

LOOFS' THEORY OF THEOPHILUS OF ANTIOCH AS A SOURCE OF IRENAEUS

II

Phrases peculiar to Irenaeus.

THIS is yet another test which can be profitably applied to the twenty-nine passages, and to other passages claimed for IQT by Loofs. There are first of all the genitive absolute and the figure chiasmus. Irenaeus has often strings of the former in passages Loofs allows are his or passes over, e.g. iii 17. 4 † 'spiritu descendente, veniente plenitudine temporis, Filio . . . incarnato, . . . implente, existente': i. 2. 6 * (supra) *συνευδοκούντος τοῦ Χριστοῦ, τοῦ δὲ πατρὸς συνεπισφραγιζομένου*; v 3. 3, * *παρέχοντος (θεοῦ), θεοῦ δυνατοῦ ὄντος . . . τῆς σαρκὸς δυναμένης*. Also note v 28. 2 † 'illo (diabolo) veniente, apostasiam recapitulante . . . operante . . . sedente,

Deo praesciente . . . immittente'; ii 13. 1 * 'sensu manente et condente et administrante et gubernante'. So when we come to iv 20. 6 (xiii IQT) 'Spiritu operante, Filio ministrante, Patre comprobante (συνειδοκοῦντος) homine consummato', and iv 38. 3 (xvi IQT) 'patre bene sentiente (εὐδοκοῦντος) et jubente, Filio ministrante et formante, Spiritu nutriente et agente, homine proficiente et perveniente ad perfectum' (also in Greek), we feel the hand of Irenaeus. Theophilus has very few genitive absolutes, θεοῦ παρέχοντος, and two or three more; in only one place (ii 32) has he two together.

Chiasmus is a frequent figure in *Adv. Haer.*, e.g. iii 14. 3 *, 'terrenum spiritali et spiritali terrenum', ii 28. 5 † 'quod cogitat, hoc et loquitur, et quod loquitur hoc et cogitat', iv 8. 3 * 'templum Dei violaverit, violabit eum Deus.' Now in iv 20. 6 (IQT xii) we have the chiasmus, ὁ ἀχώρητος καὶ ἀκατάληπτος καὶ ἀόρατος ὁρώμενον ἑαυτὸν καὶ καταλαμβάνόμενον καὶ χωρούμενον τοῖς πιστοῖς παρέσχεν. We can claim this for Irenaeus, especially as we have the same thought in iii 16. 6 † 'invisibilis visibilis factus et incomprehensibilis factus comprehensibilis'. All the negatives in xii occur in 1. 2. 1 * and 2 *, ἀόρατος καὶ ἀκατάληπτος . . . ἀχώρητος, ἀνεξιχνίαστος.

iv. 38. 3 (ii 293), claimed for IQT (xvi), has many phrases from earlier * passages. This is the most important extract, consisting of twenty-eight lines of Greek. The words (a) κατὰ τὸ παραμένειν αὐτὰ μακροῖς αἰῶσι . . . τοῦ θεοῦ προῖκα δωρουμένον (Lat. 'gratuito donante') τὴν εἰς αἰεὶ παραμονὴν αὐτοῖς. This goes back to ii 34. 2 * 'Patre donante in saeculum saeculi perseverantiam . . . vita secundum gratiam Dei datur . . . accipiet in saeculum saeculi longitudinem dierum (twice); Deo vitam et perpetuam perseverantiam donante, capit animas perseverare.'

[The same passage ii 34. 2* disproves the claim for v 2. 3 (as among 'die von IQT beeinflussten Stellen', p. 351). It describes the effect of the Eucharist (not in Theoph.) upon our bodies. Here we have τὴν ἀφθαρσίαν προῖκα χαρίζεται (Lat. 'gratuito donat') and ἡ εἰς αἰεὶ παραμονή. The phrases 'non ex nobis ipsis habentes vitam' and 'non ex nostra natura habemus in aeternum perseverantiam', go back to ii 34. 2 * 'non ex nobis neque ex nostra natura vita est, sed secundum gratiam Dei datur'. The passage is, therefore, Irenaeian.]

With διὰ τὴν ὑπερβάλλουσαν αὐτοῦ ἀγαθότητα (a) compare ii 25. 1. Gnostic *, 'propter eminentem bonitatem ejus'. ἀνερχόμενον πρὸς τὸ τέλειον (b) is 'ascendere ad perfectum', v 19. 2 † (also iv 39. 2 * 'ascendes ad perfectum'). πλησίον τοῦ ἀγενήτου γενόμενος (c) is 'appropinquat Deo', iv 17. 1 * περιποιητικὴ ἀφθαρσίας (d) is 'condonatrix immortalitatis', iv 13. 4 †; κατὰ τὸ γεγενῆσθαι αὐτὰ οὐκ ἀγένητα is 'quaecunque facta sunt . . . non sunt ingenita' ii 34. 2 *.

