

guarded his words from misunderstanding. Athanasius in condemning the Arian doctrine did not fail to see its connexion with the ideas and language of the Apologists. In his confession of faith, he goes to the root of the matter and aims a blow at both. 'We believe . . . in one only-begotten Logos, Wisdom, Son, timelessly and invisibly begotten from the Father, but not a λόγος προφορικός or ἐνδιάθετος nor an emanation from perfect being . . . for he is the true image of the Father equal in glory and honour . . . very God of very God, and we exist by his true Son, Jesus Christ.'¹ His attack was effective and is often repeated by his successors.² The terms λόγος ἐνδιάθετος and λόγος προφορικός occur but rarely in orthodox Christian cosmology for long after his time, and in the ninth century Photius can see in Clement's words perilous thoughts which it is more charitable to ascribe to the Arians who fully revealed their danger.³ Early critics of the Fathers saw Arianism in most of the passages cited above.⁴ Theophilus and Tertullian both fell under the censor's blow.

R. P. CASEY.

DR SANDAY'S NEW TESTAMENT OF IRENAEUS, WITH A NOTE ON VALENTINIAN TERMS IN IRENAEUS AND TERTULLIAN.⁵

AT long last Dr Sanday's great edition of the quotations of Irenaeus from the New Testament has appeared. Professor Turner in his Preface tells the story of the book, how it was planned by Dr Sanday soon after he returned to Oxford as Ireland Professor in 1883, and how

¹ Athanasius, Migne *P. G.* xxv 197 ff; A. Hahn *Bibliothek der Symbole*, 3^{te} Aufl., p. 264.

² Basil of Caesarea, *Homilia III in Hexaemeron* 2, Migne *P. G.* xxix 54-55; *Homilia* 24, *P. G.* xxxi 601; cf. Migne *P. G.* xlvi 193; xxxiii 701, *P. L.* xx 28, 32; cf. the texts of the longer and shorter recensions of Ignatius *ad Magn.* viii 2.

³ Basil of Caesarea, Migne *P. G.* xxix 54-55, xxxi 601; Gregory of Nyssa (?), Migne *P. G.* xlvi 193; Gregory of Nazianzus (?), *P. L.* xx 32; Phoebadius of Aginensis, Migne *P. L.* xx 28. An adequate treatment of these terms in Greek philosophy after Philo or in Christian theology after the third century is wanting, although scattered references can be found; cf. F. Osann's edition of Cornutus, pp. 283-284, M. Heinze *op. cit.* p. 317, and Wyttenbach's *Plutarch* vol. vi p. 378; viii p. 1380; and the article of Lebreton, not accessible to me, *Études* cvi p. 319. For Marcellus of Ancyra, cf. F. Loofs *Trinitätslehre Marcellus von Ancyra (Sitzungsberichte der königl. preuss. Akad. der Wissenschaften, 1902, p. 769)*.

⁴ The references may be found in the notes in Migne. Clement's name was linked with that of Arius as well as that of Origen; cf. Zahn *Forschungen* iii p. 141.

⁵ *Old-Latin Biblical Texts: No. VII. Nouum Testamentum Sancti Irenaei Episcopi Lugdunensis* . . . edited from the MSS . . . by the late William Sanday and C. H. Turner, assisted by many other scholars and especially by A. Souter. (Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1923.)

various events (some of them fortunate, such as the publication of the Armenian text) led to delay after delay, so that Dr Sanday died with the work still not quite finished.

It is not an easy book to read, for in addition to the main text of the Gospels and Acts (pp. 1-114) it is necessary always to look up Prof. Turner's *Addimenta* (Appendix I, pp. 204-225), and his *Notes and Corrections* (Appendix IV, pp. 229-252): it is well also to look what variants there may be in the Armenian text of Iren. *adv. Haer.*, books IV and V (pp. 253-288). But the main trouble is that it is a house divided against itself. The chief contributors fall into two parties: Dr Hort and Prof. Souter against Dr Sanday and Prof. Turner.

