγελίω λέγων

33 Ibid. p. xvii.

34 John Kaye, ibid. pp. 4-9 has listed other titles that Clement refers to in his works which are no longer extant, or were proposed writings.
Στρωματεία Stromateis [or Miscellanies] in eight books. (GCS [2002]; Marcovich [2002])

Quis dives salvetur [Who is the Rich Man that shall be Saved?]. (GCS 17 [1970]).

Παιδαγωγὸς Paedagogos [The Instructor] in three books. (GCS 12 [1972]; Marcovich [2002]).

'Υποτύπωσις Hypotyposes [or Deliniations] in eight books. (GCS 17 [1970]).

Αὖ οὖν προτερπτικὸς πρὸς Ἕλληνα The Exhortation to the Gentiles. (GCS 12 [1972]; Marcovich [1995]).

The following titles have not survived, or do some as fragments:

De pascha. Treatise on Easter. (GCS 17 [1970])

A Discourse on Fasting. Not extant.


A Book on the Ecclesiastical Canons (Against Judaizers). (GCS 17 [1970])

On the Prophet Amos

On Providence

On Evil-speaking

Exhortation to Patience (for newly baptised)

and about 15 other titles either written by him or about to be written.

The paucity of source manuscripts to recover the Greek text of the writings of Clement of Alexandria.

For the Protrepticus and Paedagogus the best authority is MS P (Paris. Gr. 451; written in 914 for Arethas, Archbishop of Caesarea in Cappadocia, sometimes known as Codex Aretas), but it lacks Paed. Bk I. i-x and the beginning of xi, which are supplied from MSS F (Florence. Medic. Laur. Pl. 5. c. 24 [only contains the Paed. with lacunae38], 11th cent.) and M (Mutinensis Gr. 126; 10/11th cent.)


36 In this work Clement asserted that there was a succession of worlds before Adam. See John Kaye (Bp. of Lincoln), Some account of the writings and opinions of Clement of Alexandria (London: J. G. & F. Rivington, 1835), p. 6 note.


38 Copies of F with the same missing pages of text, proving that they are direct copies, are MSS B (Oxford), R (London), Gr. 452 and 587 (Paris), N (Oxford, 15th cent.), Vat. Palatinus Gr. 86, and others, see J. Armitage Robinson (ed.), Texts and Studies: Contributions to Biblical and Patristic
cent.). MS M is regarded as a very faithful copy of P, and F an inferior copy of P. It is now recognised that all extant copies of the Paedagogus go back to a single manuscript, namely MS P.\textsuperscript{39} The latest edition of the Greek text of the Paedagogus acknowledges that, “Clement’s Paedagogus is preserved virtually in a single manuscript . . . MS P.”\textsuperscript{40} This MS was copied “from an exemplar that was full of textual corruptions, lacunae, interpolations and dislocations.”\textsuperscript{41}

For the Stromata, Exerpta, and Eclogae, are preserved virtually in a single manuscript, MS L (Florence. Medic. Laur. Pl. v. c. 3). A direct copy of this was made in the 16th cent., MS. Suppl. Gr 250 (Paris).

For the Quis Dives Salvetur is preserved virtually in a single manuscript, MS S (Scorialensis Ω III 9. 11th cent.). Michael Ghisler printed this homily in 1623 from a 16th cent. MS V (written by three scribes). There are about twelve fragments of this work, which were collated by P. M. Barnard.\textsuperscript{42}

Note that praeterquam fornicationis causa, is the translation of: χωρίς λόγου πορνείας.

Dean Burgon [1818-1888] examined Mark 10:17-31 in Clement’s quotations from this Gospel. He took Mark 10:17-31 as his test passage, and noted, “We make a surprising discovery. There are but 297 words in those 15 verses,—according to the traditional Text: of which, in the copy that belonged to Clemens Alexandrinus, 39 prove to have been left out: 11 words are added: 22, substituted: 27, transposed: 13, varied; and the phrase has been altered at least 8 times. Now, 112 words out of a total of 297, is 38 per cent.” When Burgon used Westcott & Hort’s text as the standard he found that “the words omitted amount to 44. The words added are 13: the words substituted, 23: the words transposed, 34: the words varied 16. And the phrase has been altered 9 times at least. But, 130 on a total of 297, is 44 per cent. You will also bear in mind that Clement of Alexandria is one of our principal authorities for the Text of the Ante-Nicene period.” He concluded:

“It is impossible to produce a fouler exhibition of S. Mark x. 17-31 than is contained in a document full two centuries older than either B or R,—itself the property of one of the most famous of the ante-Nicene Fathers.”\textsuperscript{43} Clement habitually mistakes apocryphal writings for inspired writings.\textsuperscript{44}


Tischendorf’s readings of Clement are excerpted from this work (so Barnard, 1899, viii n 1). Griesbach’s work was superseded by Resch, and he in turn was succeeded by P. M. Barnard (1899) as far as the Gospels and the Acts is concerned.

P. Mordaunt Barnard collected the evidence for the Greek text of Clement’s Stromata\textsuperscript{45} and discovered that the earliest manuscript was MS L. He examined MS P which was written in AD 914


\textsuperscript{40} M. Marcovich, \textit{Clementis Alexandrini Paedagogus} (Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2002). Preface.

\textsuperscript{41} Ibid. Preface.


\textsuperscript{43} Dean John William Burgon, \textit{The Revision Revised} (London: J. Murray, 1883), pp. 327-8.

\textsuperscript{44} See John Kaye (Bp. of Lincoln), \textit{Some account of the writings and opinions of Clement of Alexandria} (London: J. G. & F. Rivington, 1835), chaps 6 and 8.
by the scribe Baanes for Arethas, Archbishop of Caesarea in Cappadocia, and also MS M. He compared the hand of MS M (which he dated to the 10th or 11th century) with the hand of MS L and concluded: "This hand cannot, I think, be placed later than the 11th century, and is, I am convinced, the hand of the scribe of Med. Laur. Pl. v. c. 3 [MS L], the only authority for the Stromata. I saw both MSS. within 48 hours, and also compared this hand of [MS} M with Bandini’s facsimile of the Laurentian codex [MS L]."

John Kaye notes that Clement put the birth of Jesus in the 28th year of the reign of Augustus, and the 28th year must be dated from the victory at Actium. But Clement also believed that Jesus’ ministry lasted only one year. He quoted from all the books of the OT except Ruth, 2 Chronicles, Song of Solomon, and Obadiah. He regarded Tobit as Scripture and Ecclesiasticus. He quotes all of Paul’s Epistles except Philemon, but not James, 2 Peter, 2-3 John.

**The Matthean exception clauses in other early sources**


Resch’s parallels to Matthew 19:9a are:

3. (3) Theophil ad Autol. III, 13 καὶ ὃς ἀπολύσει γυναῖκα παρεκτὸς λόγου πορνείας ποιεῖ αὐτήν μοιχευθῆναι.
5. (5) Matthew 19:9a ὃς ἂν ἀπολύσῃ τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ μὴ ἐπὶ πορνείας καὶ γαμήσῃ ἄλλην, μοιχάται.


---

46 Ibid. p. xii.
48 Ibid. 370.
Resch's parallels for Matthew 19:9b are:
(13) Codex Ephraemi (C) Mt 19:9b
καὶ ὁ ἀπολύμανρν γυναῖκα ἀυτοῦ καὶ γαμῶν ἔτεραν μοιχεύει.
(14) Matthew 5:32b
καὶ ὃς ἔν ἀπολύμανρν γαμίνη, μοιχιάται.
(15) Justin Apol. I, 15. [p. 62A]
καὶ ὃς γαμεῖ ἀπολύμανρν ἀφ ἑτέρου ἀνδρός, μοιχιάται.
καὶ ὁ γαμῶν, φησίν, ἀπολύμανρν ἀπὸ ἄνδρος μοιχεύει.
(17) Luke 16:18b
καὶ ὁ ἀπολύμανρν ἀπὸ ἄνδρος γαμῶν μοιχεύει.
et qui dimissam duxerit, moechatur
(19) Matthew 19:9b
καὶ ὁ ἀπολύμανρν γαμίνης μοιχιάται
(20) Codex Cantabr. Mark 10:12
καὶ ἔν ἑυμ. ἐξελθῆ ἀπὸ τοῦ ἄνδρος καὶ ἄλλον γαμίνη, μοιχιάται.
et mulier si reliquerit virum et alií nupserit, moechatur super illum.
(22) Codex Cantabr. Latin Mark 10:12
et si mulier exiet a viro et alium duxerit, moechatur.
(23) Mark 10:12
καὶ ἔν αὐτῇ ἀπολύσασα τὸν ἄνδρα αὐτῆς γαμήσῃ ἄλλον μοιχιάται
Resch’s parallels for Matthew 19:10 are:
ἔν ὁ ὀφείλει ἡ ἢ αἰτία τῆς γυναικός, οὐ συμφέρει τῷ ἄνδρῳ γαμήσαι.
(25) Matthew 19:10
εἰ ὁ ὀφείλει ἡ ἢ αἰτία τοῦ ἄνδρος [Syr. Cur., Cod. Cantabr.: ἄνδρός] μετά τῆς
gυναικός, οὐ συμφέρει γαμήσαι.
εἰ ὁ ὀφείλει ἡ ἢ αἰτία τοῦ ἄνδρος καὶ τῆς γυναικός, οὐ συμφέρει γαμήσαι.
The confusion in Clement’s quotation of Matthew 19:9

Otto Stählin, in Clemens Alexandrinus. Stromata Buch I–VI (2 vols.; Leipzig: J. C. Hinrich’s Buchhandlung, 1906), quotes Clement on Matthew 19:9.49 The quotation can be found in Volume I. Book II. Cap. XXIII (§145.3). It reads as follows: πλην εἰ μη ἐπι λόγῳ πορνεῖας.50 If this is what Clement wrote, then he has amalgamated (conflated) the so-called exception clauses in Matthew 5:32 and Matthew 19:9 in a botched manner.

The original text of Matthew 5:32 read: ΠΑΡΕΚΤΟΣ λόγου πορνείας (‘apart from the matter of fornication’)

The original text of Matthew 19:9 read: μή επί πορνεία (‘not over fornication’)

In what follows I shall attempt to trace the steps that led to the confused text that represents what Clement is supposed to have written originally (according to what has survived), which is given as: πλήν εί μή ἐπί λόγῳ πορνείας. This translates as: nevertheless, except over a matter of fornication.

First, the word παρεκτός in Matthew 5:32 is a very rare word, being used only three times in the New Testament and not at all in the LXX. The nearest equivalent to παρεκτός is πλήν, which occurs 31 times in the NT, and 230 times in the Old Testament. This may explain why Clement (or his transcribers) used πλήν and not παρεκτός. If so, then he (or his transcribers) would have read Matthew 5:32 as: πλήν λόγου πορνείας, “besides the matter of fornication.”

Second, if Clement (or his transcribers) regarded πλήν λόγου πορνείας as the equivalent of μή επί πορνεία, (in Matthew 19:9), then it would have been a simple matter to change μή into εί μή. By this means Clement (or his transcribers) would have brought 19:9 into line with 5:32. Both would then be converted into explicit exclusion clauses. But did Clement do this, or did one of his many transcribers do it? We shall never know, and therefore we can never be sure what Clement actually wrote.

The end result of these changes would be that Matthew 5:32 would have been read as: πλήν λόγου πορνείας instead of παρεκτός λόγου πορνείας “besides the matter of fornication,” and Matthew 19:9 would have been read as: εί μή επί πορνεία instead of μή επί πορνεία “except/not for fornication.”

In the case of Matthew 5:32, πλήν has replaced the very rare word παρεκτός; and in the case of Matthew 19:9 εί μή has been made to agree with πλήν (or could Erasmus’s printed text have played a part in creating εί μή?).

All would have been well if Clement (or one of his transcribers) had chosen just one of these exception clauses when commenting on Jesus’ teaching about divorce, but Clement did not, if the present text represents what he wrote.

Third, unfortunately as the text now stands, someone attempted to combine every Greek word in the two different exception clauses in Matthew’s Gospel. The following diagram sets out how this was done.

![Diagram of Matthew 5:32 and Matthew 19:9 comparisons]

Fourth, in attempting to harmonise and amalgamate (conflate) the two Matthean clauses, the compiler correctly (grammatically) altered the genitive λόγου to the dative λόγῳ, but he replaced the dative πορνεία with the genitive πορνείας. This does not come across in the apparatuses of either Tischendorf or Tregelles, for both of them truncate their quotations of Clement to πορν., (see §1.4. above), which most scholars would assume read the dative form here, following επί, as in Matthew 19:9. Or more likely the compiler/copyist found πορνείας already in

---

51 The three occurrences are Mt 5:32; Acts 26:29; and 2 Cor 11:28.
Clement’s text and let it stand. The fact that the genitive form stands in the extant text, plus the use of πλήν, shows that Clement very likely had the exception clause of Matthew 5:32 in mind when he wrote his work, and not Matthew 19:9.

Now the exception clause in Matthew 5:32 says nothing about an exception, or exceptions, for divorce. Jesus is referring to culpability (not cultural ability to permit divorce) for the evil that would follow a divorce. The focus is on blame for the consequences of divorcing a wife. This is also the focus of Clement, because this is how he expounds Jesus’ exemption clause in Matthew 5:32, in what follows. For both Christ and Clement marriage was, and is, a life-long union dissolved only by the death of one member. There is no escape from marriage once it is entered into, and Jesus’ disciples instantly recognised this when they logically concluded that it was more advantageous for a man not to marry if that is the essence and implications of marriage.

The resultant text of Clement (as it has come down to us 1,000 years after it was written) is clumsy with both πλήν and εἰ μὴ meaning the same thing in this context. It is possible that originally Clement wrote πλήν λόγου πορνείας (Matthew 5:32), and this became πλήν ἐπὶ λόγῳ πορνείας “besides the matter of fornication” (cf. Esth 14:18; Sir 29:8 for the construction) when ἐπὶ was inserted.

The next change occurred when someone wrote εἰ μὴ in the margin, either to replace the uninspired πλήν, or to bring the wording of Clement’s exception clause into line with Matthew 19:9. The marginal reading was then inserted into the text when the text was recopied so that we ended up with πλήν εἰ μὴ ἐπί λόγῳ πορνείας, which is how the text now reads. Johann Potter’s 1715 edition, for the first time, made Clement’s Greek text available to the academic world.

If the 11th century text of MS L has not been tampered with, and if the words εἰ μὴ ἐπὶ were the words that Clement wrote, then this would be the earliest evidence for the reading εἰ μὴ. It would be interesting to know if the 11th century copy has the same text as the 16th century copy.

Wenham and Heth noted that ‘Clement conflates the Matt. 19 and Mark 10 accounts, first reflecting Mark 10:2b-5 then Matt. 19:4-5. Then he writes: Ἡστῇ ἡ ἀπόλυσιν τῆς γυναῖκος πόνης ποιεῖν αὐτήν μοιχεύθηναι (Matt. 5:32)! If we can learn anything from the patristic citations of the Matthean texts it is that they interpreted Matt. 19:9 in the light of 5:32.’

We know that very early on, for instance, at the time that Codex Vaticanus was written in the mid-fourth century, that the distinction Jesus was making in Matthew 5:32 and 19:9-12 was lost, because Vaticanus and the Caesarean text-type in particular, replaced the ‘exception clause’ in 19:9 with the exemption clause in 5:32, but the distinction is maintained in Clement.

The danger of assimilation when translating the works of the early Church Fathers

What we must be aware of is that when someone translates a foreign language into his own language, and he comes across a quotation from the Bible in the foreign language, if he is thoroughly familiar with his own mother-tongue Bible, he will automatically give his own translation, and not try to give a strictly literal translation of the foreign version. So, for instance, it is common to find the AV translation being used in place of an unfamiliar English translation when foreign languages are translated into English. The same would apply when transcribing Greek copies after scholars throughout Europe had become familiar with Erasmus’s Greek version.

It is acknowledged by most textual scholars that the so-called exceptive clause in Matthew 19:9 μὴ ἐπὶ πορνεία is not as instantly clear as εἰ μὴ ἐπὶ πορνεία is. It is the more difficult reading. One needs to stop and think about what μὴ ἐπὶ πορνεία means (‘not over fornication’), whereas you do not need to stop and think about the meaning of εἰ μὴ ἐπὶ πορνεία (‘except for fornication’).

---

Given the fact that many English commentators are on record as saying that there is no difference in meaning between μὴ ἐπὶ πορνεία and εἰ μὴ ἐπὶ πορνεία, then why would you omit the initial εἰ if it is clearer in than out? Given that some modern scholars would have no hesitation in retaining εἰ, or adding it in, to bring out the meaning more clearly, would not those who were transcribing the Greek writings of the early Greek Church fathers, after the publication of Erasmus’s text, be tempted to follow Erasmus’s Greek text irrespective of the state of the Greek text that the early Church Father used in his original composition?

