## SELECTED NOTES OF DR HORT ON IRENAEUS BOOK III

Dr Hort lectured on Irenaeus Bk III in 1874 , and perhaps again at a later period. Among the documents placed at the disposal of the editors of Novum Testamentum S. Irenaei was an interleaved copy of the Latin text of this book, into which he had entered brief notes for use in the lecture room. For the most part they are mere jottings to be expanded in lecturing, when they were probably accompanied by a running translation of the Latin. They seldom repeat what is to be found in earlier commentators where these do not call for correction.

The volume has come, through the passing away of Dr Sanday and Prof. Turner, into the hands of Prof. Souter of Aberdeen, who has allowed me to have the use of it and strongly encourages the publication of the selection of notes which I had made from it for my own satisfaction. The student of the Latin version of Irenaeus has so little to help him over its peculiar difficulties, in spite of the great work done by the early editors, that he will, I feel confident, be grateful for the fresh insight afforded again and again by these sparse comments, uninviting as they must appear at a first glance.

In editing the notes I have here and there added a word or two to make the sense clearer, or inserted a supplement from the margins of Dr Hort's copy of Harvey's edition, which Prof. Souter has also lent me. And I have checked the citation of variants in Cod. Claromontanus with the help of the collation which was made by Mr H. N. Bate in 1894 for the N.T. S. Iren. and is now in the Bodleian Library. Moreover, I have ventured to add, within square brackets, a few notes to call attention to some documents of more recent discovery, especially the Armenian version of the Demonstration of the Apostolic Preaching, a translation of which was published by the S.P.C.K. in 1920.

As in earlier articles on Irenaeus, I have given throughout references to the chapter-divisions and the pages of Harvey's edition, which to our discredit still holds the field in England and elsewhere.

III i 1 (Harv. vol. II, p. 2) : qui quidem et omnes ...] 'Qui' begins a fresh sentence, referring to the Evangelists. The four together made up the Gospel, while each singly faithfully represented it.

2 (p. 3) : र $\rho a \neq \grave{\eta} \nu$. . . $\dot{v} a \gamma$.] $A$ written Gospel, a writing of Gospel character. Peter and Paul are perhaps put in with reference to what follows. It represents the Roman tradition of this time: cf. Dionys. or. ap Eus. ii 25, 8.
(p. 4) : $\mathfrak{\epsilon} \dot{\xi} \sigma \delta o v]$ not mere death, but close of their course (see Lc. ix 3 r
$\pi \lambda \eta \rho o \hat{v} \nu)$ : interesting here as the word used in 2 Pet. i 15 : St Paul has $\tau \in \lambda \epsilon \omega \hat{\sigma} a \iota(\tau \epsilon \tau \epsilon \in \hat{\lambda} \epsilon \kappa \alpha) 2$ Tim. iv 7. Excessus (vitae or evita) similarly used by Cicero. Contradiction to other statements cannot be helped.
ii I (p. 7) : digne] ironically. Punctuate the sentence thus: ' Et hanc sapientiam unusquisque eorum dicit quam a semetipso adinvenit fictionem, videlicet ut digne secundum eos sit veritas aliquando quidem in Valentino, aliquando autem in Marcione, aliquando in Cerintho: postea deinde in Basilide fuit, aut' etc.