In (b) πρωτεύει μὲν ἐν πᾶσιν ὁ θεός . . . τὰ δὲ λοιπὰ πάντα ἐν ὑποταγῇ μένει τοῦ θεοῦ. See ii 34. 2 * again 'principari enim debet in omnibus et dominari voluntas Dei, reliqua autem omnia huic cedere et in servitium dedita'. The same phrase but more pointed occurs in iv 38. 3.

In (a) ἀγαθότης occurs twice, not in N.T. or Theophilus who has ἀγαθοσύνη (i. 3. sic). The opening words of the passage, *περὶ τὸν θεὸν δύναμις ὁμοῦ καὶ σοφία καὶ ἀγαθότης δείκνυται*, recall Wisdom (S) 7. 24 f, where the σοφία, δύναμις, and ἀγαθότης of God are found. In this extract Wisdom (S) 6. 19 f is quoted, ἀφθαρσία δὲ ἐγγὺς εἶναι ποιεῖ θεοῦ. Theoph. does not quote Wisdom.

In (a) τὸ καλὸν is τὸ ἀγαθόν, so iv 37. 6 * 'neque hoc ipsum intelligentes quoniam pulchrum sit bonum'. ἀφθόνως (sine invidia, Lat.) χαριζόμενος here recalls 'sine invidia praestat', iv 14. 1 *. In (a) the Sophia and goodness of God are shewn by His having made the things that were made εὔροθμα καὶ ἐμμελῆ (musical terms; see Philo iii 87. 5 (Cohn) et al.) latine 'apta et consonantia'. See a similar passage ii 24. 6 Gnostic * 'cum sapientia apta et ornata omnia a Deo facta sunt . . . bene aptata et consonantia'. There he compares the universe to a melody, 'sapientiae demonstratio et justitiae et bonitatis'. Here we have σοφία καὶ ἀγαθότης δείκνυται. In (b) ὑποταγῇ θεοῦ is followed by ἀφθαρσία and δόξα ἀγενήτου. In iv 14. 1 * the 'servitus erga Deum' is followed by 'vita et incorruptela' and 'gloria aeterna'. Compare also i 10. 1 † ζῶνν χαρισάμενος ἀφθαρσίαν δωρήσεται καὶ δόξαν αἰωνίαν περιποίησιν and χαριζόμενον . . . δωρομένου . . . περιποιητικῆ ἀφθαρσίας, δόξα ἀγενήτου here. The genitive absolutes (9) in (c) have already been mentioned. A striking difference between Theophilus and this passage, which proves that Theophilus could not have written it, is that here and always in Irenaeus immortality is a gift of God, given προῖκα, 'secundum gratiam Dei' (ii 34. 2 *) whereas in Theoph. it is a μισθός, ii 27, 'if he turns to the things of immortality, he may reap as reward (μ') immortality, ἀθανασία, from Him'. The free gift in Iren. is life, in Theoph. ii 27 it is death. 'That which he brought upon himself (death) through disobedience, God gives through philanthropy.' 'As by disobedience he drew death upon himself, so by obedience he can win for himself (περιποιήσασθαι ἑαυτῷ) eternal life.'

Here also the vision of God gives immortality, περιποιητικῆ ἀφθαρσίας, while in Theoph. i 7 immortality leads to the vision of God, ὄψη γενόμενος ἀθάνατος τὸν ἀθάνατον. See iv 20. 6 * 'homines videbunt Deum ut vivant, per visionem immortales facti'. This also shews that the phrases 'vita hominis visio Dei', iv 20. 7 (IQT xvii), and 'aeternam vitam quae unicuique evenit ex eo quod videat Deum', iv 24. 8, (IQT xi) are Irenaeian. Again '(Deus) visus per Spiritum prophetice', iv 20. 5, (IQT xi) has a parallel in v 1. 2 + 'praediximus quoniam Abraham et reliqui