The question at issue is the date of the Latin translation of the *adv. Haer.*, and in particular whether Tertullian used this translation or the original Greek. Dr Hort (Intro. to N. T. § 220) had stated his belief that this Latin translation was not earlier than the fourth century, but no exposition of his reasons had ever been published. 'Among the mass of papers which he left behind were the jottings of an investigation into this very question. . . . His son, Sir Arthur Hort, entrusted it to Dr Sanday's hands to be dealt with at his discretion. There could be no doubt as to the imperative desirability of printing it (*Praef.* p. xi). Accordingly it appears as Chapter II under the title "Did Tertullian use the Latin Irenaeus?"' (pp. xxxvi-lvi).

As might have been expected Dr Hort's paper is a very solid and judicious piece of criticism, and to me it appears quite decisive. It did not convince Dr Sanday, however, who puts in a counter-plea (pp. lvii-lxiii): it is a pity that this is disfigured by a serious blunder on p. lxi, where it is stated that Tertullian and Iren-lat both use *intentio* for ἐνθύμησις, on which Dr Sanday lays great stress. 'The coincidence in *intentio* is all the more noticeable', he says. And so perhaps it would be; but the fact is that *intentio* is only found in Iren-lat, for Tertullian has the transliterated *Enthymesis* ³/₃.¹ The rest of the points here in question are best left to the separate Note (at the end of this review), for to make them intelligible they need some sort of statement of the Valentinian theology.

Another approach to the subject is effected by the contributions of Prof. Souter and Prof. Turner. Cannot the date of the Latin translation of Irenaeus be discovered from a consideration of its style and diction? It must have been later than 180, the date of the original Greek, and it was clearly used by St Augustine in 421. Souter in 104 pages supports Dr Hort and suggests the period 370-420 (p. xcvi),

¹ *Oehler*, p. 394³, 395⁸, 395¹⁴. I prefer to regard *animationem* (394³) with Beatus Rhenanus as a gloss on *Enthymesis*, rather than as a corruption of *anteriorem* (Turner, p. xlii).

Turner adds a postscript of seven pages, more or less agreeing with Dr Sanday, and the same view is maintained in his Appendix IV containing the important 'Notes, Additions, and Corrections to the text of the Gospels and Acts' (pp. 229-252).

On one point he is clearly right. Souter had brought forward some evidence to suggest that the quotations in Iren-lat from the Pauline Epistles seemed to imply a partial use of the Vulgate itself. But Turner shews that the peculiarities of the Latin translation on which Souter had relied reappear in the Armenian, so that they must have had a place in the original Greek of Irenaeus. The Armenian translation of Books IV and V establishes—what we knew already from a general consideration of the passages still preserved in Greek—that the Latin is a very faithful and literal rendering of the Greek original. As a general rule the translator seems to have rendered almost word for word the Greek that was before him, even in the Biblical quotations. If in Jn. xii 27 Irenaeus adds *οὐκ οἶδα το καὶ τί εἶπω* (p. 86), Iren-lat adds *nescio*. If in 2 Cor. xii 4 Irenaeus wrote *ρήματα ἄρρητα* (p. 152), where all other authorities have *ἄρρ. ῥήμ.*, Iren-lat has *sermones inenarrabiles*. This makes Iren-lat a most valuable authority, but it also makes it far more difficult to place or date. I confess that I have no certainties to offer.