It is for this reason that we must be very suspicious of nineteenth-century language translations of the writings of the early Church Fathers, Greek and Latin, because transcribers and translators may have taken liberties in their quest to hurry through with their assignments. We must also take into account the theological convictions of the translators, and their standard of education, in assessing the reliability of their finished work.53

Suppose the translator was a fervent supporter of Erasmus’s exceptive clauses and Erasmus’s addition of εἰ was not in the text he was translating would he hesitate to insert it on his own authority? After all, he would argue, he was only making plain what was already there. But this is taking a liberty with the early Church Fathers’ writings. The translation of Clement of Alexandria, from Stromata 2:23:145:3 (a) reads:

That Scripture counsels marriage, however, and never allows any release from the union, is expressly contained in the law: ‘You shall not divorce a wife, except for reason of adultery.’ And it regards as adultery the marriage of a spouse, while the one from whom a separation was made is still alive. ‘Whoever takes a divorced woman as wife commits adultery,’ it says; for ‘if anyone divorce his wife, he debauches her;’ that is, he compels her to commit adultery. And not only does he that divorces her become the cause of this, but also he that takes the woman and gives her the opportunity of sinning; for if he did not take her, she would return to her husband.

The Greek text is the same in Dindorf (p. 240), Sylburg (p. 424), and Potter (p. 506).

§145 ὅτι δὲ γαμεῖν ἢ γαμήθησιν ἢ συμβουλεύειν οὐδὲ ἀφίστασθαι ποτὲ τῆς σύζυγος ἐπιτρέπει ἀντικροῦσθαι∙ οὐκ ἀπολύσεις γυναῖκα πλήν εἰ μὴ ἐπὶ λόγῳ πορνείας∙ μοιχεύσαι δὲ ἤγεῖται τὸ ἐπιτίθημα κύντος βατέρου τῶν κεχωρισμένων.

§146 Ἀνυποπτον δὲ εἰς διαβολὴν δεικνύει γυναῖκα τὸ μὴ καλλιτίζεσθαι μηδὲ μὴν κοσμεῖσθαι πέρα τοῦ πρόποτος εὐχαῖς καὶ δείσεις προσανέχουσαν ἐκείνως, τῶς μὲν ἐξόδους τῆς οίκιας υπαλληλομένην τάς πολλάς, ἀποκλείουσαν δ᾽ ὡς οὖν τε αὐτὴν τῆς πρὸς τοὺς οὐ προσηκοντας προσόψεως, προφυγαίτερον τιθείσην τῆς ἀκαίρου φλαβιας τῆς οἰκουρίας. ὁ δὲ ἀπολελυμένην λαβώσας γυναῖκα μοιχάται φησί, ἐὰν γὰρ τῆς ἀπόλυσης γυναῖκα μοιχάται αὐτήν, τούτων ἀναγκάζει μοιχεύσαι. οὐ μόνον δὲ ὁ ἀπόλυσας αὐτὸν γίνεται τοῦτο, ἀλλὰ καὶ ὁ παραδεξάμενος αὐτὴν, ἀφορμῇ παρέχων τῷ ἀμαρτήσαι τῇ γυναικί· εἰ γὰρ μὴ δεχοίτο, ἀνακάμψει πρὸς τὸν ἄνδρα.

The above text should have been translated as: nevertheless, except over a matter of fornication (πλὴν εἰ μὴ ἐπὶ λόγῳ πορνείας). What the translator produced was: “except for reason of adultery.” This is a sloppy translation, because the text reads πορνείας ‘fornication,’ not μοιχεία

‘adultery.’ Now many theologians—after Erasmus produced his exception clause—assumed that Jesus was referring to adultery as an exception for divorce, and it may be that the translator of Clement’s works had made this assumption also, so that when he came to translate Clement’s Greek he made Clement say what he wanted him to say.

It is now a matter of concern to conservative-evangelicals that only those manuscripts that pre-date Erasmus’s 1516 edition should be used to make an accurate, new translation of the writings of the Church Fathers, because the old translations cannot be trusted on a number of levels as outlined above.

Misinformation regarding Jerome’s Latin Vulgate translation

Jerome produced his Vulgate New Testament in the fourth century A.D. The Gospel accounts appeared in the year 383. We are told that Jerome used both Old Latin and Greek manuscripts, and an English translation of the Vulgate on Matthew 19:9 would read:

And I say to you, that whosoever shall put away his wife, unless [nisi] it be for fornication, and shall marry another, commits adultery: and he that shall marry her that is put away, commits adultery.

Now because this Latin translation preceded Erasmus’s Greek text by a millennia, it is held up as proof that Jerome had a Greek text that was identical to Erasmus’s at Matthew 19:9. There are three serious objections to this argument.

First, if Jerome did have Greek copies identical to Erasmus’s text at Matthew 19:9, why are there no copies of Jerome’s Greek manuscripts extant today with ἐκτὸς in Matthew 19:9?

Secondly, Jerome used the Latin term nisi, (ni si) which means ‘if not.’ If Jerome wanted to make an exception he would have used excepta which means ‘except’ (as he did in Mt 5:32). If we retranslate Jerome’s text using nisi it would read: “whosoever shall put away his wife, if not over fornication, and shall marry another, commits adultery: . . . .” Given that God ruled out divorce for fornication, and Jesus ruled out divorce apart from fornication, taken together the two forbidden categories exclude divorce for any cause, which is what the original Greek said (see below).

So Jerome was correct to use nisi and not excepta in this context because he knew what the Gospel tradition was since the time of Jesus, and he agreed with it in his writings: ‘no divorce and no remarriage.’ If Jerome had written excepta in Matthew 19:9, and if we knew from his writings that he believed that Jesus did make an exception for divorce in the case of fornication/adultery, then Jerome would have been our very first solid witness to Erasmus’s doctrine. Taken in isolation from what he believed, Jerome’s term nisi could be read either for or against an exception, and it is his rejection of an exception for divorce that is critical to understand how he interpreted the term nisi, and how we should understand his translation of the Greek text in front of him.

In Matthew 5:32 Jerome correctly used excepta, whereas Erasmus did not understand the different teaching that Jesus taught in these two places, so he used nisi, to harmonise the two places. In this he may have been misled by Codex Leicestrensis,54 which has imported the so-called exception clause of 5:32 into 19:9, and done away with the original text of 19:9.55

Thirdly, the Roman Catholic church had a single tradition going right back to the early Church Fathers which did not recognise the dissolution of a lawful marriage, and this was Jerome’s belief also, so he would hardly translate the Greek to create an exception for fornication/adultery. How could such a universal ban on divorce arise, and be a fixture in the mind of the early Church Fathers, if it did not go back to Jesus’ own teaching?

54 We know that Erasmus examined this Codex during his three-year stay in Cambridge, between 1513 and 1515, and he mentions it in his Annotations.

55 The same textual error appears in Codex Vaticanus.
Misinformation regarding Church Fathers’ support for Erasmus’s ‘exception clause’

Reliance is placed on English translations of the works of the early Church Fathers, pre-Nicene and post-Nicene, but these translations were made in the light of the Authorized Version which had followed Erasmus’s text at Matthew 5:32 and 19:9. Given that all English versions were in support of Erasmus’s text it was no wonder if the original texts of the Fathers would be brought into line with the new Protestant doctrines. It is doubtful if any of the following translations can be trusted, as they are all direct quotations from the KJV. One would need to see the original Greek or Latin transcriptions of each man’s works, and have the manuscripts dated, before one could trust the present English translations.

1. **Clement** of Alexandria (ca. 195)—“You shall not put away your wife except for the cause of fornication” (Roberts and Donaldson 1995, 2.379). I have shown that this ET cannot be trusted.

2. **Tertullian** (ca. 207): Jesus prohibits divorce “except for the cause of fornication” (Ibid. 4.45). Again, Christ “permits divorce when the marriage is spotted with unfaithfulness” (Ibid. 3.405). He allows “divorce for no cause, except one” (Ibid. 4.66).

3. **Novatian** (ca. 235): Christ “said that a wife must not be put away, except for the cause of adultery” (Ibid. 5.589).

4. **Origen** (ca. 245): The Savior does not at all permit “the dissolution of marriages for any other sin than fornication alone” (Ibid. 9:511).
   “For confessedly he who puts away his wife when she is not a fornicator, makes her an adulteress.” (Commentary on Matthew 14 [a]) The ‘exceptive’ clause is taken from Mt 5:32.

5. **Basil the Great** (375): “The Lord said, ‘If any one leave his wife, saving for the cause of fornication, he causes her to commit adultery.’” (Amphilochius 199 [a]) The ‘exceptive’ clause is taken from Mt 5:32.

When it is known that the manuscript used to translate Clement of Alexandria’s works is a 16th century manuscript, and that there is only one manuscript of his works younger than it, we are talking about a gap of over 1,000 years between the original text and the oldest known copy of his work. What scribal errors accrued in that long line of transmitting his works and ideas? What harmonising tendencies and conflations were there when it came to translating his Greek into Latin, especially when Clement was quoting Scripture?

If the oldest manuscript we had of Matthew’s Gospel was dated to 1000 years after he wrote it, could we trust it? This is what we have to ask ourselves when it comes to the writings of the ante-Nicene Fathers, especially in the light of Jerome’s translation of Matthew 5:32 and 19:9 which are both open to misinterpretation. If you come looking to manoeuvre Jesus to support divorce, then He can be manipulated to do so. What is crucial is Jerome’s own understanding of what Jesus taught on the issue of divorce, and he is against divorce, and he is against remarriage. This suggests that his use of nisi was never intended to create an exception, but should be taken at its face value to mean ‘if not over fornication.’

The conclusion of the matter is this

I have examined the foundation of the claim that Irenaeus had the same Greek text as Erasmus, and discovered that the claim rested on just two manuscript copies of his works. Both manuscripts are over 1,000 years later than the time Irenaeus wrote. When I examined the manuscript on which the modern translation of his works was based I discovered it was not a
direct quotation of any known Greek text of Matthew 19:9, nor was it in agreement with Erasmus’s Greek text. Rather it was a conflation of two distinct readings. One was taken from Matthew 5:32 and the other was taken from Matthew 19:9. This fact is hidden in the English translation of Irenaeus’s works.

The lesson we can draw from this is that the foundation of each quotation of any early Church Father must be closely examined to see how old are the manuscripts on which the English translations depend. Until this information is known and thoroughly examined and a full textual apparatus drawn up for the original wording of each Church Father’s work, we can no longer trust any translation of the works of the early Church Fathers, which are quoted as though this work had been done.

The examination of Irenaeus’s work, in this article, has been a salutary lesson not to take any modern translation of a Church Father’s work for granted. They all come under suspicion as a result of this test case.

The other factor that must be taken into account is that the surviving works of the early Church Fathers come from Gentile Christian church fathers. We do not have the works of any early Jewish Christian church fathers, which has created an imbalance. Everything is seen through the eyes of non-Jews, and this may account for the ignorance in understanding the Jewish background that pervades Matthew’s Gospel.

When the Jewish background is taken into account this brings to light a new insight into how the Jews understood Jesus’ definition of ‘every cause.’ This new insight strengthens the ‘no divorce and no remarriage’ teaching that the Holy Spirit guided Mark and Luke to give to the Gentile world. Matthew said the same thing to a Jewish audience. The betrothal interpretation is an irrelevant distraction, because Matthew is saying exactly the same thing as Mark and Luke with no additional information, and with no exception clauses.

An observation

It could well be that Erasmus misunderstood Jerome’s use of nisi in Matthew 19:9 and thought it meant the same as excepta, which Jerome used in Matthew 5:32. Erasmus informs us in one of his letters that he clarified the meaning of the text in 600 places, and it would appear that his addition of εἰ before μὴ was one of those ‘clarifications.’ There are over 1,700 manuscripts of Matthew’s Gospel dating from AD 350 to 1500, but in not a single one of them is there the addition of εἰ that Erasmus added to the text. He added the word with no authority from the three manuscripts that he used to compile his text of the four Gospels. Consequently, he added εἰ on his own authority, thinking he was ‘clarifying’ what Jesus said, even though he knew perfectly well that this was not what Jerome believed (because he was editing Jerome’s works at the time he put his first edition of the Greek NT together). Nor did Erasmus’s ‘exceptional clauses’ agree with what the Roman Catholic Church taught consistently.

Understanding why Erasmus ‘clarified’ the divorce texts

Erasmus was deeply affected by the state of marriage in his day, and he witnessed a lot of hardship and degrading unions. He was a humanist at heart, and he desperately wanted to see divorce become a doctrine of the Roman Catholic Church, of which he was a son. So there is that factor to bear in mind.

Next, we can sympathise with Erasmus’s addition of εἰ because when you remove it the text becomes difficult to understand, for it would read, ‘not over fornication.’ It is not immediately apparent what this is referring to.

Given that there was some ambiguity in the way that some early Church Fathers understood the Greek words μὴ ἐπὶ τοπορεῖα ‘not over fornication,’ to mean a husband could divorce his wife for adultery/fornication, but could not remarry under any circumstances, it was tempting to create a text that would permit divorce for fornication. The early Church Fathers were clear that there could be no remarriage following a divorce/separation.

It is well understood that practices, ceremonies, and rituals, will always be more stable than interpretations. If Jesus initiated no remarriage following a separation, this would soon develop into a tradition, and then into a set custom, and this custom would become embedded in the life of the Church universal, even if the interpretation that should have gone with it didn’t, due to heavy periods of severe persecution and disruption.

It would appear that once the Jewish influx into the Church dwindled, and the Gentile element or proportion became the majority, the key to understanding the Gospel of Matthew, which was written for the Jew, faded or was lost.

Now Jesus in Mark and Luke set out His doctrine very clearly that there were no grounds for divorce and every remarriage was an adulterous affair. Instinctively, the Early Church recognised that this was the true position of Jesus on the issue of divorce and remarriage. Consequently, the Jews must have been told the same thing in Matthew’s Gospel. But how can the words ‘not over fornication’ mean that there were no grounds for divorce and every remarriage was an adulterous affair?

The answer was very simple once one took into account that Jesus was asked by Jews (not Gentiles) a question regarding the law of God. He was asked if it was lawful to divorce a wife for every cause. Because Jesus was addressing Jews, and because He was asked a legal question, Jesus addressed Jews with a legal answer. They knew that the law did not allow divorce for adultery or fornication. So there was no problem there. Both Jesus and the Pharisees were agreed that it was unlawful to get a divorce on the grounds of adultery or fornication. The question then turned on whether it was lawful to get a divorce for a non-fornication cause, and it was at this point that Jesus announced that if any Jew standing in front of Him divorced his wife on the grounds of a non-fornication issue, it was an unlawful thing to do, and the divorce did not dissolve his marriage, and if he divorced his wife and remarried, he was committing adultery against his ‘divorced’ wife.

The Jews knew that God made it unlawful to punish adultery/fornication with divorce. Now they heard the Son of God make it unlawful to punish non-adultery causes with divorce. So, together, the first two Persons of the Trinity abolished divorce on any grounds for any reason, for all time to come. In this way all three Gospels are teaching the same thing.

In effect what Jesus did was use a negative phrase (‘not over fornication’) to identify the positive causes that He would not allow divorce for. There were literally hundreds of non-sexual sins/faults that a wife could commit, any one of which could be used by a hard-hearted husband to get rid of her. Jesus was not going to go through this long list of non-sexual causes condemning them one by one, instead He cleverly encapsulated this multitude of causes by saying, anyone who divorces his wife over a non-fornication cause was doing so unlawfully. The answer is so simple, seen in this light.

Jesus’ use of simple arithmetic summed up His position with mathematical precision. The Jews were faced with a simple sum to do in their heads. ‘Take away adultery and fornication and what are you left with?’ The answer staring them in the face was, ‘Non-adulterous and non-fornication causes.’ Back came Jesus’ mathematical logic, ‘Then I am telling you now that if you get a divorce over non-fornication issues, is it lawful.’ The Jews knew that God never gave them permission to divorce their wives ‘over non-fornication’ issues, despite the efforts of the rabbis to make Deuteronomy 24:1-3 say so. Deuteronomy was descriptive, not prescriptive, which meant that the Jews had no law justifying divorce as coming from God.

The best interpreters of Jesus’ answer in Matthew 19:9 were the Jews, because they lived under the Law. Once they became a minority as the Church expanded and the Gentiles poured into
the Church in their vast hordes, the key to understanding what Jesus meant when He said, “whoever divorces his wife over a non-fornication issue” was lost.

The Church was left with only Matthew’s words, and his words, taken out of their Jewish legal context, appeared to say to the ignorant Gentile Christian that it was not lawful to divorce for a non-fornication issue, but it was lawful to divorce for a fornication issue. But the Christian Jews knew that God did not allow them to divorce their wives for adultery/fornication, and this, they rightly judged, would carry over into Jesus’ teaching. So no Christian Jew would have argued that a Christian could get a divorce for adultery. And given Jesus’ ban on divorce for non-fornication issues, he would never accept that a Christian could get a divorce over a non-adulterous issue. It would not make sense to him. His history told him that Moses connived to permit them to divorce their wives only over non-fornication issues, but now Jesus had cut off these issues as grounds for a divorce.

Given this Jewish legal context to Jesus’ answer to a legal question we can encapsulate His answer as follows:

Now I say to you that who, for instance, may have divorced his wife—not over fornication which is punished by death—and may have married another woman, he becomes adulterous by marrying her. And the man having married a divorced wife, he becomes adulterous by marrying her.