prophetae *propheticæ videbunt* eum . . . visus est *propheticæ*. iv 7. 1 * 'per Spiritum prophetiae diem (Christi) videns' (Abraham). Irenaeus speaks in all these passages. Passages dealing with the Valentinians are pressed into service against Marcion by Loofs, e.g. iv 20. 1 (IQT i) and i 22. 1 (IQT xxv)—two important extracts dealing with the creation. In iv 20. 1 we have: 'non ergo angeli fecerunt nos, nec alius quis praeter Verbum Domini nec virtus longe absistens a Patre universorum. Nec enim indigebat horum Deus ad faciendum quae ipse apud se praefinierat fieri.¹ . . . Ipse a *semetipso* substantiam creaturarum et *exemplum* factorum et figuram in mundo ornamentorum accipiens'. Now in i 5. 2 * the Demiurge thought he made the seven heavens ἀφ' ἑαυτοῦ, but they say he was ignorant of the *figurae* of what he made. ii 7. 5 * 'Si mundi fabricator non a *semetipso* fecit haec, unde Bythus ipsorum habuit speciem ejus dispositionis?' He must 'ab altero *exemplum accepisse*'. In that section, we have 'exemplum accepisse', 'a *semetipso* facere' (4), and 'figuratio'. In ii 16. 3 * 'Si Demiurgus non a *semetipso* figuratorem creaturae fabricavit talem . . . a quo *figuram* eorum quae ante ipsum facta sunt, *accepit*?' How much better to confess that 'ipse a *semetipso exemplum et figuratorem eorum quae facta sunt accipiens*'! He had just said, 'a *semetipso* accepit exemplum mundi fabricationis' and 'unde ei est figuratio eorum quae facta sunt . . . et substantia ipsius exempli?' In ii 2. 4 † an Anti-gnostic section against the Valentinian theory that the world was made by angels or some inferior power: 'nullius indigens Deus verbo condidit omnia et fecit, neque angelis indigens adiutoribus ad ea quae fiunt, neque *virtute* aliqua valde inferiori sed ipse a *semetipso* omnia praedestinans fecit.' Also i 26. 1 * we have the opinion of Cerinthus that the world was not made by the first God, 'sed a *virtute quadam* valde *separata et distante*'. See also ii xi. 1 * 'credentes quoniam angeli aut virtus aliqua separata a Deo'. There are many passages dealing with the 'substantia creaturarum' in the early books, e.g. ii 10. 2 *: he answers those who ask 'unde substantia materiae?' by saying: 'Omnia fecit sua voluntate et virtute substantia usus.' Cf. ii 10. 4 * 'substantia eorum quae facta sunt' is attributed to the 'virtus et voluntas' of the Supreme God.

A phrase used in connexion with the creation is 'libere et ex sua potestate', e.g. ii 13. 1 *: ii 1. 1 † 'neque ab aliquo motus sed sua *sententia* et libere fecit omnia'. Here, in iv 20. 1 (IQT i), we have 'omnia libere et sponte fecit . . . ipse a *semetipso*'. Cf. also ii 10. 1 * 'sua potestate et a *semetipso*'. Accordingly, when we come to ii 30. 9 (vii IQT), an anti-Val. passage, we note that it abounds with Irenaeus

¹ The phrase 'quae ipse apud se praefinierat fieri' is Irenaeus. See ii 33. 5 *, ἀντὶς παρ' αὐτῷ προώρισε.

expressions, 'ipse a semetipso libere et sua potestate et disposuit et perfecit omnia et est *substantia omnium voluntas ejus*'—words underlined by Loofs, in spite of the fact that Irenaeus here referred back 'per plurima ostendimus' to the passages (anti-Val.) we have quoted. Again, he claims i 22. 1 (xxv IQT), a passage full of these Valentinian terms, for a treatise against Marcion. It is a 'regula veritatis' that there is 'unus Deus omnipotens qui omnia condidit per verbum suum . . . non per angelos neque per virtutes (*δυνάμεις*) aliquas *abscissas ab ejus sententia*'. Sententia is the Valentinian Ennoia. See i 1. 2 * the Propator is united *κατὰ συζυγίαν* with his own Ennoia; from this syzygy came the Aeons, i 12. 2 *: Ennoia is always with, *συνπαράχει*, the Propator or Bythus. i 23. 4 * (Menander) 'mundum factum ab angelis quos et ipse similiter ut Simon ab *Ennoia emissos* dicit'. i 23. 1 * 'This Ennoia exsiliens ex eo (pater) generare angelos et potestates by which he (Simon) said the world was made.' Thus Ennoia was detained by the very powers she had created. Irenaeus glanced at that idea in ii 16. 1 * 'oportet in eo Deo qui fecerit mundum perseverare *sententiam*'. The XXVth extract proceeds: 'nihil enim indiget omnium deus, sed *per verbum et spiritum suum* omnia faciens et disponens et gubernans et omnibus esse praestans'.

For 'disponens et gubernans' see v 18. 1 *; for 'omnibus esse praestans' ii 1. 1 †, iii 20. 2 *, ii 35. 3 *.