At the same time I cannot quite agree with Prof. Turner about some of the points which to him make a very early date so certain. Thus Matt. xi 11 appears in Iren-lat in the form *Nemo in natis mulierum maior est Iohanne Baptizatore*¹: here Irenaeus has *in natis* with *k* for *internatos* of all the other texts, and '*Baptizator*' with *k* and Tertullian for the familiar '*Baptista*'. It is indeed a striking coincidence with the ancient 'African' text, as Prof. Turner points out in his elaborate Note on the passage (p. 235). But when he goes on to say that 'it is almost incredible that any one in the later fourth century should have talked of *Iohannes baptizator*' I venture to think it is going beyond the evidence, for this form of the title was not altogether unused in later times. Adamnan tells us that Bishop Arculfus saw on the banks of the Jordan in 670 a church *in honorem sancti baptizatoris Iohannis fundata* (Itinera Sancta 266, l. 15; and again 272, l. 4). It seems to me not incredible that the translator of Irenaeus, rendering word for word with his eyes fixed on the Greek of his exemplar, may here, as elsewhere, have stumbled upon the so-called 'African' phraseology.²

This sounds rather like special pleading, but on p. xxiii Prof. Turner says: 'In Matt. xii 42 Iren-lat has *natio* for *γενεά* with *k* alone . . . : the passage is not a direct quotation and so may represent the translator's

¹ So the best MSS C and V.

² Elsewhere Iren-lat, when not directly quoting the Gospel, has *Iohannes baptisator* (IV 4, 3), but *Iohannes baptista* (IV 7, 2, V 17, 3).

own usage as easily as his Bible's.' What is important to remember is that in any case the Greek text of Irenaeus was before him, while the influence of the Latin Bible, in whatever form, was only indirect. In proportion as we lay stress upon the 'faithfulness' of the Latin Irenaeus (as demonstrated by its literal agreement with the Armenian, &c.), we must be prepared to regard its agreements or disagreements with particular types of 'Old-Latin' biblical texts as fortuitous. In Matt. xii 42 *natio* for γεῖνά is 'African', but in Phil. ii 15 it is the rendering of every Latin text, except a translation of Epiphanius on Canticles.¹

Like all known Latin biblical texts Iren-lat is not pedantically consistent in the choice of renderings. Thus the generally 'African' *si quominus* occurs three times,² but the alternative word *alioquin* is found in II 22. 1 and probably elsewhere. It may be noted in passing that no text has *si quominus* in Mark, though *k* has it in Matthew 2½ for εἰ δὲ μήγε.

The questions at issue are very well illustrated by the use in Iren-lat of *triticum* and *frumentum*, both equivalents of σῖτος. I suppose the two words correspond in usage to 'corn' and 'wheat', but I do not know which is which. In Matthew *frumentum* is clearly 'African' and *triticum* 'European' and Vulgate, but in Jn. xii 24 all Old-Latin texts have 'a grain of *triticum*'; it is only the Vulgate that has 'a grain of *frumentum*'. In Lk. xxii 31 all the texts, including Cyprian, have *triticum*. In Mk. iv 28 *e c* and *b ff* have *triticum*, *a i* and *vg* have *frumentum*, while *d f q* have *granum*. Of the passages where σῖτος occurs, Irenaeus quotes or refers to Matt. iii 12, xiii 25, 30, Mk. iv 28. Iren-lat has *triticum* in Matt. xiii 30 and Mk. iv 28, and also in Matt. iii 12 2/5; it has *frumentum* in Matt. xiii 25 and in Matt. iii 12 2/5³; while in one place it has *fructum*. And further, in the same context that Iren-lat speaks of the *zizianorum et tritici parabola* (IV 40, 2) the quotation has *superseminavit zizania inter frumentum*, and in quoting Ignatius it uses *frumentum* not *triticum* (V 28, 3). These details are tiresome and perplexing, but I venture to think they shew how little we can discriminate between the vocabulary natural to the translator of Irenaeus and the influence of the biblical text known to him.

In some places indeed it is legitimate to see this influence. Prof. Turner on p. xxiii refers to *malignus* as a term for 'the devil', and quite rightly says that it is a rendering of ὁ πονηρός and an echo of Matt. xiii 38. Now *filiis maligni* is read in Matt. xiii 38 by *e d f h q r₂* Habet-deus and Augustine 1/2, so that, as each time the phrase occurs in

¹ *Natio uiperarum* (Matt. iii 7) occurs also in 'Greg. Illib.', p. 85.

² See my Note on this phrase (*The Old Latin and the Itala* p. 41 f).