2 (p. 8): conversionem veritatis] $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota \sigma \tau \rho \circ \phi \grave{\eta} \nu \tau \hat{\eta} s \dot{a} \lambda \eta \theta \in i \alpha a$, regard, veneration for the truth. So Clem. Strom. vii 39, p. $854 \tau \grave{\eta} \nu \dot{\varepsilon} \pi \iota \sigma \tau \rho o-$ $\phi \eta ̀ \nu \tau \hat{\eta} s \delta_{\kappa} \kappa \alpha \iota \sigma \sigma v v_{\eta} s$. A usage in Greek philosophy.
iii r : habemus adnumerare] 'habemus' here stands for ${ }^{\prime} \chi \chi \mu \epsilon \nu$, 'are able'; not the Latin use 'have got to'.
(p. 9) : magisterii] teaching, instruction, see esp. v i (p. 19) : as often in Cyprian.
colligunt] See IV xl 2 (p. 236), reading of Cl. [cf. Arm.].
potentiorem] Cl . (pontiorem) probably meant the same reading:
 'full', 'thorough', 'eminent': cf. Ps.-Cyp. de laude martyrii $\mathbf{1}$, 'etsi potentia rei (martyrdom) oneratur facultas ingenii' (sc. to write worthily of it).
principalitas] may be either in its original sense 'priority' (as Tert. Praesc. $3{ }^{1}$ 'principalitatem veritatis et posteritatem mendacitatis': and so 'principales literae', initial letters, Ps.-Cyp. de montibus, S. et S. 4); or 'pre-eminence'. The former more likely from context: cf. iv $\mathbf{r}$ (p. 15 f.). It probably represents $\dot{\alpha} \rho \chi^{a} \boldsymbol{\sigma} \tau \eta \tau \alpha$ (Stieren): cf. Clem. Rom. 47, referring to the Corinthians as receiving their letter from
 successione' IV xl 2 (p. 236). Stieren refers to V xiv 1, 2 (p. 361 f.), xxi $\mathbf{I}\left(\right.$ p. $\left.3^{81}\right)$ for clear cases of 'principalis'.

2 (p. 10) : : évaudos] a good classical word (Plato onwards), obscure in derivation, used of things recent or fresh, as a sound or a memory.
$\sigma v \mu \beta\left\langle\beta \dot{\beta},{ }^{\prime} v \sigma a\right]$ 'knitting them together'. The common sense: see Lt. on Col. ii 2.

4 (p. r2) : $\pi a \rho \epsilon ́ \mu \epsilon \tau \epsilon]$ 'survived '. D. Chrys. de regno iii p. 56 єi $\mu \epsilon ́ \lambda$ -
 that keeps well.
$\grave{\epsilon} \pi \grave{\imath} \pi o \lambda \hat{v}]$ over a long space or time.
iv I (p. r6) : transfiguratores] cf. I xi r (p. 169) $\boldsymbol{\epsilon} \kappa \delta \grave{\epsilon} \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \pi \rho o \phi \eta \tau \iota \kappa \hat{\omega} \nu$ ö $\sigma a \operatorname{\mu \epsilon \tau а\mu о\rho фá\zeta ov\sigma \tau v.~}$
(p. 17) : To 'congregatio' (? $\sigma v v a \gamma \omega \gamma \eta$ ) and 'doctrina' we must carry
on 'eorum ': 'apud eos' ( $\pi a \rho \alpha ̀$ rov́roıs), i.e. the apostles. This sense is certainly required by what follows.
v I (p. i8) : ostensionem eorum] the proof afforded by those.
ostendentes] probably goes with 'revertamur', but possibly with ' conscripserunt', and it governs 'sententiam'. But 'sententiis' would read more naturally.
vi 2 (p. 23 ): idola daemoniorum] $\epsilon i \delta \omega \lambda \alpha$ $\delta a \mu \mu v i \omega \nu$ is not known in MSS, but is in Just. Ap. i 4r, where see Otto's note. Irenaeus has it again in xii 7 (p. 60).
blasphemant] must be (as Sabatier says) a corruption of 'plasmant' ( $\pi \lambda a ́ \sigma \sigma \sigma \nu \tau \epsilon 5$ ).
et ego testis, dicit Dominus] seems, as Massuet says, to come from
 not in the Heb.

Vos invocabitis] represents каì $\beta$ оâtє, and doubtless comes from assimilation.
(p. 24): hodie] for $\grave{e} v \pi v \rho i ́: ~ p r o b a b l y ~ f r o m ~ v . ~ 36: ~ s e e ~ b e l o w . ~$
hodie $\left.2^{\circ}\right]$ Here too $\dot{\epsilon} v \pi v \rho i$ is omitted and other changes made, apparently without MS authority.

3: Et ego] like Elijah.

viii I (p. 28) : adjunctive] possibly è $\pi \iota \theta \epsilon \tau \tau \kappa \omega \bar{s}$, 'adjectivally': the difficulty lies in the adjectival character of both renderings. But Irenaeus's point is just this, that Mammon is no more than a descriptive adjective. All would be right if we might insert 'et' before 'Hebraicam '.
utraque quae significantur] ả $\mu \phi o ́ \tau \epsilon \rho \alpha ~ \tau \grave{\alpha} ~ \sigma \eta \mu a \nu \nu o ́ \mu \epsilon v a, ~ ' b o t h ~ s e n s e s ' . ~ . ~$

 'sensus' in some O.L. authorities). [Cf. IV viii (p. 154) 'varie' MSS, but Arm. $=$ ' vane'.]