For 'nihil subtractum' see 'nihil subtrahens', iii 15. 1 *. The whole passage is full of Irenaeian phrases including the quotation, Ps. 33. 6, 'Spiritu *oris*' (Theoph. omits 'oris'). The reason Loofs claims it is that it has the phrase 'per verbum et spiritum suum', just as he claimed iv 20. 1 (i), iv 20. 2 (ii), iv 20. 4 (iv), iii 24. 2 (v), iv 7. 4 (vi), ii 30. 9 (vii) because they have 'per verbum et sapientiam suam', a combination five times in Theophilus (i 7, 2, 10, 15. 18). But here Irenaeus has 'per verbum et spiritum', and in iv 20. 3 defines 'sapientia' as 'spiritus', which Theoph. never does. It is also to be noted that Theophilus is not involved in an argument with another opinion of the creation, whereas Irenaeus is in every case combating a Valentinian or kindred thesis, e.g. in i 24. 3 * the theory of Basilides is given. The origin from the Pater innatus of Logos and Sophia, and from them of virtutes and angeli who made the 365 heavens, is given. That theory is glanced at by Irenaeus in iv 20. 1 *et al.* The world was not made by angels and virtutes with the assistance of Logos and Sophia. Irenaeus has sometimes *virtus Dei = verbum Dei*.¹ We have, therefore, a parallel to the phrase 'per verbum et sapientiam' in ii 30. 3 (*) omnia quae per *virtutem* Dei sunt constituta et sapientia ejus gubernantur', and in v 18. 1 † 'ea quae *ex sapientia et virtute*

¹ Loofs, pp. 26 and 429, recognizes the equation.

Patris ejus substantiam habuerunt'. The combination 'word and wisdom' has also been shewn in Wisdom (S) and Philo. The phrase is never explained by Theophilus as it is by Irenaeus, who also implied that God who made the world by His word and wisdom made it '*per semetipsum*', ii 30. 3 * and ii 30. 9 (IQT).

Loofs's claim for iv 37. 7 (p. 79) 'in apostasia hominis praefiniente Deo omnia ad hominis perfectionem *uti et bonitas ostendatur et justitia perficiatur*' on account of the last phrase which he considers a trace of Marcion is disproved by the fact that *apostasia*, frequent in *Adv. Haer.* both * and †, is never in Theophilus; that 'praefinire' is frequent also in * passages, e.g. i xi 4, ii 33. 35, v 31. 1; and that the phrase in question recalls previous passages (*), e.g. iv 33. 2 and iii 25. 3, where we have 'justum ostenditur', 'neque justum immite ostenditur, praeeunte scilicet et praecedente bonitate'. In the passage in question 'bonitas praecedes justitia'. The passage proceeds to give the words stressed on p. 61 as IQT—'ubi . . . tandem aliquando maturus fiat homo *in tantis maturescens* ad videndum et capiendum Deum', with which there is a close parallel in iv 9. 3 * 'ut possint semper proficere credentes in eum et *maturescere* profectum (acc. of resp. προκοπή) salutis.' iv 5. 1 * 'fecit temporalia propter hominem ut *maturescens* in eis fructificet immortalitatem.' Loofs also claims 'capere Deum' (p. 309 *et al.*) for IQT, and speaks of 'das aus IQT stammende capientem perfectum Patrem', v 1. 3. That phrase is Irenaeus from the beginning of the treatise i. i. 1 * where Nous alone is χωρῶν τὸ μέγεθος τοῦ πατρός (Gnostic). The conclusion of the treatise (claimed for IQT), 'capiatur ab eo . . . capiat verbum', v 36. 3, recalls 'cape (χώρησον) eum et capere (χωρήθητι) in eo', i 13. 3 * (Gnostic). Also compare i 2. 1 *, 'magnitudinem perfecti Patris comprehendere', and ii 18. 5 *, 'comprehendentes perfectum (Patrem)'. Also iv 4. 2 † 'Mensura Patris Filius quoniam *capit* eum', the explanation of a quotation. 'IQT says nothing of this' (Loofs p. 64). ἀχώρητος (incapabilis) is frequent in * passages, e.g. i 1. 1, i 2. 1, i 15. 6, πάντα χωροῦντα πατέρα, ἀχώρητον δὲ ὑπάρχοντα. It also occurs in Theoph. i 5. Irenaeus may have taken it from Pliny. He says, ii 13. 4 * '*quantus erat locus* . . . ut caperet Dei sensum?' Pliny' *N.H.* ii 1. 1. 'Numen aeternum immensum nec capit humanae conjectura mentis. . . Furor est *mensuram* ejus animo quosdam agitasse, quasi . . . mens hominum possit videre quae *mundus ipse non capit*.' Occurring so frequently in the Anti-Val. passages, it is not a mark of Theophilus. Accordingly, iv 20. 5 (IQT. xi) which has the contrast between God's love and greatness, and also 'incapabilis' ('secundum magnitudinem . . . nemo videbit

¹ Seneca *Nat. Quaest.* 1 Prol. 'omnia angusta esse, *mensus Deum*'. Pliny's passage on God, 'totus est sensus, totus visus, totus auditus, totus animae, &c.' *N.H.* ii 5 has a clear echo in the *Adv. Haer.* iv 11. 1.