We can put the grounds for divorce that Jesus is condemning in a positive format:

Now I say to you that who, for instance, may have divorced his wife over a non-fornication cause and may have married another woman, he becomes adulterous by marrying her. And the man having married a divorced wife, he becomes adulterous by marrying her.

That Jesus has closed off the only loophole in the Torah that the Jews had been in the habit of using to get a divorce, would have been obvious to the Jew who first heard Jesus’ teaching, but it is not so obvious to Gentile Christians, even today, who continue to misunderstand the phrase Jesus used, and prefer to see it as a loophole to get a divorce for fornication/adultery.

POSTSCRIPT

MS L was collated by Joseph [Giuseppe] Müller for Gulielmi Dindorfii [Wilhelm Dindorf] (1802-1883).\(^{57}\)

Three facsimiles of this manuscript can be found in older works.

First, in the catalogue of Angelo Maria Bandini (1726-1803), Catalogus codicum manuscriptorum bibliothecae Mediceae Laurentianae (4 vols. Florentiae, 1774-77; reprinted, Leipzig, 1961), I. p. 12f. Taf. I. 1 (p. 82) giving an extract from Bk 2.1 [and not 3.11 as titled].\(^{58}\)

\(^{57}\) For a description of MS L see Gulielmi Dindorf, Clementis Alexandrini opera (4 vols; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1869), vol. 1, p. xvi.f.

\(^{58}\) The facsimile text is taken from Strom. Bk II.A, lines 1-6 (ἐξης . . . προγενεστέρων), as transcribed in Dindorf’s edition (vol. 2. p. 145) and Stätlin Bk III. 1, 1. (ed. Früchtel; 1960, p. 113). The spelling of βαρβαρόν is given as μαρβαρόν (line 1) in the facsimile, but μ for β is often found in manuscripts belonging to f1 and f13 (Caesarean Text). The same word is repeated in Bk IV. 1. (Dindorf II. 315. line 9 of text) (Potter 564) in Vitelli’s facsimile 107, as also ειμολὴν is written for
Second, in *The Palaeographical Society. Facsimiles of Manuscripts and Inscriptions* (London, 1884-1894), Series II. vol. II. pl. 107. The extract covers the end of *Strom. III. Bk III*. and the beginning of Bk IV.


εἰσβολὴν (Dindorf II. 315. line 13 of the text), and in Vitelli’s facsimile at Bk VI. XVI. (Dindorf III. 230. 144 lines 18ff.) (Potter 814) where we have εἰσβολὴν (for εἰσβολοῦν), μεταβολὰς (for μεταβολοῖς), εἰμίσασθαι (for εἰμίσασθαι), αὐθινός (for αὐθηνός), εἰκοσά (for εἰκοσᾶ), ἡμὶς (for ἡμῆς), ἐμισάσσαι (for ἐμισάσσαι), εἰμὶ (for εἰμὶ), and εἰμίσασθαι (for εἰμίσασθαι) (2x). These are not noted in otherwise model transcriptions. In the second marginal note of this facsimile the spelling is εἰμὶσάσθαι. The contracted κ[aι] in the 1st and 3rd marginal notes are close to those found in some parts of Codex Vaticanus (B). The *nomina sacra* of ὡς (θεὸς) occurs twice (cf. Dindorf III. 230 line 23; 231 line 13). Δοξάδις is contracted to δοξ (as is usual in biblical texts) (Dindorf III. 232. line 4). This is not noted in Vitelli’s transcription. Dindorf replaced MS L’s δε φανεισις with εκφαινει from Philo (Dindorf, III. 230, last line). His footnotes reveal how often he departs from the reading of MS L, which does not bode well for his resultant text of what Clement may have written. As in biblical MSS, the first letter of the first full line of a new paragraph is outdented and enlarged, at the start of sect. 145 (Dindorf III. 231, line 15).

59 The printed *Indices to Facsimiles of Manuscripts and Inscriptions Series I. and II. 1874-1894* (London, 1901), p. 15 has a register: ‘Clement of Alexandria. Miscellanies. Greek. 11th cent. ii. 107.’ This refers to the Second Series. Vol. I., and Plate 107 is the 63rd item from the front. (This series should not be confused with *The New Palaeographical Society’s Facsimiles*, [London, 1913-1930]). The entry reads: “The Στρωματεῖς or Miscellanies of Clement of Alexandria. Vellum; 338 leaves, measuring 10 ¾ by 8 inches; with 31 lines in a page. Written in the 11th century. In quires generally of eight leaves, ruled, but faintly, on one side with a hard point. Written in minuscules in a flowing hand, with moderate use of contractions. The occurrences of many large forms of letters, rising above the line, may be observed. There are some marginal notes in small uncials.” The text of the facsimile is taken from *Strom. Bk III. XVIII. 110* (Dindorf, II. 313, lines 3-14 (i.e., to the end of Bk III), and Bk IV. I.1. (Dindorf, II. 315, lines 1-14/ Potter 563-64). The writing of iota subscript as a full letter, as in τιμίοι for τιμίοι is also commonly found in f1 and f13 ms, as is the contraction of και to s with a grave accent (line 6). Transposition errors are corrected by the scribe by means of σ, β (written as μ), Γ, over the letters (line 9), and Dindorf has gone with the correction, but footnoted the exact reading of MS L. The bar Nu is used at the end of a line (line 11). The original was εμπεριλήψεται and the syllable –εἰφ— was corrected (superscript)(by the original hand, it would seem) to read εμπεριλήψεται, as noted by Dindorf (II. 315 n). Occasionally Dindorf will insert final Nu where it is not in the MS, as in παραστήσαμεν(v) (line 8 of text) without any footnote notice. Occasionally he will depart from MS L and go with Sylburg’s text (Dindorf II. 315, line 12 of the text), but, fortunately, these changes are footnoted. There is one nomina sacra of θυ (for θεοῦ).


61 Vitelli gives the following details about MS L (Laur. 5, 3, c. 287; 11th cent.). Dimensions M. 0,267 x 0,196, with 29-31 lines per page; 388 pages (some mutilation). The facsimile text runs from και την παλαιαν επιγραφογον το
APPENDIX I

HOW TO CRITIQUE WORKS ON DIVORCE

This brief document examines the quickest way to assess any author’s position on the lawfulness of divorce and remarriage, from a conservative-evangelical point of view. When we are on a car journey there are many side roads that we can take to leave the main highway. It is the same with the study of divorce. This document outlines five key forks in the road where scholars have deviated from a conservative-evangelical highway and have ended up with a non-evangelical position as regards Jesus’ doctrine of forgiveness. I have used these five, potentially misleading routes as a template for assessing every new work dealing with the subject.

Anyone who follows the recommended route outlined below and is fully aware of the dangers at each of the five forks in the road and knows which choice to make will find that they arrive at a destination that does full justice to Jesus’ teaching on divorce and remarriage, and forgiveness, without adding to, or subtracting from, God’s Word, and without compromising a fully Reformed doctrine of the inspiration and inerrancy of God’s Word, as set out in the Majority (Universal) Greek New Testament.

Be warned in advance what to do when you come across five wrongs turns-offs in your journey through life. Here are brief signposts:

1. Do not go down the route of saying that God provided for divorce in Deuteronomy 24:1-3.
2. Do not accept the Greek text of Erasmus which added the word ‘except’ to God’s Word in Matthew 19:9.
3. Do not accept that Matthew 5:32 and Matthew 19:9 are saying the same thing.
4. Do not use the opinions of the early Church Fathers to cancel out the written Word of God.
5. Do not accept that the dispute between Hillel and Shammai had anything to do with the Pharisees’ question in Matthew 19 and Mark 10. Do not follow rabbinic exegesis to cancel out the Spirit’s teaching.

If you can avoid each of these potentially fatal wrong turn-offs from the direct route mapped out by Jesus then you stand a chance of getting to the end of your short life without having been robbed of the truth about divorce and remarriage. All five of these wrong turn-offs merge further on in their routes into one broad road leading to destruction.

I.1. DESCRIPTION OR PRESCRIPTION?

1. Regarding Deut 24:1-4. If this is the proof text that God has given permission to all human beings everywhere, in all dispensations, to divorce their wives for ‘every cause,’ then this interpretation will make it impossible for its supporter ever to come to a knowledge of the truth. And even if some try to modify (that is, restrict) the universality of divorce (that Deut 24:1-4 is believed to advocate) in the light of Jesus’ intervention in history, this modification is what will hold the author in bondage to a doctrine of divorce of his own making, for others will modify it.
their way, and everybody will do what is right in his own eyes (as the schools of Hillel and Shammai illustrate). Once committed to a doctrine of divorce for a lawfully consummated marriage, however modified it may be, it is virtually impossible to escape from this mind-set, because it is the mind-set of someone who does not have the Spirit of Christ actively dwelling in them, or who has followed a false teaching/teacher.

QUESTION: How do you recognise quickly the wrong interpretation of Deuteronomy 24:1-4? Look at 24:1. It will read (as in the AV/KJV): “then let him write her a bill of divorcement.” This ET presents God as the speaker, and presents God saying to every hard-hearted man (in all ages, and until the end of the world), “I give you permission to divorce your wife for any cause you care to think fit. And after you have dissolved your marriage, I give you permission to marry another virgin, and if you do not like her I give you permission to divorce her, and take a third wife, and a fourth wife, and so on and on, until you find a wife that you like. The only thing I do not want you to do is to remarry one of your past wives. This is the only restriction I put on your quest to find a suitable helpmeet.” Here God is misrepresented as prescribing (hence the term prescriptive) how divorce is to be carried out among His people.

QUESTION: How do you recognise quickly the correct interpretation of Deuteronomy 24:1-4? Go to 24:1. It will read: “and he writes her a bill of divorcement.” This ET, which must begin with ‘and’ (not ‘then’) presents God as the speaker, but here He is describing something that He strongly disapproves of. This comes out if 24:4 begins with ‘then,’ as in: “then her former husband who divorced her must not take her back again.” In other words vv. 1-3 are taken up describing a practice that God disapproves of, and v. 4 is where He displays His anger against this universal custom of divorce that is common throughout the entire world, because it is endemic in all societies, all cultures, all nations and tribes and local communities. It is as common as sin; and it can no more be eradicated from human society than sin can be. God put up with sin and divorce during the Mosaic dispensation; but He has a clear plan to introduce a new dispensation, and a new Kingdom, in which these two evils will not be able to exist. This era came into being when Jesus announced, “You must be born again to enter the Kingdom of God.” Those born again into this new Kingdom do not divorce and do not sin (wilfully).

Every author gives away his final position on divorce by the way he prefers to translate Deuteronomy 24:1-4. It is the second place I go to when I examine any work on the subject of divorce and remarriage.

1.2. ERASMIAN AND NON-ERASMIAN SOLUTIONS


QUESTION: How do you recognise quickly the wrong interpretation of Matthew 19:9? If the ET reads: “except for fornication,” then the author is a supporter of Erasmus, who added a word to Scripture to put divorce into the teaching of Jesus. Because the AV/KJV dominated the English-speaking world for 400 years, its ET of Deuteronomy 24:1-4 and Matthew 19:9 have controlled the thinking of readers and scholars alike. It is the default position, and so it became the consensus view. It is very difficult to shift it, now that divorce has come inside the Church from the world.

QUESTION: How do you recognise quickly the correct interpretation of Matthew 19:9? If the ET reads: “not over fornication,” then the author is not a supporter of Erasmus, and has removed the word he added to Scripture. Any of the following ETs bring out Jesus’ original teaching on divorce as spoken to His fellow-countrymen: (1) not over fornication which was punished by death (McFall), (2) not over fornication (Darby Bible; W. B. Godbey; Conservative Version), (3) for any other cause than the loss of her virtue (Basic English Bible), (4) for any cause other than her
unfaithfulness (Good News Translation), (5) for any reason other than her unfaithfulness (God’s Word® Translation; (6) not on [the ground of] fornication (J. B. Rotherham), and (7) for any reason except her unfaithfulness (Weymouth N.T.).

What all these English translations have in common is that they have correctly isolated non-fornication issues as the grounds for divorce in Jesus’ content-identity phrase ‘not over fornication,’ because they have honestly translated the Greek text in front of them. However, it is not at all clear whether the committees or individuals who produced these ETs were aware that the Pharisees had not changed God’s capital punishment for fornication, so that divorce could not be obtained for adultery or fornication in Jesus’ time. The modern reader needs to know this background information if he is not to create an exception where no exception existed in the mind of the Lord Jesus. It is for this reason that I have translated Matthew 19:9 as: “. . . not over fornication which was punished by death.” It was easier for Jesus to refer to all non-fornication causes using this expression, than give a long list of non-fornication causes that He is about to condemn. He was a master of conciseness and precision. Jerome’s Latin has nisi ‘not if,’ and reads: “whoever divorces his wife if not for fornication, . . .” which, given that Jerome did not accept remarriage after divorce, means that he has identified non-fornication causes as the target of Jesus’ condemnation. In this he disagrees with the modern, Erasmian position.

Speaking for myself, I recognise that Matthew wrote his Gospel specifically for his own fellow-countrymen. It was addressed to Jews, not to Gentiles, and that is the key to understanding and to interpreting the biblical record of what Jesus said regarding divorce. The solution is very simple. No Jew was permitted by God to divorce his wife for fornication. Every divorce was obtained by the Jews for non-fornication causes. Jesus grouped these non-fornication causes under the phrase “not over fornication.” God the Father banned divorce for fornication; God the Son banned divorce for non-fornication causes. Together, they banned divorce from the earth for all time to come. QED.

Every author gives away his final position on divorce by the way he prefers to translate Matthew 19:9. It is the first place I go to when I examine any work on the subject of divorce and remarriage. In a matter of seconds the author’s position is revealed to be either Erasmian or non-Erasmian. The next step is to see how the author translates Deuteronomy 24:1-4. The author may not follow the AV/KJV, in which case he cannot trace divorce back to Moses, so he will go to the O.T. prophetical literature and justify divorce as a legitimate institution because God used it as an analogy of His relationship with Israel. “If God used it then it cannot be a sin for humans to use it,” goes the argument, but this is to use figurative language to establish a biblical doctrine. Is God a rock because He likens Himself to such?!

I.3. TWO DISTINCT TEACHINGS

3. Regarding the separate teaching in Matthew 5:31-32 and 19:3-9. All authors can be divided into two positions.

(1) Those who recognise that Jesus is teaching two different things in Matthew 5 and Matthew 19; and

(2) Those who are ignorant that Jesus is teaching two different things in Matthew 5 and Matthew 19.

The vast majority are in the ignorant position. This position treats both passages as though Jesus is making an exception to His total ban on divorce for any cause, in both places.

Those in position (1) recognise that there is a genuine exemption clause in Matthew 5, but there is no exception clause in Matthew 19. This position puts the exemption clause in Matthew 5 in the context of Jesus’ blame theology. Jesus blames the man who divorces his wife for any cause (sexual or non-sexual) and thus forces her into a position of sleeping with another man through a remarriage, which is adultery in Jesus’ eyes, but not in the eyes of the Jews.
In Jesus’ blame theology, her sin of adultery (when she remarries) will be blamed on the first husband, and not on his wife, whom he divorced. However, the exemption from blame comes into play if the divorced wife committed adultery or fornication before he divorced her, or if she became a prostitute after he divorced her. In these cases of fornication, the first husband will not be held accountable, because she sinned against her own conscience.

Blame theology comes into its own where a divorce culture exists, and where it is believed (though wrongly) that divorce dissolves a lawfully consummated marriage. If the divorcer and the divorced believe they truly revert to being single again after a divorce bill has passed between the two, and the divorced wife sincerely believes she is doing a legitimate thing in remarrying another man, then Jesus shields her from the penalty for her remarriage, and blames the adultery of her remarriage on her first husband.

The introduction of a blame theology was a completely new doctrine, as it affected the custom of divorce. It had never been discussed by the rabbis, or by the schools of Hillel and Shammai. It is nowhere mentioned in the Mishnah nor in the Talmuds. They are all ignorant of such a doctrine.

Blame theology is not discussed in any modern treatments of divorce and remarriage. The reason for this oversight has been the way those in the ignorant category approach the text. They come to it with blinkers on. They are looking solely to see if the words can be read as a loophole to Jesus’ absolute ban on divorce for any reason. It is, sadly, a case of ‘Seek and you shall find’ what you come to the text to expect to find. In ignorance, the two, so-called exception clauses in Matthew 5 and Matthew 19 are ignorantly assumed to be addressing the same exception to permit divorce for fornication.

The cause of this confusion is twofold. (1) Ignorance in reading the text itself, coupled with ignorance of the different Greek words used in the two places, and (2), conflating what the Spirit said to the Gentiles with what He said to the Jews. This merging of the two cultural backgrounds, by Gentile teachers, was a fatal mistake. If the merging had been done by Jews then they would never have made the fatal mistake that some early, Gentile, Church Fathers made.

I.4. THE LEGACY OF THE CHURCH FATHERS

4. The legacy of the early Church Fathers. Unfortunately, part of the confusion left behind by the early, non-Jewish Church Fathers is still in place to this day. The Gospel of Matthew should have been read within a Christian Jewish context; and the Gospels of Mark and Luke should have been read within a Christian Gentile context, and kept distinct, which would have led to the discovery that Jesus was as absolute about His ban on divorce when speaking to the Jews, as He was when speaking through the Spirit to the Gentiles in Mark and Luke.