2 (p. 3r) : id est, ex David Virgine] Impossible to make sense of text: meaning clear by Just. Dial. 68, p. 293 D, Tert. Marc. iii 23. Probably 'ex semine David'.
[The Arm. version of Iren. Demonst. has since thrown light on the passage: see c. 36 (p. 103 of translation): 'the peculiar uniqueness of Him, who was the fruit of the virgin body that was of David', and note there.]

Balaam] must be a correction. Cl. has 'Esaias', which is probably right. Just. $A p .3^{2}$, p. 74 C , has a different confusion: Kaì 'Horaías $\delta \grave{\epsilon}$


\&c., the second clause only being from Isaiah. But Irenaeus must be

 other authority for $\dot{\eta} \gamma o v ́ \mu \epsilon \nu o s, ~ L X X ~(G k . ~ a n d ~ L a t) ~ h a v i n g. ~ \ddot{a} \nu \theta \rho \omega \pi o s . ~$

 Chron. (cf. Mic. v 2).
[It is interesting now to find that Irenaeus in Dem. 58 has: 'And again Moses says: There shall rise a star out of Jacob; and a leader shall be raised up out of Israel'.]
x (p $\mathbf{3}^{2}$ ): in domum Jacob] Just. Ap. 32, p. 74 D , referring to this


[Considerable portions of the original Greek of cc . ix , x were published in 1903 by Grenfell and Hunt: see their revised text in Oxyrh. Pap. IV, p. 264 f. They are too mutilated to be helpful at the points above dealt with, but are of importance in regard to the text of Matt. iii 16 f. : see N.T. S. Iren. (Turner's note) p. 232.]
xi I (p. 33 f.) : et venit ut sacrificaret] No N.T. authority for this addition. Possibly a duplicate Latin rendering (reading evenit $=\boldsymbol{\epsilon} \lambda a \chi \epsilon \nu$ ) for what precedes: $\theta v \mu \hat{a} \sigma \alpha c$ is 'sacrificare' in $d$. In that case this is probably what the translator wrote, and the other rendering, common in Latin authorities, may be due to scribes.
qui praeest] seems best joined to the quotation. Perhaps ôs $\pi \rho o i \sigma \tau a-$ rai. Delete comma after 'persona'.
salutarem] 'salutaris' used in O.L. as well as 'salutare': cf. Rönsch, It. u. V. гоо.

3 (p. 36): falsarii] means only forgers or falsifiers, which makes no clear sense here: yet 'falsi' does not seem likely. On the whole 'falsarii Gnostici' is probably a clumsy rendering of $\psi \in v \delta o \gamma \nu \omega \sigma \tau \iota \kappa o i ́$, which is used by Hipp. Haer. v 28.
 I i 1 (p. 52), i9 (p. 83), 20 (p. 85), viii 14 (p. 150), III xi 8 (p. 42 ). Stieren has a long note ( $\mathrm{p} . \mathrm{rio}$ ) on the second of these passages, but cannot be quite right : there are evidently three sources of our Lord's nature, Achamoth, the Demiurge, and the oiкovoмia: but none of the passages shew in what sense oiкovopia is used. It probably is equivalent to Nature, and may be illustrated by the doctrine of Basilides (Hipp. vii 24, p. 237) about the lower world being governed not by either of the two archons but by the original plan of Him who foreordained all things.

5 (p. 38): imposuerunt] with e only. Not rarely used of conducting
persons to a place or post in order to station them there: and this seems implied in 'adstare': cf. г Sam. i 24.
nullam] Grabe right in putting 'novam' (or ? 'novellam') for 'nullam'; but no reason to exclude 'testamentum'. The error is evidently in the translation, and arises from the consecutive genitives: кalv̀̀v $\bar{\epsilon} \lambda \epsilon v \theta \epsilon \rho i ́ \alpha s$
 may be in the scribes, who wrote 'adventum' for 'adventus'. See also xii $\mathrm{I}_{7}$ (p. 70 f.).