Deum et vivet, incapabilis enim Pater; secundum autem dilectionem') is most certainly Irenaeus; and so is iv 20. 1 (IQT x) 'secundum magnitudinem non est cognoscere Deum: impossibile est enim mensurari Deum, secundum autem dilectionem. . . .' All through the treatise God's love and greatness are connected and contrasted, e.g. ii 13. 4 * 'dicitur (Pater) secundum haec propter dilectionem, sentitur autem super haec secundum magnitudinem'; ii 17. 10 * 'Pater si propter immensam magnitudinem ignorabitur et propter immensam dilectionem etc.' He varies the form of the antithesis, e.g. ii 6. 1 †, 'invisibilis propter eminentiam, ignotus nequaquam propter providentiam'. All passages where this form is found, e.g. iv 20. 5 (IQT xi), iv 20. 6 (IQT xii), iv 20. 4 (IQT iv), where God's 'magnitudo' and 'dilectio' are contrasted, are Irenaeus, not Theophilus. Also iii 24. 2 (IQT v) 'propter dilectionem et *immensam benignitatem*', has the Irenaeus phrase 'propter *immensam benignitatem*', iv 36. 5 *. See the anti-Val. passage, i 2. 1 *, τὸ μέγεθος τὸ ἀμέτρητον (not in Theophilus) τοῦ πατρὸς κατανοῶν, ἡλικός καὶ ὅσος ἰπῆρξε. This shews that 'impossibile mensurari Patrem . . . tantus Deus est' (iv 20. 1 IQT x), 'sentiet de Deo quantus est Deus', iii 20. 1, and 'immensurabilis est Deus . . . tam magnum Deum' all claimed for IQT are echoes of the anti-Val. controversy. From the controversial beginning to the end of the treatise Irenaeus emphasized the unsearchable, ἀνεξιχνίαστος (not in Theophilus), greatness of God (τὸ μέγεθος . . . τὸ ἀνεξιχνίαστον, i 2. 2 *: ἐξηγείται . . . τὸν ἀνεξιχνίαστον, i 15. 6 Gnostic *). Accordingly, τὸ μέγεθος αὐτοῦ ἀνεξιχνίαστον . . . ἡ ἀγαθότης ἀνεξήγητος, in iv 20. 6, IQT xii has the Irenaeus hall-mark. We have another in ii 17. 9 *, 'altitudines investigantes incogniti Patris', ii 28. 9 *, 'Valentinus aliquis existens aut Ptolemaeus . . . qui *altitudines Dei* exquisisse se dicunt'; i 1. 1. * the 'Aeon ἐν ἀοράτοις ἐψώμασι'; ii 30. 3 * 'quis poterit investigare magnitudinem sapientiae . . . Dei?' These Val. passages disprove the claim for IQT of iv 20. 4, IQT iv 'nemo investigavit altitudinem ejus', and v 36. 3 (conclusion) 'non praevalent investigare sapientiam Dei'.

A pair of terms often in the Val. passages is ἀχώρητος καὶ ἀκατάληπτος i. 2. 5 *, i. 2. 1 * *et al.*, 'incapabilis et incomprehensibilis' (three times), ii 17. 10 *: ἀόρατος is joined with them in i 1. 1 * and i 2. 1 *, so that iv 20. 6 (IQT xii) with ὁ ἀχώρητος καὶ ἀκατάληπτος καὶ ἀόρατος belongs to Irenaeus. Extract IQT xx, 4. 39. 2 contains an Irenaeus phrase—'facere proprium est benignitatis dei, fieri autem proprium est hominis naturae'. (Loofs says is 'wörtlich aus IQT', p. 411.) But compare iv 11. 2 * 'hoc Deus ab homine differt quoniam Deus quidem facit, homo autem fit. Deus bene facit; bene autem fit homini, neque Deus cessat in benefaciendo' (cf. Philo, i 62. 16 (C) θεοῦ τὸ ποιεῖν ἴδιον, *Leg. Alleg.* i 44 θεοῦ τὸ εὐεργετεῖν ἴδιον, παύεται οὐδέποτε ποιῶν ὁ θεός). See

also ii. 34. 2 * on the difference between God and man—'sine initio et sine fine et semper idem et eodem modo se habens, solus est Deus. Quae autem sunt ab illo omnia, quaecunq; facta sunt, et fiunt, initium suum accipiunt generationis, *et per hoc inferiora sunt ab eo qui ea fecit quoniam non sunt ingenita*; ita ut sic initio fierent et postea ut sint eis donat. . . . Debet reliqua autem omnia huic cedere et subdita esse.' In iii 8. 3 IQT xxviii Irenaeus enlarges on the difference between the Maker and the things He made. 'Ipse infectus et sine initio' (ἀναρχος i 2. 1 *).