The confusion among the early Gentile Church Fathers was caused when they ignored the Jewish background of the Gospel of Matthew, and became confused over their harmonisation of the divorce texts. Because these three Gospels were predominantly commented on by Gentile Church Fathers, their commentaries blinkered and channelled the thinking of all who followed in their wake. They lifted out the Jewish-orientated clauses in Matthew and metaphorically pasted them into what Mark and Luke said to the Gentile nations (Greek and Roman), and the inevitable result was confusion. Their error has been repeated by all who have followed, sheep-like, in their

62 It would have been inappropriate for Matthew to incorporate Mark 10:12 into his Gospel, as it would have been inappropriate for Mark to incorporate Matthew’s content-identity phrase ‘not for fornication’ into his Gospel. Because these two Gospels were written for different cultures, each spoke directly to the target culture in such a way as to leave both cultures in no doubt about Jesus’ absolute ban on divorce for any reason.
trails. Today, the untaught repeat the same methodological mistake that the early Church Fathers made.

The lesson from church history is to interpret Matthew’s statements within a Jewish setting and a Jewish context, and do not attempt to harmonise the Synoptic Gospels as a first step. When Jesus’ answer is interpreted in terms of how the Jews lived under the Law, and how the Greeks and Romans lived without the Law, it will be appreciated that divorce for adultery was never a lawful option for the Jews, but it was a lawful option for the Greeks and Romans whom God allowed to live under their own laws. Through Mark and Luke, Jesus informed Greeks and Romans alike that divorce on any grounds was banned for ever.

If the early Church Fathers had held back harmonising the statements in Mark and Luke with the statements in Matthew, and had, through this more cautious procedure, discovered that Jesus made no exception for divorce in Matthew’s Gospel, then they would never have made the blunder that many of them did in allowing divorce (which most of them viewed as a temporary separation) for fornication/adultery. What united them, however, was their insistence that there could be no remarriage following a ‘divorce.’ This must have come through to them from the earliest traditions, or ethics, as we would expect, because practices transmit longer and more faithfully than their interpretations.

The procedure of most Western commentators is to merge the statements on divorce in the three Gospels, and treat them together in one place. This is to repeat the mistake of the past. It is a methodological error to exegete Matthew’s statements alongside those of Mark and Luke. This must lead to confusion in both the author’s mind and in his readers’ apprehension of the true situation and context in which these statements were made. Context is paramount in conjunction with the requirements of the target audience.

Speaking for myself, it was only when I looked at Matthew’s statement on divorce in Matthew 19:9 in total isolation from those in Mark and Luke, and after I had removed Erasmus’s addition of ἐνί before μη, and put myself in the sandals of those who stood in Jesus’ presence, that the Jewish setting of Jesus’ reply to the Pharisees proved to be the key to unlock its interpretation.

This interpretation meant that the Betrothal interpretation became obsolete, unnecessary, and a hindrance to discovering the truth, because this explanation was created specifically to account for Erasmus’s insertion of the exception clause in Matthew 19:9, which the early proponents of the Betrothal solution assumed to be part of Jesus’ teaching on divorce. How wrong they were, but they can be forgiven because (as Paul said) they did it in ignorance. However, no modern supporter of the Betrothal solution can plead ignorance any longer. No textual scholar, worthy of the name, would ever accept Erasmus’s addition as the original Greek text of Matthew 19:9. The Betrothal ‘house’ had been built on Erasmus’s sand; the truth must be built on Matthew’s original text. With the collapse of the Betrothal house, where can conservative-evangelicals go to preserve the truth that Mark and Luke state very clearly, and yet account for the so-called ‘exception clauses’ in Matthew’s Gospel?

I.5. THE SCHOOLS OF HILLEL & SHAMMAI

5. The Schools of Hillel and Shammai. We know nothing about the teaching of Hillel and Shammai, who probably died before the birth of Jesus, but even that is not known for certain. There is no direct connection between them and the Schools of Hillel and Shammai. What little evidence we have about these two schools suggests that they came into existence after the destruction of the Temple in A.D. 70. Both schools belong to the sect of the Pharisees. The Mishnah, or Oral Torah, only reached a written form many generations after the time of Jesus, and after the era it purports to write about, and only from memory. The Babylonian Talmud was composed about 450 years after the death of Jesus, and it, too, is based on memory.
We have no evidence at all for the suggestion that the Schools of Hillel and Shammai existed in Jesus’ day. Consequently, we have no warrant to assume that the Pharisees who questioned Jesus in Matthew 19 belonged to either school.

The likelihood is that the Jews in Jesus’ day were fiercely loyal to God in obeying His every command, and had been throughout the Maccabean period and through to the Second Jewish Revolt in A.D. 132-135. Although the Romans were tenuously masters of Palestine, they were forced by the Jews to remove their image-bearing standards from Jerusalem. The Jews were so incensed at this violation of their Law that they were prepared to die for their religion in order to ensure that they got their way. The result of these religious riots was that the conquerors had to give in to their zealous, religious hostility. Nowhere else in the Roman Empire were the Romans forced to back down in the face of such implacable, national, religious fervour.

John records in his Gospel numerous occasions where the religious leaders were in total control of the national religion and had the public audacity to seek to kill religious heretics, such as Jesus. They had their own Temple police force. See John 5:16, 18 (Judea); 7:1, 19, 20, 25 (Galilee); 8:22, 37, 40; 11:53; 12:10. These twelve references to assassination attempts on Jesus’ life at the instigation of the highest religious authority had strong, religious backing in the Law of Moses, where law-breakers and blasphemers were to be stoned to death. Paul was one of these zealous defenders of the Law of Moses.

Paul was given authority from the religious leaders in Jerusalem to imprison and kill any of Jesus’ followers, which he did willing out of pure zeal for God, and to preserve the national religion from heretical views.

A woman taken in adultery would have been stoned to death at a nod from Jesus, showing that these men were keeping strictly to the commands of God. If the Roman authorities had tried to control the death penalty for breaking the Law of God they would have been sent packing with the words that Peter uttered before the Sanhedrin, “We ought to obey God rather than man” (Acts 5:29). Every Jew, to a man and boy, had nothing but contempt for every Roman soldier who would keep them from obeying God. It was within this fiercely, nationalistic defence of their religion that Jesus lived and moved and had His being. If the Roman authorities had attempted to change the Law of God and take away from the Sanhedrin their right to discipline its heretics, they would have stirred up a hornet’s nest of protest, and galvanised the entire nation to such a pitch of national anger that it could have sparked off riots nationwide, which the Romans would not have been able to quell. The Romans had to tread very carefully not to offend the religious sensibilities of the people, as represented by the Sanhedrin. So if divorce replaced the death penalty, this would have to come from the religious leaders themselves and not be forced upon them by the Romans.

It is an unproved assumption that the Roman authorities interfered in the internal affairs of the Jewish religion and could prevent the death penalty for adultery from being carried out. God commended any Israelite who took it into his own hands to inflict the death penalty for sins that He had laid down the death penalty for. So those who were prepared to stone the adulteress in John 8 would not have been sinning against God if they had carried out the stoning, because they were still living under the Law, and not under Grace, and death for adultery, Sabbath-breaking, blasphemy, etc. etc., must often have been carried out during the 1,500 years since God gave the law at Mount Sinai.

POSTSCRIPT

Another identifying characteristic of those who follow the Erasmian teaching is the absence of Jesus’ doctrine of forgiveness in their pastoral counselling. It is very rare to find a soft-hearted divorcer; they are all hard-hearted sinners, male and female. If there is a reference to forgiveness among the Erasmians it is just a token section. It has no substance.
I.6. McFall’s solution in a nutshell

Mark and Luke state Jesus’ total ban on divorce for Greeks and Romans without any exceptions.

Matthew states the same because he did not need to state that the Jews could not get a divorce for adultery and fornication, as these were punished with death, not divorce. Consequently, Jesus was able to say to the Jews, Whoever gets a divorce for a non-fornication issue, and remarries, he is an adulterer, because his first marriage has not been dissolved.

What looked like an exception in the words “not over fornication,” was misunderstood by later generations and this accounts for the confusion in handling Matthew’s record. Jesus cleverly answered the Pharisees’ question “… for all causes?” with his subtraction formula, Whoever divorces his wife, not over fornication (meaning, ‘anything besides fornication’), and marries another woman commits adultery.”
**APPENDIX J**

THE VERB ‘TO FORNICATE’ IN GREEK LITERATURE

CATEGORY A: The verb ‘to prostitute/fornicate’ used in Greek sources.

No. 1. DEATH FOR ADULTERY AND BETROTHAL FORNICATION.

Flavius Josephus (AD 37–ca. 105), *Against Apion* (Greek, ed. B. Niese; English: Loeb Class. Lib.)

Josephus was born the year Pontius Pilate left Judea (AD 36/7), so he was a contemporary witness to the punishments meted out for homosexuals, rapists of virgins, adulterers and adulteresses.

Book 2, section 199: But, then, what are our laws about marriage? That law owns no other mixture of sexes but that which nature hath appointed, of a man with his wife, and that this be used only for the procreation of children. But it abhors the mixture of a male with a male; and if any one do that, death is its punishment [Lev 20:13; 18:22, 29].

It commands us also, when we marry, not to have regard to portion [not to be influenced by dowry], nor to take a woman by violence, nor to persuade her deceitfully and knavishly; but to demand her in marriage of him who hath power to dispose of her, and is fit to give her away by the nearness of his kindred; for, says the Scripture, “A woman is inferior to her husband in all things.” (Note 1) Let her, therefore, be obedient to him; not so that he should abuse her, but that she may acknowledge her duty to her husband; for God hath given the authority to the husband.

A husband, therefore, is to lie only with his wife whom he hath married; but to have to do with another man’s wife is a wicked thing, which, if any one ventures upon, death is inevitably his punishment: no more can he avoid the same who forces a virgin betrothed to another man, or entices another man’s wife [Lev 20:10; Deut 22:22-27].

The law, moreover, enjoins us to bring up all our offspring, and forbids women to cause abortion of what is begotten, or to destroy it afterward; and if any woman appears to have so done, she will be a murderer of her child, by destroying a living creature, and diminishing human kind; if any one, therefore, proceeds to such fornication or murder, he cannot be clean.

COMPULSORY RITUAL WASHING AFTER INTERCOURSE (‘tradition of the Elders’?) Moreover, the law enjoins, that after the man and wife have lain together in a regular way, they shall bathe themselves; for there is a defilement contracted thereby, both in soul and body, as if they had gone into another country; for indeed the soul, by being united to the body, is subject to miseries, and is not freed therefrom again but by death; on which account the law requires this purification to be entirely performed.

(Note 1) A literal text is no where present in the Old Testament, but the concept certainly is (cf. Paul’s use of ‘law’ in 1 Cor 7:39).


No. 2. MARRIED WIFE COMMITTED ADULTERY AND FORNICATION Cassius Dio Cocceianus, *Historiae Romanae* (ἐμοιχεύετο) (ἐπορνεύετο)

---

63 All the material in this Appendix was obtained via the online database of Perseus, which contains 69 million Greek words.
Book 61, chapter 31: ὅτι ἡ Μεσσαλίνα ὡσπέρ οὐκ ἔξαρκοι οἱ ὁτι καὶ ἐμοιχύεστο καὶ ἐπορνεύετο τὰ τε γὰρ ἄλλα αἰσχρῶς ἐπράττε, καὶ ἐπ’ οἰκήματος ἔστων ὅτι ἐν τῷ πολέμῳ αὐτὴ τε ἐκαθέζετο καὶ τὰς ἄλλας τὰς πρώτας ἐκαθίζε, καὶ ἐπεθύμησε καὶ ἄνδρας τούτο δὴ τοῦ λόγου ἀκολουθεῖν.

Messa, as if it were not enough for her to play the adulteress (ἐμοιχύεστο) and harlot (= fornication) (ἐπορνεύετο),—for in addition to her shameless behaviour in general she at times sat as a prostitute in the place herself and compelled the other women of the highest rank to do the same,—now conceived a desire to have many husbands, that is, men really bearing that title. And she would have been married by a legal contract to all those who enjoyed her favours.

No. 3. (οὐκευθείσαι) (πορνεύεσθαι) (ἐπορνεύετο) (ἐμοιχύεσθη) (ἐπορνεύετο)
Dio Chrysostom, Orationes (ed. J. de Arnim)(πορνεύεσθαι)(ἐπορνεύετο)
speech 64, section 364: ... καὶ νομοθετικὴ, τρεῖς ἔθηκεν αὐτή τοῖς Κυπρίοις νόμους: τὴν οὐκευθείσαν κειραμένην πορνεύεσθαι: θυγατρὶ αὐτῆς ἐμοιχύεσθη καὶ τὴν κόμην ἀπεκέρασα κατὰ τῶν νόμων καὶ ἐπορνεύετο. τὸν αὐτὴν ἀποκτείνατα ἄταφον ῥίψατας: δύτερος ὦτος Δημοκράτης νόμος: τρίτος ὦτος μὴ ἀποκτείναι βοῶν ἀρότριον. διὸς δὲ αὐτὴ παῖδων ἄρρενων ὄντων, οῦ μὲν ἐπὶ τῷ βοῶν ἀποκτείναι

[Cyprus had its famous women:] just so Cyprus too had its Demonassa, a woman gifted in both statesmanship and law-giving. She gave the people of Cyprus the following three laws: a woman guilty of adultery (οὐκευθείσαι) shall have her hair (κόμην) cut off and be a harlot (πορνεύεσθαι)—her daughter became an adulteress (ἐμοιχύεσθη), had her hair cut off according to the law, and practised harlotry (ἐπορνεύετο); whoever commits suicide shall be cast out without burial—this was the second law of Demonassa; third, a law forbidding the slaughter of a plough-ox. Of the two sons which she had, the one met his death for having slain an ox, while the other, who slew himself, she refrained from burying.

No. 4. MARRIED WOMAN COMMITTED FORNICATION (ἐπορνεύετο) (οὐκευθείσης)
Lucian, Luppiter trageades (Zeus Rants) (ed. A. M. Harmon)
Vol. 2. section 52.: Τιμοκλῆς εἰρωνεύει τοὺς πρὸς ἐμέ, τιμβορύχε καὶ μιαρὲ καὶ κατάττυσι καὶ μαστίγα καὶ κάθορα; οὐ γὰρ ἴσων οὕτως μὲν πατρὸς εἰ, πῶς δὲ ἡ μῆτηρ σου ἐπορνεύετο, καὶ ὡς τὸν άδελφον ἀπεννίζασα καὶ οὐκευθείσης καὶ τὰ μειράκια διαφθείρεις, λιχνώτατε καὶ ἀνασχυντότατα; μὴ φύει δ’ οὖν, ἔως καὶ πληγᾶς παρ’ ἐμοί λαβῶν ἀπέλθης; ἢδὲ γὰρ σε τούτωι τῷ ὀστράκῳ ἀποσφάξαι παμμαίραν ὄντα.

TIMOCLES: Are you mocking me, you ghouls, you miserables, you abomination, you gallows-bird, you scum of the earth? Don’t we know who your father was, and how your mother was a courtesan (ἐπορνεύετο), and that you strangled your brother and you run after women (= you commit adultery, οὐκευθείσης) and corrupt the young, you height of all that’s lewd and shameless?

No. 5. MARRIED PROSTITUTE COMMITS ADULTERY (πεπορνευμένων) (οὐκευθείσης)
Procopius, Historia Arcana (Anecdota)
(Greek). Vol. 6, chapter 1, p. 6, line 19ff.: Ἡν τῷ Βελισαρίῳ γυνή, ἥς δὲ ἐν τοῖς ἐξηρευθεὶς λόγοις ἐμμαθήσῃ, πάσσου μὲν καὶ πατρὸς ἡμίων, ἐν τῷ Βεζαντίῳ καὶ Θεσσαλονίκῃ τὸ ἔργον τῶν ἐνδεξαμένων, ἦπλος δὲ τῶν τινος ἐν θυελέτῃ πεπορνευμένων, αὐτὴ τὰ πρότερα μάχον τινα βιωσάσα βιον καὶ τὸν τρόπον ἔξαρπωσε, φορμακεύσει τὰ παρομοῖα πολλὰ ὁμοληψία, καὶ τὴν μάθησιν τῶν οἱ άναγκαίων ποιηματίας, ἐγγυητῇ ὀστεῖν Βελισαρίῳ γυνὴ γέγονε, μήτηρ ἢδη παῖδων γενομένη πολλῶν. εὖς δὲ μὲν οὖν ἥξιον οὐκευθείσης τὸ εξ ἀρχής εἶναι,

64 In Perseus this is wrongly referenced to Speech 47.
Belisarius had a wife, whom I have had occasion to mention in the previous books; her father and grandfather were charioteers who had given exhibitions of their skill in both Byzantium and Thessalonica, and her mother was one of the prostitutes (περονευμένων) attached to the theatre. This woman in her early years lived a lewd sort of life and having become dissolute in character, not only having consorted much with the cheap sorcerers . . . later became the wedded wife of Belisarius, after having already been the mother of many children. Straightway, therefore, she decided upon being an adulteress (μοιχεύτρια) from the very start, but she was very careful to conceal this business, not because she was ashamed of her own practices . . . but because she dreaded the punishment the Empress might afflict.