³ Here Iren-lat agrees with Aug (*Collat. Carth.* 316): this reference should be added on p. clvi.

Iren-lat it refers to Matt. xiii 38, it is useless to bring *malignus* forward as an indication of place or date. In this verse, it may be added, *k* has *filii mali* and it is the Vulgate alone that has the generally 'African' *nequam*.¹

It was a great step forward when Dr Sanday in 1885, in his 'Remarks on the Corbey St James' (*Studia Biblica* i 233 ff), first made us familiar with the 'African' Biblical vocabulary, *felix* for 'beatus', *claritas* for 'gloria', *sermo* for 'uerbum', &c. But further research shews that not all of these distinctions hold good right through the Four Gospels, not to speak of other books. Thus *claritas* is undoubtedly by far the most generally characteristic rendering of *δόξα* in *k* and *e* and Cyprian, but it is equally characteristic of *b* and the Vulgate in the latter part of St John's Gospel; while if attestation can prove anything the angelic song in Lk. ii 14 always began in Latin with *Gloria*, though it may be doubted whether the earliest rendering had *in excelsis* or *in altissimis*.

Among the test-words in the Gospels are the renderings of *ἀρχιερεύς*. In Iren-lat *pontifex* is not used, but plain *sacerdotibus* occurs in Matt. xvi 21 (= *e*), and *principibus sacerdotum* in a reference to Acts iv 5 ff. What is remarkable, however, is that *summus sacerdos* occurs no less than four times, in one of which it certainly seems to be due to the Latin translator rather than to come from Irenaeus himself. Thus he has *summi sacerdotes* in a reference to Acts v 23 (III 12, 5), our Lord is said to perform *summi sacerdotis opera* (IV 8, 2), we find *Caiphās² summus sacerdos et Anna et reliqui summi sacerdotes* in a reference to Jn. xviii 13 ff (II 19, 7), and there is the phrase *summi sacerdotis mortua filia*, meaning Jairus's daughter (V 13, 1). As Irenaeus in I 8, 2 speaks of *τὴν τοῦ ἀρχισυναγώγου θυγατέρα* (*archisynagogi filiam*), and as the Armenian in V 13, 1 has 'the dead daughter of the Centurion', we see that something is wrong, but in any case the partiality of Iren-lat for *summus sacerdos* is illustrated. Now this term is characteristic of the 'European' text of Mark, followed by the Vulgate. What the exact genesis of that text was is most obscure, but at least it was neither 'African' nor primitive. The most consistent witnesses in Mark to *sum. sac.* seem to be *d* and the Vulgate, after that comes the Irish text *r*.

The Latin translation of Irenaeus is no doubt very faithful, but there are some indications that the influence of the biblical text upon the translator now and then went beyond the choice of synonyms. The Oxyrhynchus fragment of the original Greek (*OP* 405) is, according to

¹ The other renderings are *fil. iniqui* (*b m*) and *fil nequitiae* (*a c f f g*).

² On p. 223 Prof. Turner writes *Caiphās*: if this be really the reading of C it should have had *sic* put to it. The only 'Caiphās' in Latin I know outside the better text of the Vulgate is a correction made by the ancient Latin corrector of Codex Bezae (Act iv 6, Scrivener's G). *Anna* for *Annas* is found in *a* and *r*.

Grenfell and Hunt, 'not later than the first half of the third century and might be as old as the latter part of the second'—in other words it is almost contemporary with the author. It is only a tiny fragment, corresponding to Harvey, vol. ii, p. 31, ll. 24-31, and p. 32, ll. 7-14 (III 9, 1 and 2), but it represents what no doubt was once a complete copy: it is not like the quotations and extracts that make up the rest of the 'Greek text' of Irenaeus, which are of later date and were in some cases carelessly or inaccurately excerpted. It is therefore of the utmost interest to compare the quotation of Matt. iii 16, 17, which occurs in the fragment, with Iren-lat.

Iren. III 9, 3.