'Et sine fine et nullius indigens, ipse sibi sufficiens (ἀντὸς ἑαυτῷ ἰκανὸς ὁ θεός, Ph. iii. 165. 1. C) et adhuc reliquis omnibus ut sint, hoc ipsum praestans; quae vero ab eo sunt facta initium sumpserunt et dissolutionem possunt percipere, et subjecta sunt, et *indigent ejus* qui se fecit.' With 'dissolutionem percipere' compare 'dissolutionem accipientia', iv 16. 4 *. That God does not need man's service and man needs God is one of the main thoughts of *Adv. Haer.*, e.g. iv 17. 4 * 'non indigens Deus servitute eorum'. Cf. iv 16. 4 *, iv 18. 3 *, iv 18. 6 * 'nullius indigens est Deus'; iv 14. 1 * 'in quantum Deus nullius indiget in tantum homo indiget Dei communione'; iv 38. 1 (IQT xxix) continues the theme, and has an echo of ii 34. 2 * 'quae facta sunt ab eo *secundum quod postea facturae initium habuerunt, secundum hoc et minora esse oportuit eo qui se fecerit*, which shews that it is Irenaeian also. (See ii 34. 2 * supra.)

A phrase frequently in * passages is 'ars dei'; in connexion with corpus, ii 33. 5 *; 'continere ejus (Dei) artem', iv 39. 3 *; 'caro perceptit artem Dei', v 3. 3 *. So iv 39. 2 (IQT xx) with 'recipies ejus artem et eris perfectum opus Dei' is Irenaeian. Here Irenaeus describes the work of the potter and his two processes of (1) moistening and moulding the clay and then of (2) glazing. Loofs interrupts the process by beginning his extract with the glazing process—'liniet te ab intus et a foris auro puro et argento etc'. In the preceding passage we have the moistening and moulding process, 'custodi figuram qua te figuravit artifex, habens in temetipso humorem, ne induratus amittas vestigia digitorum ejus'. To this Loofs makes no direct claim. But having described the glazing process, Irenaeus refers back to the former process, 'si obduratus respuas artem ejus . . . artem ejus amisisti'. This Loofs claims. But it is an echo of a passage he does not claim and is in accordance with iv 39. 3 * 'non ars deficit Dei, neque Deus coget eum qui nolit continere ejus artem'. Irenaeus had both processes before him in Ecclus. 38. 29 τυπώσει πηλόν . . . συντελέσαι τὸ χρίσμα. The whole extract is Irenaeian (v 5. 1 has πύρινος (igneo curru) from Ecclus. 48. 9 (Elias)).

Words relating to the arrangement, order, and adornment of the world

are frequent in the controversial part; e.g. ii 30. 3 * has 'aptabilia, adornare, ornata,' etc., ii 7. 5 * 'ornata dispositio', i 2. 6 * 'in unum adaptantes', i 2. 1 * 'adaptare', ii 24. 6 * 'apta et ornata omnia a Deo sunt facta', ii 25. 1 * 'aptata et consonantia', ii 34. 2 * 'stellae et omnia ornamenta ipsorum', iii 6. 5 * 'omne ornamentum caeli' (LXX κόσμος, Theoph. ii 35 *σπαριά*, Deut. 4. 19). We can, therefore, claim for Irenaeus the extracts which Loofs assigns to IQT: iv 20. 1 (X) with 'adornavit'; iv 20. 2 (II) with 'adornavit'; iv 20. 1 (I) with 'ornamenta'; iv 20. 4 (IV), 'adaptavit'; i. 22. 1 (XXV), 'aptavit'; v 6. 1 (XXIII), 'adaptare'; *Epideixis* (5) viii, 'geschmückt'. Loofs (p. 14) emphasized these terms, but overlooked their origin in the earlier books of the anti-Val. controversy.

Loofs (p. 27) also stresses the use of 'paternus' (*πατρικός*) claiming for IQT iv 39. 3 with '*paternum lumen*' (XVII), τὸ πατρικὸν φῶς, and iv 20. 2 'paterna lux'. Again, he failed to trace the source of the expression, the anti-Val. controversy, ii 19. 3 *, see ii 19. 4 * where the '*pleromate lumen*' is called '*paternum lumen*'. It occurs four times in the section ii 4. 2—ii 5. 2 * in connexion with the *Pleroma*. He also claims in this connexion iv 20. 6 (XII) 'οἱ βλέποντες τὸ φῶς ἐντὸς εἰσι τοῦ φωτὸς καὶ τῆς λαμπρότητος; so those who see God are ἐντὸς τοῦ θεοῦ (sharing His λαμπρότης)'. Again, see the anti-Val. passage ii 4. 2 * 'If they imagine that the "*paternum lumen*" can illumine all things that are *intra eum*' (Pater) (twice). In ii 5. 1 * he proceeds 'cogentur omnia lucida ea quae sunt *intra Patrem* confiteri, aut *paternum lumen* accusare quasi qui (pater) non possit omnia illuminare'. The idea of being *within God* is paramount in this and the following section ii 4. 2 *. So also ii 18. 5 * 'de quaerendo perfectum Patrem et velle *intra eum* fieri et habere ejus comprehensionem'. These ideas are expressed in XII, where those who see God are within God, and share His brightness; and the incomprehensible becomes comprehensible. Theophilus used *πατρικός* twice, but in a *human* connexion, ii 25, iii 22, with ἐντολή and συνήθεια, but Ir. has the aeon Πατρικός, i 1. 3 *. iv 39. 3 (XVII) has '*lumen incorruptibilitatis*', but '*lumen incorruptibile*' (twice) is in i 30. 1 * Gnostic. The Barbeliotae (i 29. 1 *) called the *lumen*, anointed by the Father with the Spirit, Christ. This may have suggested '*paterna lux*' for Christ to Irenaeus.