No. 6. BRIDE COMMTS ADULTERY. MARRIED MAN COMMTS FORNICATION

Basil, Saint, Bishop of Caesarea, Epistulae (Greek)

(p. 112, line 1ff.) XXI. In the case of a man married (συνοικών) to a woman, whenever not being satisfied with his marriage he falls into fornication (πορνεύον), and we hold him to a longer period in his punishment; but we have no canon which subjects him to a charge of adultery (μοιχεύον), if the sin be committed against some unmarried (ἐλευφόρον ‘free’) woman; because it says, “The adulteress (μοιχάλις) polluted shall be polluted,” and shall not return (ἀναστηρέσῃ) to her husband: and “He that keepeth an adulteress is foolish and wicked.” However, he who has committed fornication (πορνεύοσι) shall not be excluded from living with his wife (καὶ ὁ κατέχων μοιχαλίδα ἄφρων καὶ ἀσβηνις. ὁ μεντὸς πορνεύον τὸν ἀποκλεισθῆσαι τής πρὸς γυναῖκα ἐστιν πρὸς συνοικήσεως). Therefore the wife will receive her husband when he returns from fornication, but the husband shall dismiss (ἀποστείσῇ) the polluted woman from his house. But the reasoning in these matters also is not easy, but the custom has so obtained.

chapter 199: XXII (p. 114, line 9ff.) ... ὡστε ἢ ... πορνεύον ἐπιγνώσαι ἐπίτιμον. ἔστι δὲ ἐν τῶσαρος ἔστιν ὀρισμένη τοῖς πορνεύουσι πρὸς ἐπίτιμον. χρῆ τῷ πρῶτῳ ἐκβάλλεσθαι τῶν προσευχῶν, καὶ

Continuation of the above (p. 112, line 17ff.). XXII. Regarding men who hold women by abduction, if they have carried off women who had been betrothed (προμεμηθευμέναι) to others, they must not be received [to take Communion] before they have separated (ἀφέλέσθαι) from them and have placed them in the power of those to whom they were originally betrothed (μισθεούμενοι), whether the latter wish to receive them or to give them up. . . . However, he who holds a wife by secret or somewhat violent seduction must acknowledge the punishment for fornication. And punishment for four years has been prescribed for fornicators (πορνεύοσι).

65 A married man who cohabited with an unmarried woman was subjected, not to the punishment of adultery (fifteen years), but to that for fornication (seven years). Cf. Canons 59 and 77. This was in accord with the Mosaic law and the Roman law, but in the Christian law any carnal intercourse in which one of the parties, either the man or the woman, is married, is adultery.
69 Cf. Canon 9 and note.
70 Basil does not use the word for ‘divorce’ but simply ‘sends away’ his wife. For how long is not stated.
No. 7. BETROTHED WIFE COMMITS FORNICATION (πορνεύσαι)
Basil, Saint, Bishop of Caesarea, Epistle
(Greek)

chapter 46 (p. 300, line 15ff.) Ετι τούτοις Μη ὁ πίπτων οὐκ ἀνισταταί; ἢ ο ἀποστρέφων οὐκ ἐπιστρέφει; διὰ τι ἀπέστρεψεν ἢ παρθένος ἀποστροφὴν ἀναιδή, καίτοιγε ὁκούοσασα Χριστοῦ τοῦ νυμφίου διὰ Ιερεμίου λέγοντος· Καὶ εἰπα μετὰ τὸ πορνεύσαι αὐτὴν ταῦτα πάντα· πρὸς με ἀναστρέψων· καὶ οὐκ ἀνέστρεψε. Μη ρητίνη οὐκ ἔστιν ἐν Γαλαάδ; ἢ ἰατρός οὐκ ἔστιν εἰκε; διὰ τι οὐκ ἀνέβη ἴσος θυγατρὸς λαού μου;

Why did the virgin turn away, a shameless turning, even though she heard Christ her spouse declare through Jeremias: “And when she had committed all these fornications (τὸ πορνεύσαι), I said: Return to me; and she did not return”? Is there no balm in Gilead?

No. 8. MARRIED FEMALE PROSTITUTES
Strabo, Geography (πορνεύειν)
(Greek) (English, ed. H.C. Hamilton, Esq., W. Falconer, M.A.)
book 8, chapter 1: πολλάς δε γαμούσιν ἄνητας παρὰ τῶν γυνέων, λαμβάνουσι τε ἀντιδιδόντες ξύος βοῶν, ὥν τὰς μὲν εὐπειθείας χαρίν τὰς δ’ ἄλλας ἡδονίς καὶ πολυτεκνίας· εἰ δὲ μὴ σωφρονεῖν ἀναγκάσασθαι, πορνεύειν ἔρεστι. θείει δὲ οὐδεὶς ἑστεφανομένοις οὐδὲ θυμῷ οὐδὲ σπένδει, οὐδὲ σφάττοις τὸ ἱερεῖον ἄλλα πνίγουσιν, ἵνα μὴ λελαβημένον ἄλλ’ ὀλόκληρν’ π.’

They marry many wives, who are purchased from their parents, and give in exchange for them a yoke of oxen. Some marry wives to possess obedient attendants, others with a view to pleasure and numerous offspring, and the wives prostitute themselves (πορνεύειν), unless chastity (σωφρονεῖν ‘to have self-control, discretion’) is enforced (ἀναγκάσασθαι) by compulsion.

No one wears a garland when sacrificing, or burning incense, or pouring out a libation. They do not stab, but strangle the victim, that nothing mutilated, but that which is entire, may be offered to the Deity.

No. 9. FORNICATION AND ILLEGITIMATE OFFSPRING
Plato, Laws
book 8, section 841d: δ καὶ δυοῖν ότερα βιασαίμεθα περὶ έρωτικών, ἢ μηδένα τολμάν μηδένος ἀπτεθαί τῶν γυναικών ἄμα καὶ ἐλευθέρων πλην γαμετής ἔστιν τού γυναικὸς, ἀθυτα δὲ παλλακῶν σπέρματα καὶ νόθα μὴ σπέρειν, μηδὲ ἄγονα ἀρρένων παρὰ φύσιν· ἢ τὸ μὲν τῶν ἀρρένων πάμπαν αφελοὶμὲθ’ ἃν, τὸ δὲ γυναικῶν, εἰ τις συγγίγνοιτο τινὶ πλήν ταῖς μετὰ θεών καὶ ιερῶν γάμων ἐλθόσαις εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν, ὀμηται εἴτε

[841d] . . . we might forcibly effect one of two things in this matter of sex-relations,—either that no one should venture to touch (ἀπτεθαί) any of the noble and freeborn, save his own wedded wife, nor sow any unholy and bastard seed in fornication, nor any unnatural and barren seed in sodomy,—or else we should entirely abolish love for males, and in regard to that for women, if we enact a law that any man who has intercourse with any women save those who have been brought to his house . . .

COMMENT: The contrast is between ‘wedded wife’ (and lawful offspring) and unwedded sex (and illegitimate children). The words “in fornication,” are supplied by the translator. They are not in the Greek.

71 Paul used the same delicate expression in 1 Cor 7:1, “It is good for a man not to touch a woman.”
No. 10. FORNICATION (πορνεύονται) IS PRE-MARRIAGE SEX
Herodotus, The Histories (Greek) (English, ed. A. D. Godley)

There are not many marvellous things in Lydia to record, in comparison with other countries, except the gold dust that comes down from Timolus. [2] But there is one building to be seen there which is much the greatest of all, except those of Egypt and Babylon. In Lydia is the tomb of Alyattes, the father of Croesus, the base of which is made of great stones and the rest of it of moulded earth. It was built by the men of the market and the craftsmen and the prostitutes (παιδίσκαι, ‘maidsens’). [3] There survived until my time five corner-stones set on the top of the tomb, and in these was cut the record of the work done by each group: and measurement showed that the prostitutes’ (παιδίσκων, ‘maidens’) share of the work was the greatest. [4] All the daughters of the common people of Lydia ply the trade of prostitutes (πορνεύονται), to collect dowries, until they can get themselves husbands; and they themselves offer themselves in marriage. [5] Now this tomb has a circumference of thirteen hundred and ninety yards, and its breadth is above four hundred and forty yards; and there is a great lake hard by the tomb, which, the Lydians say, is fed by ever-flowing springs; it is called the Gygaeian lake. Such then is this tomb.

No. 11. MALE PROSTITUTES (πεπόρνευται)
Aeschines, Against Timarchus
speech 1, section 94: καὶ τοιοὶ λογογράφος γε τις φησίν, ὁ μηχανόμενος αὐτῷ τὴν ἀπολογίαν, ἐννοτε μὲ λείψιν ἐμαυτὸ. οὐ γὰρ δὲ δοκεῖ ἐναὶ αὐτῷ δυνατὸν τὸν αὐτὸν ἀνθρώπον πεπορνεύσασι καὶ τὰ πατρῶα κατεδοκέναι· τὸ μὲν γὰρ ἠμαρτηκέναι τι περὶ τὸ σῶμα παιδός εἶναι φησί, τὸ δὲ τὰ πατρῶα κατεδοκέναι ἄνδρος. ἔτι δὲ τοὺς κατασχύνοντας αὐτοὺς μισθὸς φησὶ πράξασθαι τοῦ πράγματος· ἀποθαυμάζων όμεν περιέρχεσθαι καὶ περατεύομενος κατὰ τὴν ἀγοράν, οἷος πεπόρνευται τε καὶ τὰ πατρῶα κατεδοκένειν.

And yet a certain speech-writer who is concocting his defence says that I contradict myself; since it seems to him impossible, he says, for the same man to have been a prostitute and to have consumed his patrimony. For, he says, to have sinned against one’s own body is the act of a boy, but to have consumed one’s patrimony is that of a man. And furthermore he says that those who defile themselves exact pay for it. He therefore goes up and down the marketplace expressing his wonder and amazement that one and the same man should have prostituted himself (πεπόρνευται) and also have consumed his patrimony.

No. 12. MALE PROSTITUTES (πεπορνεύσθαι)
Aeschines, Against Timarchus
speech 1, section 70: ... αὐτὸν κατασχύνῃ πρὸς Ἑγήσανδρον, οὐ δοκεῖ ἦμιν πρὸς τὸν πόρον πεπορνεύσθαι; ἢ τίνας αὐτοὺς ύποκατοχθάναι βελεύρας παροινοῦντας
Δάρα, γε ἐξαχθήσομαι τι σαφέστερον εἰπεῖν ἢ κατὰ τὴν ἐμαυτοῦ φύσιν; ἐπιτέ μοι πρὸς τοῦ Δίος καὶ τῶν ἄλλων θεῶν, ὃς ἀνδρεῖς Ἀθηναίοι, ὅσις αὐτὸν κατηχεύει πρὸς Ἡγήσανδρον, οὐ δοκεῖ ὑμῖν πρὸς τὸν πόρνου πεπορνεύσαθι:

Shall I yield to the temptation to use language somewhat more explicit than my own self-respect allows? Tell me, fellow citizens, in the name of Zeus and the other gods, when a man has defiled himself with Hagesandrus, does not that man seem to you to have prostituted himself (πεπορνεύσαθι) to a [male] prostitute?

No. 13. MALE PROSTITUTES (πεπορνεύσαθι)
Aeschines, Against Timarchus
(Greek) (English)
speech 1, section 79: φέρε δὴ πρὸς τοῦ Δίος, εἰ, ἄσσερ περὶ τοῦ γένους, οὕτω καὶ περὶ τοῦ ἐπιπεδεύματος τούτου ἐδέσθη δοῦναι ψήφον Τιμαρχοῖν, εἰτ' ἐνοχὸς ἐστιν εἶτε μὴ, ἐκρινετο δὲ τὸ πράγμα ἐν τῷ δικαστηρίῳ, ἐισῆγετο δὲ ὡς θεμιστοκλῆς ὑπὸ τῆς νόμου ἦν, μὴ ἔχην δ' ἐκ τοῦ κόμου ἦν τοῦ ψηφίσατο μήτε ἐμοὶ κατηχομένοι μήτε ὑπὲρ ἀπολογεύσατο, οὖ δὲ κήρυξ ὑπὸ τοῦ νυνὶ παρεκτικὸς ἐμοὶ ἐπιράτα ὡς τὸ ἐκ τοῦ νυμοῦ κήρυγμα. τῶν ψήφων ἡ τετραμεθημενή, ὅτω δοκεῖ πεπορνεύσαθι Τιμαρχοῖν, ἢ δὲ πλήρης, ὅτω μή, τί ἀν ἐψηφίσασθε; ἀκριβῶς οἶδ' ὅτι κατέγνωτ' ἀν αὐτοῦ.

Come now, in God’s name! if, as on the question of birth, so on the question of these personal habits, Timarchus had to submit to a vote as to whether he is guilty of the charge or not, and the case were being tried in court and were being brought before you as now, except that it were not permitted by constitution or statute either for me to accuse or for him to defend himself, and if this crier who is now standing at my side were putting the question to you in the formula prescribed by law, “The hollow ballot for the juror who believes that Timarchus has been a prostitute, (πεπορνεύσαθι) the solid ballot for the juror who does not,” what would be your vote? I am absolutely sure that you would decide against him.

No. 14. MALE PROSTITUTES (πεπορνεύσαθι)
Aeschines, Against Timarchus
(Greek) (English)
speech 1, section 136: ἐγὼ δὲ οὕτω ἔρωτα δίκαιον ψέφω, οὕτω τοὺς κάλλει διαφέροντας φημὶ πεπορνεύσαθα, οὕτ' αὐτοὺς ἐξαρνοῦμαι μὴ οὐ γεγονέναι τ' ἐρωτικὸς, καὶ ἔτι καὶ νῦν εἶναι, τόσο τ' ἐκ τοῦ πράγματος γιγνομένας πρὸς ἐτέρους φιλονικίας καὶ μάχας οὐκ ἄρνομαι μὴ οὕχι συμβεβηκέναι μοι.

Now as for me, I neither find fault with love that is honorable, nor do I say that those who surpass in beauty are prostitutes (πεπορνεύσαθαι). I do not deny that I myself have been a lover and am a lover to this day, nor do I deny that the jealousies and quarrels that commonly arise from the practice have happened in my case.

No. 15. MALE PROSTITUTES (πόρνης) (πεπορνεύσαθαι)
Demosthenes, Against Androclitus
speech 22, section 61: καὶ προσήκειν αὐτῷ τὸ ἔκτον μέρος εἰσφέρειν μετὰ τῶν μετοίκων, τῷ δ' ἀπογράφειν ὡς 'ὑφείλετ' ἡ ἁρχής, τὸ δ' τὸ δείνα, τὸν δ' ὁμοῦ ῥήτα καὶ ἁρρῆτα κακά, ἐξῆς ἀπαντᾷς;

[61] Then do you suppose that all these men are his inveterate enemies merely because he collected this money from them? Is it not rather because he said of one of them, in the hearing of all of you in the Assembly, that he was a slave and born of slaves and ought by rights to pay the
No. 16. MALE PROSTITUTES (πεπορνευμένοι)
Aeschines, Against Timarchus
speech 1, section 119: εἰ μὴ πάντες μέµνησθε ὅτι καθ' ἕκαστον ἐνιαυτὸν ἢ βουλή πωλεῖ τὸ πορνικὸν τέλος καὶ τοὺς προσεύχεσθε τὸ τέλος ὡς εἰκάζειν, ἀλλ' ἀκριβῶς εἰδέναι τοὺς ταύτῃ χρωμένους τῇ ἐργασίᾳ. ὅποτε δὴ ὅων τετόμηκα ἀντιγράφασθαι πεπορνευμένος Τιμάρχω μὴ ἐξείναι δημηγορεῖν, ἀπαίτειν φησι τὴν πράξιν ἀυτὴν ὡς αἰτίαν κατηγόρου, ἀλλὰ μαρτυρίαν τελῶν τοῦ παρὰ Τιμάρχου τούτῳ ἐκλέξαντος τὸ τέλος.

The eminent orator Demosthenes says that you must either wipe out your laws, or else no attention must be paid to my words. For he is amazed, he says, if you do not all remember that every single year the senate farms out the tax on prostitutes, (πορνικῶν) and that the men who buy this tax do not guess, but know precisely, who they are that follow this profession. When, therefore, I have dared to bring impeachment against Timarchus for having prostituted himself, (πεπορνευμένον) in order that I may deprive him of the right to address the people in assembly, Demosthenes says that the very act complained of calls, not for an accuser's arraignment, but for the testimony of the tax-gatherer who collected this tax from Timarchus.

No. 17. MALE PROSTITUTES (πεπορνευμένων)
Aeschines, Against Timarchus
speech 1, section 155: καὶ πάλιν ὑμῖν ἀντιδίεξεις ἀνθρώπων πεπορνευμένων σίσχρως καὶ φανερῶς ὄνομα, ἵνα ὑμεῖς ἀναμνησθέντες κατανείμητε εἰς τὴν προσήκουσαν τάξιν Τιμάρχου.

I will recite to you the names of older and well-known men, and of youths and boys, some of whom have had many lovers because of their beauty, and some of whom, still in their prime, have lovers today, but not one of whom ever came under the same accusations as Timarchus. Again, I will tell over to you in contrast men who have prostituted themselves (πεπορνευμένων) shamefully and notoriously, in order that by calling these to mind you may place Timarchus where he belongs.