. . . Aperti sunt caeli
et uidit spiritum Dei
quasi columbam
uenientem super eum; et
ecce uox de caelo
dicens: Hic est filius meus
dilectus, in quo mihi
complacui.

Oxy. Pap. 405

. . . ανεω[χθησαν οι ουρανοι
και ειδεν [πνευμα θυ κατα-
βαινον ωσ π[εριστεραν και
ερχομενον ε[π αυτον, και
ιδου φω[νη εκ των ουρανων
λεγουσα συ ε[ι ο υσ μου ο αγα-
πητος [ε]ν ψ [ευδοκησα

Here it will be seen that the Greek agrees with the Latin in omitting $\alpha\delta\tau\omega$ after $\acute{\alpha}\nu\epsilon\acute{\omega}\chi\theta\eta\sigma\alpha\nu$, in agreement with \aleph^*B , but against almost all the Latin texts except the Spanish MS *tol*. It should further be noticed that Iren-lat does not add *de caelo* after *Dei* as *a b d h* do, that *b vg* have *super se* and *a h* have *in ipsum*, and that *a b d f h* all have *bene* for *mihi*: these small points shew that Iren-lat has not here been assimilated wholesale to any Latin biblical text. On the other hand it has no equivalent for *καταβαίνον*, an omission unsupported elsewhere; and it has 'This is' for 'Thou art', in accordance with most Greek and Latin texts, but *D* and *a* support the Oxyrhynchus Fragment.¹

The authentic text of Matt. iii 17 is very doubtful. No doubt the original Evangelical tradition is that of Mark and Luke, according to which the Voice from Heaven was addressed at the Baptism to Jesus, but at the Transfiguration to the Disciples; yet it is quite likely that it was the Evangelist Matthew himself who assimilated the words at the Baptism to those at the Transfiguration. However this may be, it is evident that an early Western text had 'Thou art' in Matt. iii 17, and that later Western texts rejected this. It is therefore more likely that the Oxyrhynchus Fragment has preserved the genuine text of Irenaeus and that Iren-lat has conformed its text to that generally current than *vice versa*. But the differences in minor details from other Latin texts noticed above make me think that it was a case of *memoriter* assimila-

¹ *k e ff* and *q* are all missing at this point.

tion of a notable aberrant reading to what was familiar, rather than the result of any conscious collation of texts.

Exactly similar to the case of Matt. iii 17 is that of Lk. i 46. In IV 7, 1 we find in the Claromontane and Vossian MSS *Sed et Elisabeth ait 'Magnificat anima mea Dominum . . .'*, and this ascription of the *Magnificat* to Elisabeth is confirmed by the Armenian version. The evidence of the Armenian shews that it was Irenaeus, not his Latin translator, who introduced Elisabeth. When therefore we find in III 10, 2 *exsultans Maria clamabat . . . Magnificat* it is reasonable to suppose that 'Maria' is due to the translator. Here again it is a delicate question whether the true text of Luke had *Maria* or *Elisabeth* or no name at all, but I venture to think that the evidence points to St Irenaeus himself having been a supporter of *Elisabeth*.

In conclusion I should like to draw attention to the rather marked 'insular' or Irish element in *C*, the Claromontane or Phillipps MS, now at Berlin. It seems likely that *C* was once at Corbie, for Loofs and Sanday point out that the eleventh-century catalogue of the Corbie Library contained 'Herenei episcopi Ludunensis contra omnes hereses' (*sic*, both in MS and Catal., see p. xxvi). The handwriting of *C* is about half-way between Amiens 10 (Bensly's MS of 4 Ezra) and Amiens 12 (Bible of Maurdrannus). Both *C* and Bensly's MS have the ligature for *rt* (Bensly, p. 10; Harvey's *fac.*, l. 5 from end), and both have *quo* for *quoniam* and \div for *est*. And 'insular' spellings are not inconsistent with a Corbie origin: Corbie was originally a colony from Luxeuil, the foundation of Columbanus.