XVII. iv 20. 2 (IQT), 'in carne domini nostri occurrat paterna lux . . . sic homo deveniat in incorruptelam circumdatus paterno lumine' is therefore to be explained by the anti-Val. sections.

The same applies to the passages on human progress and perfection in the *Adv. Haer.* Loofs (p. 61) says the idea of a gradual development of man to perfection under God's training is indicated in the books to Autolycus. He adds—strangely enough as IQT is supposed to precede

Ad Autolyicum—'in IQT ist dies ein mannigfach ausführlicher entwickelter Grundgedanke.' In ii 4. 2 * anti-Val. Irenaeus rings the changes on 'perfection', 'quemadmodum (how) homines advocari ad perfectum dicunt' (Valentinians), 'in novissimis temporibus¹ misertus est hominum et perfectum eis dat . . . dare eis perfectum . . . perfecti facti'. See also ii 19. 3 f * 'figurari . . . et augescere et formari et ad perfectionem pervenire'. iv 9. 3 * 'ut possint semper proficere, credentes in eum et per testamenta maturescere profectum (προκοπή) salutis'; ii 32. 2 *, Gnostic, 'ad perfectum transgrediantur'; iv 11. 2 * 'Deus perfectus in omnibus, homo profectum percipiens et augmentum ad Deum . . . semper proficiet ad Deum'; iv 9. 2 * 'adveniente perfectio' (τὸ τέλειον) we shall see this Father whom we now desire to see . . . this Son of God in whom we believe . . . we receive this Holy Spirit who is with us . . . 'et in iisdem ipsis (i.e. Father, Son, and Spirit) augmentum habebimus et proficiemus.' These are all passed over by Loofs. So when he claims (p. 61) iv 38. 3 (IQT xvi) τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἡρέμα προκόπτοντος καὶ ἀνερχομένου εἰς τὸ τέλειον (cf. v 19. 2 † 'ascendere ad perfectum') and iv 20. 7 'ut haberet ad quod proficeret', iv 37. 7 (p. 79) 'ut . . . aliquando maturus fiat in tantis maturescens² ad videndum et capiendum Deum', we challenge the claim.

Theophilus refers to growth also, ii 24. When man was transferred to Paradise, God gave him ἀφορμὴ προκοπῆς ὅπως αὐξάνων καὶ τέλειος γενόμενος ἔτι δὲ καὶ θεὸς ἀναδειχθεὶς, οὕτως καὶ εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν ἀναβῆναι. But man fell and was removed from Paradise (and the growth referred to was from childishness (νήπιος) and in Paradise) in order that, having expiated (ἀποτίσας) his sin and been disciplined (παιδευθεὶς), ἐξ ὑστέρον ἀνακληθῆναι (26). Man's own death is the means of his recovery. As a vessel broken ἀναχωνεῖται ἢ ἀναπλάσσειται, so it happens to man διὰ θανάτου; he is broken by its power to be found whole in the resurrection. And yet Loofs c aims for IQT iii 20. 2 (p. 92), 'He who died for man was made in the likeness of sinful flesh, that he might condemn sin (Rom. 8. 3), and cast it out of the flesh.' In iii 18. 7 the slaying of sin is described, God recapitulating in Himself the ancient formation of man that he might slay sin and evacuate death and give man life. He recapitulated man's death, v 23. 2, iii 21. 10. In v 19. 1 he speaks of the 'obedientia in ligno' in relation to the 'inobedientia in ligno' in terms of a recapitulation; in v 17. 1 'Nostram inobedientiam per suam obedientiam *consolatus*.'

¹ An Irenaeus phrase, not in Theoph., occurring 27 times in 25 passages: only one claimed for IQT iv 33. 15 (xv), and in that in connexion with effusion of the Holy Spirit, not in Theoph., but in iii 12. 9 * and iii 11. 9 †. The phrase makes XV Irenaeus.