No. 18. MALE PROSTITUTES (πεπορνευμένους)
Aeschines, Against Timarchus
speech 1, section 159: ὑμεῖς ἴδε τοῦτ᾽ ἐρωτηθέντες ἀποκρίνασθε πρὸς ἐμὲ, εἰς ὁποτέρα τὴν τάξιν Τιμάρχου κατανείμετε, πότερα εἰς τοὺς ἐρωμένους ἢ εἰς τοὺς πεπορνευμένους. οὐκοῦ ἡ καταλπών ἢ τιλού συμμορίαν αὐτομολήσης εἰς τὰς τῶν ἐλευθέρων διαστριβάς.

To which class do you assign Timarchus—to those who are loved, or to those who are prostitutes (πεπορνευμένους)? You see, Timarchus, you are not to be permitted to desert the company which you have chosen and go over to the ways of free men.

No. 19. MALE PROSTITUTES (πεπορνευμένους)
Aeschines, Against Timarchus
speech 1, section 188: θεμαύζω δ᾽ ὑμῶν, ὡς ἄνδρες Ἀθηναῖοι, κάκειν, ἐὰν τοὺς μὲν πορνοβοσκούς μισεῖτε, τοὺς δὲ ἐκόντος πεπορνευμένους ἀφήσετε· καὶ ὄς ἔοικεν ὁ αὐτὸς οὗτος ἀνήρ ἱερωσύνη μὲν οὔδενος θεῶν κληρώσεται,
I am also surprised, fellow citizens, that you who hate the brothel-keeper propose to let the willing prostitute (περνεμένους) go free. And it seems that a man who is not to be permitted to be a candidate for election by lot for the priesthood of any god, as being impure of body as that is defined by the laws, this same man is to write in our decrees prayers to the August Goddesses in behalf of the state. Why then do we wonder at the futility of our public acts, when the names of such public men as this stand at the head of the people's decrees? And shall we send abroad as ambassador a man who has lived shamefully at home, and shall we continue to trust that man in matters of the greatest moment? What would he not sell who has trafficked in the shame of his own body? Whom would he pity who has had no pity on himself

No. 20. MALE PROSTITUTES (περνεμένους)
Aeschines, Against Timarchus
speech 1, section 189: τινὶ δ’ ὑμῶν οὐκ εὐγνωστός ἦσθιν ἡ Τιμάρχου βδελυρία; ὡσπερ γὰρ τοὺς γυμναζόμενους, κἂν μὴ παρόμεν ἐν τοῖς γυμνασίοις, εἰς τὰς εὐεξίας αὐτῶν ἀποβλέποντες γιγνάκοις, ὡς τοὺς περνεμένους, κἂν μὴ παρόμεν αὐτῶν τοῖς ἔργοις, ἐκ τῆς ἀναιδείας καὶ τοῦ βράσους καὶ τῶν ἐπιπηδεμάτων γιγνάκοις.

To whom of you is not the bestiality of Timarchus well known? For just as we recognize the athlete, even without visiting the gymnasia, by looking at his bodily vigor, even so we recognize the prostitute (περνεμένους), even without being present at his act, by his shamelessness, his effrontery, and his habits. For he who despises the laws and morality in matters of supreme importance, comes to be in a state of soul which is plainly revealed by his disorderly life

No. 21. MALE PROSTITUTES (περνεμένου)  
Demostenes, On the False Embassy  
speech 19, section 233: τούτων μὲν τοῖνυν οὐκ ἐκρίνειν Ἀισχίνης, ὅτι τὸν αὐτοῦ παῖδ’ ἐπ’ αἰσχύνη πρὸς Φίλιππον ἐπεμψεν. εἰ δὲ τίς ὃν εἰς ἡλικίας ἐτέρω βελτίων τὴν ἱδέαν, μὴ προϊδόμενος τὴν εἰς ἐκείνης τῆς ὅψεως ὑποψίαν, ἰταμώτερον τῷ μετὰ ταύτ’ ἐχρήσατο βίῳ, τούτων οὓς περνεμένουν κέρικεν

Now Aeschines never prosecuted Phryno for sending his own son to Philip with a dishonorable intention. But if a man in the bloom of his youth was more comely than others, and if, disregarding the suspicion that his personal charm might provoke, he has lived rather recklessly in later years, Aeschines must needs proceed against that man for fornication (περνεμένου).

No. 22. MALE PROSTITUTES (περνεμένους)  
Aeschines, Against Timarchus  
speech 1, section 52: καὶ παρὰ τούτων ὡς ἔτερον ἐληλυθότα, οὐκέτι δὴ πανεταῖ τὸν ἡταρικῶς, ἀλλὰ μὰ τὸν Διόνυσον οὐκ ὄδ’ ὡς δυνάσθαι περιπλέκειν ὅλην τὴν ἡμέραν καὶ περνεμένους· ὁ γὰρ ἐκεί τοῦτο καὶ πρὸς πολλοὺς πράττων καὶ μισθοῦ, αὐτῷ μοι δοκεὶ τούτω ἔνοχος εἶναι

But if, saying nothing about these bestial fellows, Cedonides, Autocleides, and Thersandrus, and simply telling the names of those in whose houses he has been an inmate, I refresh your memories and show that he is guilty of selling his person not only in Misgolas’ house, but in the house of another man also, and again of another, and that from this last he went to still another, surely you will no longer look upon him as one who has merely been a kept man, but—by Dionysus, I don’t know how I can keep glossing the thing over all day long—as a common prostitute (περνεμένου). For the man who follows these practices recklessly and with many men and for pay seems to me to be chargeable with precisely this.
No. 23. MALE PROSTITUTES (περονευμένου)
Demosthenes, *On the False Embassy*
speech 19, section 233:
... δήσεως ὑποψίας, ἰταμώτερον τῷ μετὰ ταύτ' ἐχρήσατο βίω, τούτου ὡς περονευμένου κέκρικεν.

“Or the man who has failed to perform all the military service demanded of him, or who has thrown away his shield.” And he is right. Why? Man, if you fail to take up arms in behalf of the state, or if you are such a coward that you are unable to defend her, you must not claim the right to advise her, either. Whom does he specify in the third place? “Or the man,” he says, “who has debauched or prostituted himself (περονευμένου).” For the man who has made traffic of the shame of his own body, he thought would be ready to sell the common interests of the city also. But whom does he specify in the fourth place?

No. 24. MALE PROSTITUTES (περονευμένου)
Aeschines, *Against Timarchus*
speech 1, section 154: ἔγω δὲ τί λέγω κατα Τιμάρχου, καὶ τίνα ποτ’ ἐστίν ἃ ἄντιγραμμαί; δημιουργεῖν Τιμάρχου περονευμένον καὶ τὴν πατρώαν ὦσιν κατεδηδοκότα. ὑμείς δὲ τί ὀμοιόκατε; ὑπέρ αὐτῶν ψφιείσθαι ὃν ἂν ἡ δίοξίς ἦ

What is it that I say against Timarchus, and what is the charge that I have brought? That Timarchus addresses the people, a man who has made himself a prostitute (περονευμένου) and has consumed his patrimony. And what is the oath that you have taken? To give your verdict on the precise charges that are presented by the prosecution.

No. 25. MALE PROSTITUTES
1 Corinthians 10:6-9 (πορνεύωμεν) (ἐπόρνευσαν)

[7] Neither be idolaters, as some of them were. As it is written, “The people sat down to eat and drink, and rose up to play.” [8] Neither let us commit sexual immorality (πορνεύωμεν), as some of them committed sexual immorality (ἐπόρνευσαν), and in one day twenty-three thousand fell. [9] Neither let us test the Lord, as some of them tested, and perished by the serpents.

No. 26. MALE PROSTITUTION (ἐπόρνευς)
Vol. 4. section 5: ἐπισάκων μὲν οὖν ἔτι ὅν πάνι ὤραῖον, ὡς ἔνθι χάλη ἐπὶ τις καλάκης τεχαίρεσθαι καὶ ἀκούειν τῶν διπρονεμένων, ἀνέδηδ ἐπόρνευς καὶ συνὴ ἐπὶ μισθῷ τοῖς δεομένοις. ἐν δὲ τοῖς ἀλλοῖς λαμβάνει τις αὐτῶν ἑρατίς γόης τῶν μαγείας καὶ ἐποδᾶς θεσπείους ὑπεραξομένων καὶ χάρις ἐπὶ τοῖς ἑρατίοις καὶ ἐπαγογῆς τοῖς ἐχθροῖς καὶ θεασμῶν ἀναπομπᾶς καὶ κλῆρον διαδοχᾶς.

While he [Alexander] was still a mere boy, and a very handsome one, as could be inferred from the sere and yellow leaf of him, and could also be learned by hearsay from those who
recounted his story, he trafficked freely (έπόρνευε lit. he prostituted) in his attractiveness and sold his company to those who sought it. Among others he had an admirer who was a quack, . . .


No. 27. MALE PROSTITUTE (πεπορνευκότα)
Cassius Dio Cocceianus, *Historiae Romanae*
book 6, chapter 40: γέλοια μέντοι ο Ουιτέλλιος πολλοίς παρείχεν όρόλυμε γάρ ἄνδρα σεμνοπροσωπώστα αν ταῖς δημοσίαις προσόδοις ὥν ἤδεσαν πεπορνευκότα, καὶ ἐφ ἵππου βασιλικοῦ καὶ ἐν χαμαμί πορφυρα ὃν ἢπίσταντο τοῦς ἀγωνιστάς ἰπποὺς ἐν τῇ οἰκετείᾳ ἐσθήτι ψέχοντα,

Vitellius, however, furnished many with material for amusement. They could not restrain their laughter when they beheld wearing a solemn face in the official religious processions a man whom they knew to have played the strumpet (πεπορνευκότα, ’prostituted himself’).

No. 28. MALE PROSTITUTE (πεπορνεύσθαι)
Athenaeus, *The Deipnosophists*
(Greek) (English, ed. C. D. Yonge, B.A.) (Greek, ed. Kaibel)
book 6, chapter 40: . . . Φιλοξένος δ’ ἦ Πετρνοκοτίς ἐμπεσόντος λόγου ὅτι αἱ κίχλαι τίμιαι εἰσὶ καὶ τοῦ Κορύδου παρόντος, ὡς ἐδοκεὶ πεπορνεύσθαι, ἀλλ’ ἐγώ, ἐφ’, μημονεύω ὅτε ὁ κόρυδος ὄβολον ἤμ. ἢν δὲ καὶ ὁ Φιλοξένος τῶν παρασίτων, ὡς Αξιόνικος εἴρηκεν ἐν τῷ Χαλκίδικῳ.

But Philoxenus, who was surnamed Pternocopis, when it happened to be mentioned that, too, while Corydus was present, who was said formerly to have prostituted himself (πεπορνεύσθαι)—”I,” said he, “can recollect when a lark (κόρυδος) only cost an obol.” (And Philoxenus too was a parasite, as Axionicus has stated in his Chalcidian. But the statement is thoroughly proved.)

No. 29. MALE PROSTITUTE (πεπορνευκύιας)
book 5, chapter 302: γίνεται δὲ εἰν τοῖς πράγμασιν, ἐπάν τις αἰσχρὰ καὶ δύσρητα ἀναφανθὸν λέγη, καθάπερ ο Ἱμιανδρός κατηγορῶν ὡς πεπορνευκύιας τὴν λεικανίδα καὶ τοὺς ὄβολους καὶ τὴν ψίθου καὶ πολλὴν τινα τοιαύτην δυσφημίαν κατήρασεν τῷ δικαστηρίῳ.

Side by side with the forcible style there is found, as might be expected, a corresponding faulty style, called ‘the repulsive.’ It occurs in the subject-matter when a speaker mentions publicly things which are disgusting and defile the lips. The man, for instance, who accused Timandra of having lived a wanton life (πεπορνευκύιας, lit. ‘having lived fornicatingly’), bespattered the court with a description of her basin, her obols, her mat, and many other such unsavoury details.

No. 30. MALE PROSTITUTE (πεπορνεύσθαι)
Athenaeus, *Deipnosophistae*
(Greek) (Greek, ed. Charles Burton Gulick) (English, ed. C. D. Yonge, B.A.)
book 6, chapter 40: Φιλοξένος δ’ ἦ Πετρνοκοτίς ἐμπεσόντος λόγου ὅτι αἱ κίχλαι τίμιαι εἰσὶ καὶ τοῦ Κορύδου παρόντος, ὡς ἐδοκεὶ πεπορνεύσθαι, ἀλλ’, ἐγώ ἐφ’, μημονεύω ὅτε ὁ κόρυδος ὄβολον ἤμ. ἢν δὲ καὶ ὁ Φιλοξένος τῶν παρασίτων, ὡς Αξιόνικος εἴρηκεν ἐν τῷ Χαλκίδικῳ πρόκειται δὲ τὸ μαρτύριον μημονεύει δ’ αὐτοῦ καὶ Μέινανδρος ἐν Κεκρυφάλῳ αὐτὸ μόνον Πετρνοκοπίδα αὐτὸν καλῶν.
But Philoxenus, who was surnamed Pternocopis, when it happened to be mentioned that thrushes were very dear, and that too while Corydus was present, who was said formerly to have prostituted himself (πεπορνεύσθαι)—"I," said he, "can recollect when a lark (κόρυδος) only cost an obol." (And Philoxenus too was a parasite, as Axionicus has stated in his Chalcidian. But the statement is thoroughly proved.)

No. 31. MALE PROSTITUTION
Jude 7 as Sodom and Gomorrah, and the cities [fem. pl.] around them, in like manner to these [masc. pl.] prostituting themselves (ἐκπορνεύσασαι [fem. pl. aor. ptc, due to 'cities']), and gone after other flesh, have been set before — an example, of fire age-during, justice suffering.

Jude 7 ὡς Σόδωμα καὶ Γόμορρα καὶ αἱ περὶ αὐτᾶς πόλεις τῶν ὀμοίων τρόπον τοῦτοις ἐκπορνεύσασαι καὶ ἀπελθούσαι ὑπὸ σαρκὸς ἐτέρας, πρὸκειται δείγμα πυρὸς αἰώνιον δίκην ὑπέξουσαι.

No. 32. MALE FORNICATOR
A Dictionary of Greek and Roman biography and mythology
Entry Apellos-"... that he was expelled from the school of Marcion for fornication with one Philumene, who fancied herself a prophetess, ..."

Apelles flourished about A. D. 188, and lived to a very great age. Tertullian (Praescript. Haeret. 30) says, that he was expelled from the school of Marcion for fornication with one Philumene, who fancied herself a prophetess, and whose fantasies were recorded by Apelles in his book entitled Φανερώσεις (see Euseb. Hist. Eccl. 5.13).

No. 33. MALE DEACON COMMITS FORNICATION
Basil, Saint, Bishop of Caesarea, Epistula chapter 188, III (p. 22, line 6ff.): Διάκονος, μετὰ τὴν διακονίαν πορνεύσας, ἀπόβλητος μὲν τῆς διακονίας ἦσσαν εἰς δὲ τὸν τῶν λαϊκῶν ἀπώθετος τόπον, τῆς κοινωνίας οὐκ ἐγκαθίσταται. διότι ἀρχαῖος ἦσσαν κανόνα τοῦ ἀπὸ βασιλεύς πεπτωκότας τούτῳ μόνῳ τῷ τρόπῳ τῆς κολάσεως ὑποβάλλεται.

If a deacon commit fornication (πορνεύσας) after receiving the diaconate, he shall be removed from the diaconate ... those in the ranks of the laity, after being expelled from the place of the faithful, are again taken back into the place from which they fell, but the deacon once and for all incurs the lasting penalty of deposition.

No. 34. FEMALE PROSTITUTES (πεπορνευμένην)
Demosthenes, Against Neaira
speech 59, section 107: ὡσκον δεινόν; πρὸς μὲν τοὺς ἀστυγείτονας καὶ ὠμολογουμένως ἀρίστους τῶν Ἑλλήνων εἰς τὴν πόλιν γεγενημένους οὔτω καλῶς καὶ ἀκριβῶς διωρίσασθε περὶ ἐκάστου, ἄφο αὐτὸ ἐξὶν τὴν διώρειαν, τὴν δὲ περὶφερείαν ἐν ὀπίσω τῇ Ἑλλάδι πεπορνευμένην οὕτως ἀσχρός καὶ ὀλγισμός ἐσαστὶ ὑπὸ βρίσκουσαι εἰς τὴν πόλιν καὶ ἀσφαλούσαν εἰς τοὺς θεοὺς ἀτιμώρητον, ἢ νῦτε οἱ πρόγονοι ἀστην κατέλιπον οὕτ', ὅ δὲ ἡμῶν πολίτες ἐποίησατο

Is not this a monstrous thing? In the case of those who were neighbors and who had shown themselves of all the Greeks by common consent to have conferred the greatest benefits upon your state, you thus carefully and accurately defined regarding each one the terms on which they should

72 Apelles, a disciple of Marcion, departed in some points from the teaching of his master. Instead of wholly rejecting the Old Testament, he looked upon its contents as coming partly from the good principle, partly from the evil principle.
receive the gift of citizenship; are you then thus shamefully and recklessly to let off unpunished a woman who has openly played the harlot (πορνεύσαι) throughout the whole of Greece, who treats the city with outrage and the gods with impiety, and who is a citizen neither by birth nor by the gift of the people?