6 (p. 39) : in fine autem, \&c.] Earliest certain trace of close of St Mark (?? Just. $A p$. i 45).

7 (p. 42): Hic enim operabatur] the word évípyєt: see Grabe's note ad loc.
emissum] 'that He was sent forth as Lord and Artificer of'.
8: transfiguratum] that He was manifested by being transfigured into the shape of a man.

9 (p. 43): Bonum enim] Apparently something lost, though there is a connexion. The prophets are the wine made naturally and drunk first at Cana [note the repetition of 'primo']: the Apostles the miraculous wine which succeeded. But Irenaeus goes off at once to the relation of Christ to the Creation.
compendialiter] cf. xvii 7 (p. 88) 'compendii poculo'. In xi it (p. 49) $\sigma$ v́vтouov is 'compendiosam'.

10 (p. 45) : principia Evangelii] the beginnings of the Gospel according to the different Evangelists.
secundum Matthaeum] Distinct use of $\kappa a \tau \grave{\alpha}$ M $\alpha \tau \theta$., \&c.
(p. 46): id quod est secundum Marcum] A unique and singular statement.
ir (p. 46 f.): neque autem plura] Dr Gregory has copied from




[The MS would seem to be Gregory's Evv. 685 (London, Huth 354), c. xiii, which belonged to the notorious Libri, and was examined by Gregory in 1883 . The intervening words, not here reproduced, are a compressed paraphrase of the Greek already printed. Into his copy of Harvey's text Dr Hort has entered a collation of a similar but much fuller passage from Evv. 238 which begins: Oü $\tau \epsilon \pi \lambda \epsilon i \neq v a \operatorname{tòv~ápet~} \theta$ àv
 (This so far corresponds exactly with the Latin.) His reference is ' 238 (Mosq. = Matthaei's e) ap. Matth. Mc. 21 (multa libera)'.]
(p. 47): $\left.\tau \in ́ \sigma \sigma a \rho a ~ к а \theta_{0} \lambda_{\iota \kappa \grave{~}} \pi v \epsilon^{\prime} \mu a \tau a\right]$ the universality expressed in

Ezekiel's four $\pi \nu \varepsilon \dot{\prime} \mu a \tau a$ corresponds to that of the Gospels: ' principalis' here equals ка $\theta_{0} \lambda \iota \kappa o ́ s$, i.e. primary (cf. p. $\left.50 \kappa а \theta_{0} \lambda \iota \kappa \alpha i\right)$. The $\tau \in \epsilon \sigma \sigma \alpha \rho a$ $\pi \nu \epsilon \dot{v} \mu a \tau a$ come from the Vat. (and other) text of Ezek. xxxvii $9{ }^{\circ}{ }^{\prime}{ }^{\kappa} \tau \bar{\omega} \nu$ $\boldsymbol{\tau \epsilon \sigma \sigma a ́ p \omega \nu} \pi \nu \in v \mu a \dot{\tau} \omega \nu \quad \dot{\epsilon} \lambda \theta \dot{\epsilon}$, where A and others have $\dot{a} \nu \dot{\epsilon} \mu \omega \nu$, as in 1 Chron. ix 24.
$\pi \nu \epsilon \hat{\prime} \mu a \zeta \omega \hat{\eta} \varsigma]$ Ezek. i 20 f., xxxvii 5 . Probably the four $\zeta \widehat{Q} \alpha$ are conceived of as four $\pi \nu \epsilon \dot{\epsilon} \mu a \tau a$ subordinate to the one $\pi \nu \epsilon \hat{v} \mu a$ mentioned in both chapters of Ezekiel; and similarly the four orúdoc as subordinate to the one $\sigma$ vúdos.
$\vec{a} \phi \theta a \rho \sigma i ́ a \nu$, ảvă̧ $\omega \pi v \rho o \hat{v} \nu \tau a s]$ because the $\pi \nu \epsilon \hat{v} \mu a$ causes the resurrection of the dead.
$\dot{\delta} \kappa \alpha \theta . \dot{\epsilon} \pi \grave{\imath} \tau$. $\chi \in \rho$.] The phrase in several places of O.T., e.g. Psalm quoted immediately. But the idea here comes from Ezek. i 26; x 1 . $\tau \grave{o} \mu \grave{\epsilon} \nu \pi \rho \hat{\omega} \tau o \nu \zeta \uparrow ิ o \nu]$ For the short account in Ezek. i io Irenaeus substitutes the rather longer account in Apoc. founded on it.