² Cf. iv 5. 1 * 'fecit temporalia propter hominem ut *maturescens in eis* fructificet immortalitatem'.

³ Irenaeus has 15 quotations from Rom. viii. Theophilus has none.

In v 16. 2 this obedience 'in ligno' dissolved the disobedience 'in ligno'. In the second Adam we have been reconciled, having been made 'obedient unto death'. The death of Christ, the crowning act of Christ's obedience and identification in Irenaeus, is left out of the system of Theophilus, who quotes 1 Cor. 1 18 (2. 1) with ἡμῶν in place of σταυροῦ.

Again in iv 39. 3 (IQT xvii) the phrase '(lumen) fugientibus et quasi semetipsos excaecantibus . . . praeparavit tenebras' is Irenaeian. In v 13. 2 * it is the story of Oedipus that suggested the phrase 'fugiunt lumen veritatis secundum tragicum Oedipodem semetipsos excaecantes'; v 27. 2 * 'qui excaecaverunt semetipsos'. On the other hand, Theophilus (i 2) speaks of those upon the eyes of whose souls a film has gathered from sin, not of the self-blinded. For the rest of the passage see iv 40. 1 * 'super eos . . . qui refugiunt ejus lumen . . . tenebras praeparans'. The phrase in iv 39. 3 (same extract), 'per suam abstiterunt (ἀπέστησαν) culpam (αἰτίαν), ἐλεύθερα καὶ αὐτεξούσια τὴν γνώμην', has a parallel in v 27. 2 *, 'separavit semetipsum a Deo voluntaria sententia' (following a passage on the self-blinded).

Among other special phrases of Irenaeus are 'secundum placitum (εὐδοκία) Patris' occurring often in * and † passages, with the variant 'ex placito Patris'. Theophilus has κατὰ τὸ θέλημα, iii 23. These phrases challenge iii 20. 2 (IQT p. 92), v 1. 3 (IQT xxi). The phrase 'qui continet omnia' is not in Theoph. but often in Iren. Theoph. has τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ περιέχον (i 3); *Adv. Haer.* v 2. 3 * τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ συνέχον τὰ πάντα; iii 11. 8 * the Logos ὁ συνέχων τὰ πάντα; iv 20. 6 (context *) 'Pater qui continet omnia et omnibus esse praestat.' This challenges the claim of iv 20. 1 (IQT x), 'continet omnia'.

The preceding words 'constituit et adornavit'¹ are in 1 Praef. 2 * ὁ τότε τὸ πᾶν συστησάμενος καὶ κεκοσμηκός. 'Omnibus esse praestans.' We have this and the preceding 'qui continet omnia' in ii 35. 3 * 'unus Deus et Pater qui continet omnia et omnibus ut sint praestans'. The latter phrase is often in * passages, e.g. iii 20. 2, and † passages, ii 1. 1, iv 20. 6. It challenges the claim of i 22. 1 IQT xxv. 'Hic mundus qui est secundum nos' (IQT x). This is an Irenaeian phrase in ii 2. 4 †, v 31. 1 †, i 5. 4 *, iv 33. 2 *. *Per haec tanta uno ostenso Patre*, ii 35. 3 * is repeated in iv 20. 6 IQT xiii, 'per omnia haec deus pater ostenditur'. In v 5. 1 IQT xxii ῥυθμίζειν is used of what the hands of God do to their πλάσμα. In ii 15. 2 * anti-Val. we have rhythimizatio (2) and rhythmizatus (deponent in sense of 'disponens'). ἀπ' ἀρχῆς i 10. 1 †, v 16. 3 (twice IQA?). Theoph. has ἀρχῆθεν, ii 17, 18, iii 9. This challenges

¹ Loofs (p. 18) sees in 'constituit, fecit, adornavit' a reference to the Trinity. But Philo ii 255. 3 (C) has ἔθηκε καὶ διατάξατο καὶ διεκόσμησε τὰ ὅλα. Irenaeus has many echoes of Philo which Loofs did not notice.

iv 38. 1 IQT xxix. ἐν ἀρχῇ (v 28. 4 IQT xxiv) is another Irenaeus mark, Theophilus using ἐν πρώτοις of time, e.g. i 10, ii 6, 10, 22, 24, 32 *et al.* and explaining ἐν ἀρχῇ Gen. 1. 1 as διὰ τῆς ἀρχῆς!

We have now tried Loofs's twenty-nine passages and many others assigned to his source IQT by a threefold test: scriptural quotations, Irenaeus phrases, and passages, principally in the earlier controversial books, passed over by Loofs or allowed by him to be the work of Irenaeus. Passages of this kind are adduced throughout the article, and form the chief foundation of its argument. The conclusion of our study of this monumental work is that Irenaeus has lost nothing by the process and that Loofs's theory is not proven.

F. R. MONTGOMERY HITCHCOCK.