No. 35. FEMALE PROSTITUTE (πορνεύσαι) (πορνείας)
Revelation 2:20-22

But I have this against you, that you tolerate your woman, Jezebel, who calls herself a prophetess. She teaches and seduces my servants to commit sexual immorality (πορνεύσαι), and to eat things sacrificed to idols. I gave her time to repent, but she refuses to repent of her sexual immorality (πορνείας). Behold, I will throw her into a bed, and those who commit adultery with her into great oppression, unless they repent of her works.

No. 36. FEMALE PROSTITUTE (πόρνης)(ἰπόρνευσαν)
Revelation 17:2

One of the seven angels who had the seven bowls came and spoke with me, saying, "Come here. I will show you the judgment of the great prostitute who sits on many waters, [2] with whom the kings of the earth committed sexual immorality, and those who dwell in the earth were made drunken with the wine of her sexual immorality (ἰπόρνευσαν)."

No. 37. FEMALE PROSTITUTE (ἰπόρνευσαν)(πορνεύσαντες)
Revelation 18:3, 9

He cried with a mighty voice, saying, "Fallen, fallen is Babylon the great, and has become a habitation of demons, and a prison of every unclean spirit, and a prison of every unclean and hateful bird! [3] For all the nations have drunk of the wine of the wrath of her sexual immorality, . . . [9] the kings of the earth committed sexual immorality with her, and the merchants of the earth grew rich from the abundance of her luxury.”

No. 38. FEMALE PROSTITUTE (κοταπορνευθείσαις)(πορνεύειν)
Strabo, Geography
(Greek) (English) (English, ed. H.C. Hamilton, Esq., W. Falconer, M.A.)
book 11, chapter 14: άλλα καὶ θυγατέρας οί ἔπιφανεστατοί τοῦ ἔθνους ἀνιεροῦσιν
παρθένοις, αἳς νόος ἐστι καταπορνεθείσαις πολὺν χρόνον παρὰ τῇ θεῷ μετὰ τῶτα διδάσκαι
πρὸς γάμον, οὐκ ἀπαξιοῦντος τῇ τοιαύτῃ συνοικεῖν οὐδένος. τοιούτων δὲ τι καὶ Ἡρόδοτος λέγει τὸ
περὶ τᾶς π. Λυδᾶς: πορνεύει γαρ ἄπασας. οὕτω δὲ φιλοφρόνοις χρώνται τοῖς ἐρασταῖς ὡστε καὶ
ξενίαν παρέχουσι καὶ δορὰν ἀντιδίδοσι πλείω πολλάκις ἢ λαμβάνουσιν, ἀτ’ ἐξ ἐυτύρων οἰκῶν
ἐπιχορηγοῦμενα. δέχονται δὲ οὐ τοὺς τυχόντας τῶν ξίνων, ἄλλα μάλιστα τούς ἀπὸ ἴσου
ἀξιώματος.

Both the Medes and Armenians have adopted all the sacred rites of the Persians, but the
Armenians pay particular reverence to Anaitis, and have built temples to her honour in several
places, especially in Acilisene. They dedicate there to her service male and female slaves; in this
there is nothing remarkable, but it is surprising that persons of the highest rank in the nation
consecrate their virgin daughters to the goddess. It is customary for these women, after being
prostituted ((καταπορνεθείσαις) a long period at the temple of Anaitis, to be disposed of in
marriage, no one disdaining a connexion with such persons. Herodotus mentions something
similar respecting the Lydian women, all of whom prostitute (πορνεύειν) themselves. But they treat
their paramours with much kindness, they entertain them hospitably, and frequently make a return
of more presents than they receive, being amply supplied with means derived from their wealthy
connexions. They do not admit into their dwellings accidental strangers, but prefer those of a rank
equal to their own.

No. 39. FEMALE PROSTITUTES (πορνεύσθαι)(πόρνης)
Strabo, Geography
(Greek) (English) (English, ed. H.C. Hamilton, Esq., W. Falconer, M.A.)
book 13, chapter 4: … οὐ τὸ πλείστον ἔργον οἱ παιδίσκαι συνέτελεσαν· λέγει δ’ ἐκείνος καὶ
πορνεύσθαι πάσας· τινὲς δὲ καὶ πόρνης μνήμα λέγουσι τὸν τάφον χειροτοίητον δὲ τὴν λίμνην ἔννοι
ιστοροῦσι τὴν Κολόνη πρὸς τὸν ξάνθον τῶν πλημμυρίδων, οἱ συμβαίνουσι τῶν πταμών
πληγουμένων, ἤπαινα δὲ πόλις ἐστὶ καταβαίνουσιν ἀπὸ τοῦ Γυάλου πρὸς τὸ τοῦ Καύστρου
πεδίον.

The monuments of the kings lie around the lake Coloë. At Sardes is the great mound of
Alyattes upon a lofty base, the work, according to Herodotus, of the people of the city, the greatest
part of it being executed by young women. He says that they all prostituted themselves
(πορνεύσθαι); according to some writers the sepulchre is the monument of a courtesan ((πόρνης).
Some historians say, that Coloë is an artificial lake, designed to receive the superabundant waters
of the rivers when they are full and overflow . . .

No. 40. FEMALE PROSTITUTE (πορνευμένη) (ἔταιραν)
Athenaeus, The Deipnosophists
(Greek) (English, ed. C. D. Yonge, B.A.) (Greek, ed. Kaibel)
book 13, chapter 51: Λυσίας δ’ ἐν τῷ πρὸς Λαίδα, ἐν γνήσιος ὁ λόγος, τούτων
μνημονεύει. Φίλιρο γε τοι ἐπάυσατο πορνευμένη ἐτὶ νέα ωᾶσα καὶ Σκιώνη καὶ Ἡπάσφοις καὶ
Θέκλεια καὶ Ψαμάθη καὶ Λαγίσκα καὶ Ἄνθεια. μήποτε δὲ δεῖ γράφειν ἀντὶ τῆς Ἀνθείας Ἄντειαν.
οὐ γάρ εὐρίσκομεν παρ’ οὐδενί” Ἀνθείαν ἄναγγειμένη ἐταιράν,

And Lysias, in his oration against Lais, if, indeed, the speech is a genuine one, mentions
these circumstances— “Philyra abandoned the trade of a harlot (πορνευμένη) when she was still
quite young; and so did Scione, and Hippaphesis, and Theoclea, and Psamathe, and Lagisca, and
Anthea.” But perhaps, instead of Anthea, we ought to read Antea. For I do not find any mention made by any one of a harlot (ἐταίραν) named Anthea.

No. 41. FEMALE PROSTITUTE (πορνευμένη) (ἐταίραν)
Athenaeus, *The Deipnosophists*
(Greek) (English, ed. C. D. Yonge, B.A.) (Greek, ed. Kaibel)
book 13, chapter 62: . . . καὶ λογος ὁ λόγος, ἐκ γνήσιος ὁ λόγος, ὑμνοῦμεν αὐτῆς, καταλέγον καὶ ἀλλας ἐταιρας ἐν τούτοις. Φιλυρα γέ τοι ἐπαύσατο πορνευμένη ἔτι νέα σώα καὶ Σκιώνη καὶ Ἰππάφεας καὶ Θεόκλεια καὶ Υφανθῆ καὶ Λαγίσκα καὶ Ἀνθεία καὶ Ἀριστόκλεια.

For perhaps here we ought to read Nais, and not Lais. But Hermippus, in his Essay on Isocrates, says that Isocrates, when he was advancing in years, took the *courtesan* (= prostitute) Lagisca to his house, and had a daughter by her. And Strattis speaks of her in these lines

And while she still was in her bed, I saw Isocrates’ concubine, Lagisca,
Playing her tricks; and with her the flute-maker.
And Lysias, in his speech against Lais, (if, at least, the oration be a genuine one,) mentions her, giving a list of other *courtesans* also, in the following words:—“Philyra indeed abandoned the trade of a *courtesan* while she was still young; and Scione, and Hippaphesis, and Theoclea, and Psamathe, and Lagisca, and Anthea, and Aristoclea, all abandoned it also at an early age.”

No. 42. FEMALE PROSTITUTE (ἐτέρω)(περονευμένη)
Procopius, *Historia Arcana* (Anecdota)
Vol. 6, chapter 5 (p. 62, line 111f.). ἦκακα δὲ Αντωνίνα τῆς βασιλίδος ἀπογευμένης ἢς Βούκαντίου ἦδεν, ἐπέλαβο μὲν ἑθελούσα ἄν ἐκείνη ἐναγχαίας ἔστη ἑργαστο, ὡς ἦκιστα δὲ ὑπολογίσματι ὡς, ἦν τῷ ἑκτῷ ἡ παῖς αὕτη ἤ νοικιζοίτο, περονευμένη τὰ πρότερα ἔσται, τὸν Θεοδώρας ἐκγονοὶ κηδετίσι ἐτίμαζε, τὴν τε παῖδα ὡς μάλιστα ἀκουσάν ἑβασαμένη ἀνδρός τοῦ ἐρωμένου ἀπέστησε, μεγάλη τε ἀγκωμοσύνης ἐκ τοῦ ἑργοῦ τούτου ἀπηγέγκατο δόξαν ἐς πάντας ἀνθρώπους, ἤκοντα τε οὐδεὶς πόνῳ ἀναπείθει τὸν ἀνδρα τοῦ ἀγοὺς αὕτη μεταλαξεὶν τοῦδε.

But when Antonina, after the Empress’ death, came to Byzantium, she purposely forgot the benefits which the Empress recently had conferred on her, and paying no attention whatever to the fact that if the girl should marry anyone else, her previous record would be that of a *prostitute* (περονευμένη), she spurned the alliance with the offspring of Theodora . . .

No. 43. FEMALE SLAVE PROSTITUTE (περονευσθαι)(μοιχὸν)
book 6, chapter 20: Οὐκ ἄγαπης ὁτι σοι λαλάω, καὶ μεγάλη ἐνυπιχθαν δοκεῖς τὸν σὸν καταφιλήσαι δεσπότην, ἀλλὰ ἀκίζη καὶ σχήματις πρὸς ἀπόνοιαν; Εγὼ μὲν σέ καὶ περονευσθαι δοκῶ καὶ γάρ μοιχὸν φιλεῖς.

[Leucipe, a female slave of Thersander, was a virgin and remained so.] Thersander . . . when he was disappointed of his hopes [to mate her] gave free rein to his anger, “Wretched slave,” he cried, striking her on the face, “miserable, love-sick girl; I heard all your raving. Are you not delighted that I even speak to you? Do you not think it a great piece of good fortune to be able to kiss your master? . . . A harlot you must be, for it is an adulterer ((μοιχὸν)) that you love.”

No. 44. MALE AND FEMALE PROSTITUTES (περονευκότος)(ἐταίρας)
(Greek) (English, ed. R.D. Hicks)
book 6, chapter 2: δύο μαλακῶν περικρυμπόμενων αὐτῶν ἐφί, μή ἐυλαβεῖθαι κώς τευτλία οὐ τρώγει. περὶ σαίδος περονευκότος ἐφοτηθεῖσι πόθεν εἶν, Τεγεάτης, ἐφί, ἀφή παλαιστὴν
When two cowards hid away from him, he called out, “Don’t be afraid, a hound is not fond of beetroot.” [62] After seeing a stupid wrestler practising as a doctor he inquired of him, “What does this mean? Is it that you may now have your revenge on the rivals who formerly beat you?” Seeing the child of a courtesan [εταίρας = prostitute] throw stones at a crowd, he cried out, “Take care you don’t hit your father.”

No. 45. MALE AND FEMALE PROSTITUTES (τὰ πορνεία) (εταίρας) (ἐπορνεύετο) (αἱ πόρναι)

Cassius Dio Cocceianus, Historiae Romane
(Greek)

book 80, chapter 13: τάδε ἐστίν. ἡς καταλείπει ἐσηὶ νῦκτι περιβεθαίς κόμαις χρώμενος, καὶ τὰ τῶν κατηλίδων εἰργάζετο. ἐδὲ πορνεία τὰ περιβότα ἐσεφοίτα, καὶ τὰς ἑταίρας ἐξελαύνων ἐπορνεύετο. καὶ τέλος ἐν τῷ παλατίῳ οἰκήμα τὶ ἀποσδείξας ἐνταόθα ἱσέλγανε, γυμνός τ’ αἴε ἐπὶ τῆς θύρας αὐτοῦ ἐστῶς ὅπερ αἱ πόρναι, καὶ τὸ συνδόνιον χρυσος κρίκος ἐξερπημένον διασείων,

He [Sardanapalus] would go to the taverns by night, wearing a wig, and there ply the trade of a female huckster [innkeeper]. He frequented the notorious brothels (τὰ πορνεῖα), drove out the prostitutes (ἐταίρας), and played the prostitute himself (ἐπορνεύετο). Finally, he set aside a room in the palace and there committed his indecencies, always standing nude at the door of the room, as harlots (αἱ πόρναι) do, . . . while in a soft and melting voice he solicited the passers-by.

No. 46. MALE AND FEMALE PROSTITUTES

1 Corinthians 6:15-19 (πόρνη)(πόρνη)(πορνεῖα)(πορνεύων)

book I Corinthians, chapter 6:15-19, Ἀρας οὖν τὰ μέλη τοῦ Χριστοῦ ποιῆσαι πόρνης μέγη; Μή γένοιτο. οὐκ οἶδατε ὅτι ὁ κολλώμενος τῇ πόρνῃ ἑν σώμα ἑστιν; . . . [17] ὁ δέ κολλώμενος τῷ κυρίῳ ἑν πνεῦμα ἑστιν. φεύγετε τὴν πορνείαν πάν ἀμαρτήμα αὐτὴν ἀμαρτήμα εἰς τοῦ σώματός ἑστιν. ὁ δὲ πορνεύων εἰς τὸ ἱδίον σώμα διαμαρτάνει. ἢ οὐκ οἶδατε ὅτι τὸ σώμα ὑμῶν ναος τοῦ ἐν ὑμῖν ἀγίῳ πνεύματος ἑστιν, οὐ ἔχετε ἀπὸ θεοῦ; καὶ οὐκ ἐστε ἐσωτῆρες, ἓγορασθήτε γὰρ τιμῆς· δοξάσατε δὴ τὸν θεόν ἐν τῷ σώματί ὑμῶν.

Don’t you know that your bodies are members of Christ? Shall I then take the members of Christ, and make them members of a prostitute? May it never be! [v. 16] Or don’t you know that he who is joined to a prostitute (πόρνῃ) is one body? For, “The two,” says he, “will become one flesh.” [v. 17] But he who is joined to the Lord is one spirit. [v. 18] Flee sexual immorality (πορνεία)! “Every sin that a man does is outside the body,” but he who commits sexual immorality (πορνεύων) sins against his own body. [v. 19] Or don’t you know that your body is a temple of the Holy Spirit which is in you, which you have from God, and you are not your own? For you were bought with a price; therefore glorify God in your body.

No. 47. ABSENCE OF ADULTERY AND PROSTITUTION (μοιχείαιν)

Plutarch, Mulierum virtutes (ed. Goodwin)(English) (Greek, ed. Gregorius N. Bernardakis)
(English, ed. Frank Cole Babbitt) (Greek, ed. Frank Cole Babbitt) chapter 12: “It was a custom among the maids of Cios to assemble together in the public temples, and to pass the day together in good fellowship; and there their sweethearts had the felicity to behold how prettily they sported and danced about. In the evening this company went to the house of every particular maid in her turn, and waited upon each other’s parents and brethren very officiously, even to the washing of their feet. It oftentimes so fell out that many young men fell in love with one maid; but they carried it so decently and civilly that, when the maid was espoused (γυναῖκα) to one, the rest presently gave off courting of her. The effect of this good order among the women was that no mention (ἀνεγγυών = not credited) was made of any adultery or fornication (φθοράν = destruction) among them for the space of seven hundred years.”


No. 48. COMMAND NOT TO COMMIT ADULTERY OR FORNICATION (πορνεύεισις)(μοιχεύεισις)
Barnabas, Barnabae Epistula (ed. Kirropp Lake)
(Greek, Loeb, p. 76, by B. D. Ehrman)
chapter 19: οὐχ ὑψώσεις σεαυτόν, ἵνα δὲ ταπεινώσωσιν κατὰ πάντα· οὐχ ἀρείας ἐπὶ σεαυτόν δόξαν. οὐ λήψῃ βουλήν ποιησάν κατ’ τοῦ πλήσον σου, οὐ δόξας τῇ ψυχῇ σου βράσος; οὐ πορνεύεις, οὐ μοιχεύεις, οὐ παιδοθηρείτες. οὐ μὴ σου ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ ἐξελίθη ἐν ἀκαθαρσίᾳ τινῶν. οὐ λήψῃ πρόσωπον ἐξέχει τινὰ ἐπὶ παραπτώματί. ἐσθ πρᾶξα, ἐσθ ἡμίχιος, ἐσθ τρίῳ τῶν λόγων οὕς ἠκουσας. οὐ μησικακήσεις τῷ ἀδέλφῳ σου.