Thus *Cessarem* and *gauissus* (p. 248) are definitely Irish, but Bensly gives a list of fourteen instances of *ss* for *s* in the Corbie MS (A) of 4 Ezra (*Missing Fragment*, p. 15). *Ab Effeso* (p. 250) is of the same stamp; the regular Irish spelling is *Effessus*, but *Effesus* is found in the St Gallen MS of Acts (Wordsworth's S) and occasionally elsewhere in inferior MSS, such as the Sessorianus of the *Testimonia* and the *Speculum*, but never in first-rate texts. *Diabulus* (p. 239) is Irish, though it occurs here and there elsewhere. *Porpuram* and *purporam* for *purpuram* (p. 245) are 'insular', the former being in the Book of Armagh (D) $\frac{3}{33}$, the latter in the Llandaff MS (L) $\frac{2}{2}$. *Paupera* (fem. of *pauper*, p. 246) is found in 4 Ezra xv 51 SA (not in the Spanish text), as well as in *ads* Lk. xxi 3, &c.: insular MSS mostly have *paupercula*. *Torcolar* (see the Oxford *facsimile*) seems only to be found in Wordsworth's E Matt. xxi 33. *Luxoria*, *luxoriose*, so far from being 'the commoner form in early MSS generally' (p. 245), is a well-known insular spelling: it is not found in Lk. xv 13 in the older MSS either of the Old Latin or of the Vulgate.¹ *Sathanas* (p. 244) is a curiously rare

¹ The list is D E P G H Θ K V, I O Z 1 q: of these the oldest are Z and O. In

spelling in MSS as early as *C*, though it was the common form in late mediaeval times: it is found in parts of *cav* (Wordsworth's *C*) and the *Liber Comicus*.

Finally the spelling of *scamillum* in Matt. v 35 *C* (p. 233) is rather in favour of Corbie. The word *scabellum* or *scabillum* does not seem to have been much used in Africa, for Cyprian and *k* have *suppedaneum*, and the form *scamillum* is still rarer. It is found in Matt. v 35 *h* and in B. N. 13169, better known as *sangerm.2* or *g₂*, an 'insular' MS once at Angers (Berger, p. 48); it is also found in *d* Mk. xii 36, Acts ii 35, vii 49: *scamellum* occurs in *q* Mk. xii 36, in the Ricemarch Psalter (from Wales) ²/₂, and in the Corbie text of James ii 3. In 4 Ezra vi 4, where the Spanish text has *scabellum*, the French codices *S* and *A* have *camillum*, obviously a mistake for *scamillum*. And our MS of Irenaeus also blunders over the word, having *scam illum*. The natural deduction is that they did not call a footstool *scamillum* at Corbie, but that the Codex Claromontanus of Irenaeus may very well have been written there.¹

These scattered Notes on lexical points have perhaps been unduly extended, but it is by such means that some light may be thrown upon the transmission of this most important text. The more I study the Latin Irenaeus the more I feel that its importance lies chiefly in what it tells us about the original Greek text of St Irenaeus, and the less important I feel it to be as an 'Old-Latin' authority. Here and there, no doubt, the translator has made changes through his knowledge of the current Latin Bible—witness *Hic est* and *Maria*, discussed above. But I think this was very occasional, and occurred chiefly in well-known passages. I do not suppose the translator ever looked up his Bible to guide him in the choice of words. So closely indeed did he follow the Greek before him that it is difficult to fix his date or his country. Was it in the home of St Irenaeus, at Lyons itself? Or did some reader of Tertullian wish to know more of the great controversial work that he had used? *Non liquet*.

The following are the passages referred to on p. 57 of the preceding review and discussed in the Note which follows:—

Gr. [*Epiph.* 178: Harvey i pp. 18–20].

Διὰ δὲ τοῦ Ὄρου τούτου φασὶ | κεκαθάρθαι καὶ ἐστρήχθαι τὴν Σοφίαν, | καὶ

Vergil *Georg.* iii 81, *Aen.* xi 497, *luxori-* is only found in some of Ribbeck's inferior MSS, not in either M, P or R.