Do not exalt yourself but be humble in every way. Do not heap glory on yourself. Do not engage in sexual immorality, do not commit adultery, do not engage in pederasty. The word of God must not go out from you to any who are impure.

[Alternative ET:] You shall not exalt thyself, but shall be humble-minded in all things; thou shalt not take glory to thyself. Thou shalt form no evil plan against thy neighbour, thou shalt not let thy soul be froward. Thou shalt not commit fornication (πορνεύεισις), thou shalt not commit adultery (μοιχεύεισις), thou shalt not commit sodomy. Thou shalt not let the word of God depart from thee in the impurity of any men.

No. 49. FEMALE PROSTITUTES (πορνευμένος)(προσαγωγεύειν), PIMPS (μαστροπόις)
Athenaeus, The Deipnosophists
(Greek, ed. Kaibel)(English, Loeb, vol. iv. by C.B. Gulick)
book 10.443a ἕπαισαν οὖν αὐτοὺς τούτων Κλέως ὁ τύραννος, ὁ καὶ τάς μαστροπόις τᾶς εἰδίπεμαν προσαγωγεύει τᾶς ἐλευθέρας γυναικας καὶ τρεῖς ἤ τέτταρας τᾶς ἐπιφανεστάτα πορνευμένος ἐνδίσας εἰς σάκκους κατακοπήσας τιον προστάξας καὶ ᾿Εμιππον δέ ἐν τοῖς περὶ τῶν ἐπτὰ σοφών Περιανδρον τὸ αὐτό ποιήσαι.

‘. . . And so the tyrant stopped them from these practices; he was the one who tied up in sacks the procuresses (= pimps, τάς μαστροπόις) who were in the habit of seducing (= to prostitute, προσαγωγεύειν) well-born women of the free class, as well as three or four of the most

73 Where information about languages is given in each extracted entry, this is taken from Perseus, which does not always include an ET. This has to be obtained from elsewhere.
conspicuous harlots (πορνευόμενασ), and ordered them to be drowned in the sea.’ Hermippus, too, in his work On the Seven Sages, says that Periander did the same.

No. 50. ADULTERERS (μοιχεύοντες), FORNICATIONS (πορνευόμενα)
Clement of Alexandria, Quis Dis Salvetur (‘The Rich Man’s Salvation’) (ed. G.W. Butterworth)
chapter 40 (Loeb, p. 354, lines 4-8):  ο κλέπτης, ἀφεσιν βούλει λαβεῖν; ὑμᾶς κλέπτε· ὁ μοιχεύων, ὑμᾶς πυροσθῶ· ὁ πορνεύων, λοιπὸν ἁγιεῖτο· ὁ ἀρπάσας, ὁ πορθὸς καὶ προσαποθόδου· ὁ ψευδομάρτυς, ἀλήθειαν ἄσκησον· ὁ ἕπορκος, ὑμᾶς ὄμνυε·


No. 51. ADULTERY (μοιχεύοντα), FORNICATION (πορνεύον)
Clement of Alexandria, Protrepticus (‘Exhortation to the Greeks/Heathen’) (ed. G.W. Butterworth)
chapter 4 (p. 136, lines 6-12): . . . κατάπαυσον, ὄμηρε, τὴν ὁδὴν· οὐκ ἔστι καλῆ, μοιχεύον
didásei: πορνεύει δὲ ἡμεῖς καὶ τὰ ὅτα παρήτημεθα·

Cease the song, Homer. There is no beauty in that; it teaches adultery. We have declined to lend even our ears to fornication.

No. 52. FORNICATION (πορνεύον) PIMP (πορνοβοσκός)
Xenophon of Ephesus, Ephesica (‘The Ephesian Tale of Anthia and Habrocomes’) (ed. Rudolf Hercher)74
(Greek)(ET by Jeffrey Henderson)75
book 5, chapter 7: Καί δὲ κοσμήσας καλῆ μὲν ἐσθήτα πολλῶν δὲ χρυσῶ ήγεν ως προστηραμομένην τέγου; ἡ δὲ μέγα ἀνακακώσασα 2 χιού μοι τῶν κακῶν ἔπευ, οὐχ ἰκανά γὰρ αἱ πρότερον συμφοραί, τὰ δεσμα, τὰ ληστηρία, ἀλλὰ ἔτι καὶ πορνεύει ἄναγκαζόμει; ὁ κάλλος δικαίως ὑβρισμένων, τί γὰρ ἡμῖν ἀκαίρως παραμένει; Ἀλλὰ τὰ ταύτα θηρικά καὶ οὐχ ἐυρίσκα τινα μηχανήν, διὸ ἂς φιλάξα τὴν μέχρι υἱόν τετηρημένην σωθηροῦν;

In due course the pimp (πορνοβοσκός) who had bought Anthia made her display herself in front of the whorehouse. He dressed her up in a beautiful costume and lots of gold and took her to her spot outside a stall. But she raised a loud wail: “What troubles are mine!” she cried, “Are my previous predicaments not enough, the chains of banditry? Must I now be a whore as well? Beauty of mine, you are justly violated, . . . [Anthia was married to Habrocomes.]

No. 53. ADULTERY (μοιχεύοντα) FORNICATION (πορνεύον)
John, of Damascus (attributed author), Vita Barlaam et Joasaph (ed. G.R. Woodward, H. Mattingly)
(Greek)
chapter 27.253 (p. 422, lines 9-12): προσθέντος αὐξάσα τινήν καὶ ζηεὶν τοῦ μέλλοντος αἰώνος· οὐ μοιχεύοντο, οὐ πορνεύοντο, οὐ ψευδομαρτυροῦσι, οὐ ἐπιθυμοῦσι τὰ ἀλλότρια, τιμῶσι πατέρα καὶ μητέρα, καὶ τοὺς πληροῖς φιλοῦσι,

---

[Christians:] They neither commit adultery nor fornication; nor do they bear false witness, nor covet other men’s goods: they honour father and mother, and love their neighbours.

No. 54. ABSENCE OF PROSTITUTES AND MALE FORNICATORS IN ISRAEL

Deut. 23:17 ‘There is not a prostitute (πόρνη) among the daughters of Israel, nor is there one fornicating (πορνεύων) among the sons of Israel;

Οὐκ ἦσται πόρνη ἀπὸ θυγατέρων Ἰσραήλ, καὶ οὐκ ἦσται πορνευόντων ἀπὸ υἱῶν Ἰσραήλ. οὐκ ἦσται τελεσφόρος ἀπὸ θυγατέρων Ἰσραήλ, καὶ οὐκ ἦσται τελισκόμενος ἀπὸ υἱῶν Ἰσραήλ.

CATEGORY B: ‘Fornication’ used in non-Greek sources.

No. B1. Titus Livius (Livvy), The History of Rome (ed. Evan T. Sage, Ph.D.)76 book 38, chapter 24: “... her disposition; when he found it shrinking from voluntary fornication (Lat. stupro), he did violence to her body, . . . .” 

LATIN: [3] is primo animum temptavit; quem cum abhorrerentem a voluntario videret stupro, corpori, quod servum fortuna erat, vim fecit

The full context to the above except is:

“There remained an entirely new war with the Tectosagi. Setting out against them the consul came on the third day of marching to Ancyra, a famous city in that region, from which the enemy was a little more than ten miles distant.

[2] While they were established in camp there, a memorable deed was done by a captive woman. The wife of the chieftain Orgiago, a woman of surpassing beauty, was held under guard among a large number of prisoners; the commander of the guard was a centurion, characterized by both the lust and the greed of the soldier.

[3] At first he tried her disposition; when he found it shrinking from voluntary fornication, he did violence to her body, which fortune had made a slave.

[4] Then, to quiet her indignation at the injury, he held out to the woman the hope of a return to her own people, but not even that, as a lover might have done, did he grant her for nothing. Having stipulated for a definite quantity of gold, to avoid taking one of his own men as an accomplice, he allowed the woman herself to send as a messenger to her people whomsoever of the prisoners she should choose.

[5] He designated a spot near the river to which not more than two of the kinsmen of the captive were to come with the money the following night to receive her. It happened that one of the woman’s own slaves was among the prisoners under the same guard.

[6] This man, as messenger, the centurion at nightfall conducted beyond the line of sentinels. The following night both the two kinsmen of the woman and the centurion with the prisoner came to the appointed place.

[7] While they were displaying the money, which was to amount to an Attic talent — for

[8] so great had been the sum agreed upon — the woman in her own language ordered them to draw sword and kill the centurion as he was weighing the money.

[9] When they had slit his throat and cut off his head, the woman herself wrapped it in her garment and carried it on her return to her husband Orgiago, who had escaped home from Olympus;

76 Livy. Books XXXVIII-XXXIX with an English Translation. Cambridge. Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press; London, William Heinemann, Ltd. 1936: published without copyright notice. Practically the same story is told by Polybius (XXII. xxi), Plutarch (Mul. Virt. 43), Valerius Maximus (VI. i. ext. 2) and Florus (I. xxvii. 6). All probably came from the same ultimate source, although Plutarch quotes as from Polybius an item not now found in Polybius’ own version.
[10] before she embraced him she dropped at his feet the head of the centurion, and, when he wondered whose head this was and what this act meant, so unlike that of a woman, she confessed to her husband the violence done to her person and the vengeance exacted for her forcibly violated chastity, and, as the story goes, by the purity and dignity of her life in other respects maintained to the end the [11] glory won by a deed that marked her as a true matron.

No. B2. William Shakespeare, Measure for Measure (PERSEUS SOURCE: shak. mm 2.1)
act 2, scene 1: "... a woman cardinally given, might have been accused in fornication, adultery, and all uncleanliness there."

SCENE I. A hall in ANGELO'S house. Enter ELBOW, and Officers with FROTH and POMPEY.
Elb. He, sir! a tapster, sir; parcel-bawd; one that serves a bad woman; whose house, sir, was, as they say, plucked down in the suburbs; and now she professes a hot-house, which, I think, is a very ill house too.
Escal. How know you that?
Elb. My wife, sir, whom I detest before heaven and your honour,—
Escal. How? thy wife?
Elb. Ay, sir; whom, I thank heaven, is an honest woman,—
Escal. Dost thou detest her therefore?
Elb. I say, sir, I will detest myself also, as well as she, that this house, if it be not a bawd's house, it is pity of her life, for it is a naughty house.
Escal. How dost thou know that, constable?
Elb. Marry, sir, by my wife; who, if she had been a woman cardinally given, might have been accused in fornication, adultery, and all uncleanliness there.
Escal. By the woman's means?
Elb. Ay, sir, by Mistress Overdone's means: but as she spit in his face, so she defied him.
Pom. Sir, if it please your honour, this is not so.
Elb. Prove it before these varlets here, thou honourable man; prove it.

COMMENT: Shakespeare is aware that there is a difference between 'adultery' and 'fornication' but that the same woman can be guilty of both sins.

No. B3. MEN MISUSE WIVES FOR FORNICATION
The Quran (ed. Muhammad M. Pickthall)
sura 5: The food of those who have received the Scripture is lawful for you, and your food is lawful for them. And so are the virtuous women of the believers and the virtuous women of those who received the Scripture before you (lawful for you) when ye give them their marriage portions and live with them in honour, not in fornication, nor taking them as secret concubines.

No. B4. MEN MISUSE WIVES FOR FORNICATION
The Quran
Sura 2: [197] The pilgrimage is (performed in) the well-known months; so whoever determines the performance of the pilgrimage therein, there shall be no intercourse nor fornication nor quarrelling amongst one another;
No. B5. MEN MISUSE WIVES FOR FORNICATION
The Quran

Sura 4: [24] And all married women except those whom your right hands possess (this is) Allah’s ordinance to you, and lawful for you are (all women) besides those, provided that you seek (them) with your property, taking (them) in marriage not committing fornication. Then as to those whom you profit by, give them their dowries as appointed; and there is no blame on you about what you mutually agree after what is appointed; surely Allah is Knowing, Wise. [25] And whoever among you has not within his power amleness of means to marry free believing women, then (he may marry) of those whom your right hands possess from among your believing maidens; and Allah knows best your faith: you are (sprung) the one from the other; so marry them with the permission of their masters, and give them their dowries justly, they being chaste, not fornicating, nor receiving paramours; and when they are taken in marriage, then if they are guilty of indecency, they shall suffer half the punishment which is (inflicted) upon free women.

No. B6. MEN MISUSE WIVES FOR FORNICATION
The Quran

sura 17: [31] And do not kill your children for fear of poverty; We give them sustenance and yourselves (too); surely to kill them is a great wrong. [32] And go not nigh to fornication; surely it is an indecency and an evil way.

No. B7. MEN MISUSE WIVES FOR FORNICATION
The Quran

sura 25: [68] And they who do not call upon another god with Allah and do not slay the soul, which Allah has forbidden except in the requirements of justice, and (who) do not commit fornication and he who does this shall find a requital of sin; [69] The punishment shall be doubled to him on the day of resurrection, and he shall abide therein in abasement;

No. B8. MARRIED WOMEN COMMIT FORNICATION
The Quran

sura 60: [12] O Prophet! when believing women come to you giving you a pledge that they will not associate aught with Allah, and will not steal, and will not commit fornication, and will not kill their children, and will not bring a calumny which they have forged of themselves, and will not disobey you in what is good, accept their pledge, and ask forgiveness for them from Allah; surely Allah is Forgiving, Merciful.

No. B9. MARRIED MEN AND WOMEN COMMIT FORNICATION
The Quran
sura 24: A sura which We have sent down and which We have ordained in it have We sent down Clear Signs, in order that ye may receive admonition. [2] The woman and the man guilty of adultery or fornication, flog each of them with a hundred stripes: Let not compassion move you in their case, in a matter prescribed by Allah, if ye believe in Allah and the Last Day: and let a party of the Believers witness their punishment. [3] Let no man guilty of adultery or fornication marry and but a woman similarly guilty, or an Unbeliever: nor let any but such a man or an Unbeliever marry such a woman: to the Believers such a thing is forbidden.

[4] And those who launch a charge against chaste women, and produce not four witnesses (to support their allegations), flog them with eighty stripes; and reject their evidence ever after: for such men are wicked transgressors; [5] Unless they repent thereafter and mend (their conduct); for Allah is Oft-Forgiving, Most Merciful.

[6] And for those who launch a charge against their spouses, and have (in support) no evidence but their own, their solitary evidence (can be received) if they bear witness four times (with an oath) by Allah that they are solemnly telling the truth; [7] And the fifth (oath) (should be) that they solemnly invoke the curse of Allah on themselves if they tell a lie.

[8] But it would avert the punishment from the wife, if she bears witness four times (with an oath) By Allah, that (her husband) is telling a lie; [9] And the fifth (oath) should be that she solemnly invokes the wrath of Allah on herself if (her accuser) is telling the truth. [10] If it were not for Allah’s grace and mercy on you, and that Allah is Oft-Returning, full of Wisdom, (Ye would be ruined indeed).

AT WHAT POINT WERE THE MARRIAGE VOWS MADE?

Deuteronomy 24:5 that it is when a man TAKES his wife that he is then exempt for military service for the first year of his marriage. The year does not begin with the betrothal. In Genesis the betrothal and marriage are not separated by any length of time. This is proved by comparing Deut 20:7 and 24:5. Scripture recognises that the first year of marriage only begins after the consummation of the marriage (Deut 24:5). It was only in later times that these two parts of a Hebrew wedding were artificially placed months apart.

Adam and Eve were married the day they met. Abraham’s servant, Eliezer, paid the dowry to Laban (sister of Rebekah) and Bethuel (father of Rebekah) and without any delay he returned to Isaac with her immediately (Gen 24:55-61). On meeting Rebekah Isaac married her immediately (24:67). There was no delay between purchase and consummation. The two stages were one. Jacob married Rachel seven days after he married Leah. Genesis 29:27 spells out the contract or dowry, and then Jacob took Rachel after he has fulfilled the week’s festivities for Leah. Jacob would have married Rachel the day he agreed to the terms of Laban, but for his obligation to complete the week of days for Leah (cf. Jud 14:12). That Jacob took both sisters for wives before he served fourteen years as their dowry, see Dake’s Bible p. 30, first side column.

It would appear from the account of the marriage of Samson to an unnamed Philistine wife that the period between contracting the dowry to the marriage feast was a matter of days. Samson went with his father and mother to pay the dowry. While the parents stayed in Timnath, Samson journeyed back home (three miles away) but on the way he killed a young lion. A few days later, on his way back to Timnath to claim his bride a swarm of bees had nested inside the carcase, bringing their store of honey with them. Samson sampled the honey and took some of it for his parents who were still in Timnath, no doubt making preparations for the week-long wedding festivities.

When David paid the dowry of 200 Philistine foreskins to Saul he was immediately given Michal as his wife (1 Sam 18:17-20, 28). There was a day set for the marriage of David to Merab,
Saul’s eldest daughter, but inexplicably, Saul gave her to another man. Saul tried to mollify David by offering to keep the date he set for their wedding but that it would be to Michal, his younger daughter. However, in place of a dowry, Saul requested 100 Philistine foreskins before the wedding day came. David accomplished the task set for him “before the days had expired” (1 Sam 18:26). So there was just a short time between David’s betrothal to Michal and his marriage to her.
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