¹ It should have been noted on Rom. xv 12 that in III 3, 3 the 'root of Jesse' is twice mentioned (Isa. xi 1), and that in the second place *C* spells the word *Gesse*. This is a rare blunder, the only other occurrences I have noted being Lk. iii 32 *tol*, Act. xiii 22 *tol*, Rom. xv 12 *tol* and *comicus*. But the Land of Goshen (*Gessen*) is sometimes spelt *Iessen*, e. g. *Itinera Sancta* 50, l. 9.

ἀποκατασταθῆναι τῇ συζυγίᾳ | χωρισθείσης γὰρ τῆς Ἐνθυμήσεως ἀπ' αὐτῆς σὺν τῷ ἐπιγινομένῳ πάθει αὐτὴν μὲν ἐντὸς πληρώματος μέναι | τὴν δὲ Ἐνθυμήσιν αὐτῆς σὺν τῷ πάθει | ὑπὸ τοῦ Ὁρου ἀφορισθῆναι καὶ ἀποστερηθῆναι¹ | καὶ ἐκτὸς αὐτοῦ γενομένην | εἶναι μὲν πνευματικὴν οὐσίαν . . . ἄμορφον δὲ κτλ. .

Iren-Lat. Per Horon autem hunc dicunt | mundatam et confirmatam Sophiam | et restitutam coniugi : | separata enim Intentione ab ea cum appendice Passione, ipsam quidem infra Pleroma perseuerasse, | Concupiscentiam uero eius cum Passione | ab Horo separatam et crucifixam | et extra eum factam | esse quidem spiritalem substantiam . . . informem uero, etc.

Tert. Huius (Hori) praedicant opera | et repressam ab illicitis et purgatam a malis et deinceps confirmatam Sophiam | et coniugio restitutam; | et ipsam quidem in Pleromatis censu remansisse, | Enthymesin uero eius et illam appendicem Passionem | ab Horo relegatam et crucifixam | et extra eum factam | . . . spiritalem tamen substantiam illam . . . sed informem, etc.

Gr. [*Επίρρη.* 178: Harvey i pp. 17, 18].

ὁ δὲ Πατήρ | τὸν προειρημένον Ὁρον | ἐπὶ τούτοις διὰ τοῦ Μονογενοῦς | προβάλλεται ἐν εἰκόνι ἰδίᾳ | ἀσύζυγον ἀθήλυτον· | τὸν γὰρ Πατέρα ποτὲ μὲν μετὰ συζυγίας τῆς Σιγῆς, ποτὲ δὲ καὶ ὑπὲρ ἄρρην καὶ ὑπὲρ θῆλυ εἶναι θέλουσι.

Iren-Lat. Pater autem | praedictum Horon | super haec per Monogenem | praemittit in imagine sua | sine coniuge masculofemina.² | Patrem enim aliquando quidem cum coniuge Sige, modo uero et pro masculo et pro femina esse uolunt.

Tert. Ibi demum Pater aliquando motus | quem supra diximus Horon | per Monogenem³ in haec | promit in imagine sua | feminamare,⁴ | quia de Patris sexu ita uariant.

F. C. BURKITT.

NOTE ON VALENTINIAN TERMS IN IRENAEUS AND TERTULLIAN.

IN *Adv. Haer.* I i 1-3 (Harvey p. 8 ff) Irenaeus gives an account of the Valentinian theory of the origin of things. He says there was an original *Forefather* (Προπατήρ), called also *The Deep* (Βυθός). With this primordial essence dwelt a *Notion* (Ἐννοια), called also *Grace* (Χάρις) for it was not conditioned, and *Silence* (Σιγή) for it made no

¹ leg. ἀποσταυρωθῆναι.

² ? read 'masculofeminum'.

³ MSS appear to have 'Monogenum'.

⁴ ? read *feminamarem*.