тò $\nLeftarrow \mu \pi \rho \alpha \kappa \tau o v]$ 'activity': here and below 'efficabile', a peculiar word.

 $\pi \rho o ́ \sigma \omega \pi a$, with reference to to the four $\zeta \omega \bar{\omega}$.
sacrificante] for $\theta_{\nu \mu} \omega \hat{\omega} \nu$ tos confirms the former passage [see n. on xi I].
(p. 49) : humiliter sentiens]? $\tau a \pi \epsilon \iota \nu o ́ \phi \rho \omega \nu$.

тaparןé Xovoav] rapid, as contrasted with dwelling on a matter.
actum] here 'actus' where Gk. has $\tau \dot{\alpha} \xi_{t s}$; but above we have 'ordinatio' (p. 48). If we had only this passage, we might prefer 'actus' [i.e. as representing the proposed emendation $\pi \rho \hat{\alpha} \xi \tau v$ ]: but the other passage favours $\tau \dot{\alpha} \xi \mathbf{\xi}$ s.
(p. 50) : recapitulat] probably the three preceding.
[Among other variants noted by Dr Hort in Matthaei's $e$ are the following :
(р. 47): єіко́т $\omega$ s] єiкós
(p. 49) : 'I $\eta \sigma o \hat{v} \mathrm{X} \rho \iota \sigma \tau o \hat{v}$ (post Ev̉a $\gamma \gamma^{\prime} \lambda i ́ o v$ )] om.

$\dot{\omega} \mu i \lambda \epsilon \iota] \pi \rho \sigma \sigma \omega \mu i ́ \lambda \epsilon \iota$
$i \epsilon \rho \alpha \tau \iota \kappa \bar{\eta} v]+\kappa \alpha i \lambda \lambda \epsilon \tau о v \rho \gamma \iota \kappa \eta{ }^{\prime} \nu$
т $\alpha \hat{v} \tau \alpha]$ тоиิто $\dot{\eta} \mu \hat{\imath} v$



12 (p. 5I) : volunt] Certainly 'nolunt' (so Ziegler 59, referred to by Lipsius, $R$. $K$. 214, cf. 103, who however keeps 'volunt', after previously taking ' $n o l u n t$ '). These Alogi in their determination not to be 'pseudo-
prophetae' cast away prophecy altogether, heretical in their opposition to Montanist heresy.
prophetiae] 'propheticam' is to be read (with Cl .). [The same phrase is in Dem. 99, 'cast away from themselves the prophetic grace'.]
xii I (p. 52): $\left.\tau \grave{\eta} \nu \dot{a} \nu a \pi \lambda \eta \eta_{\rho} \rho \sigma \sigma v\right]$ i.e. bringing about the filling-up of the Apostles on the strength of \&c.: cf. éк $\tau \hat{\omega} v \pi \rho o \phi \eta \tau \hat{\omega} \nu(\mathrm{p} .55)$.

2 (p. 53): fiducialiter] $\mu \epsilon \tau \grave{\alpha}$ тapp $\quad \sigma$ ias (cum fiducia $d e$ : audenter vg. Fulg.). But Irenaeus, who often repeats $\pi a \rho \rho \eta \sigma i a$ hereabouts, evidently meant by it not courage but plainness of speech, in contrast to the accommodation which the Apostles were said to have practised.
 Gnostics in this sense, to express the upward fleeting to heaven.

3 (p. 56): Фavєрòv тò кй $\rho v \gamma \mu a$ ö II.] reading ó II. (as Cramer): the Latin is quite correct.
$\tau \grave{\partial} \nu$ 'I $\left.\sigma \rho a \eta{ }^{\prime} \lambda\right]$ Coisl. has $\tau \hat{\omega}$, which is doubtless correct, so as to govern ròv viòv $\tau$. $\theta$. by ${ }^{2} \gamma \omega \nu$, not by катa$\gamma \gamma^{\epsilon} \lambda \lambda \omega \nu$. The Latin is neutral.

4 (p. 57): lapis spretus] After 'lapis' Ar. inserts 'pretiosus' from r Pet. ii 6, and then 'reprobatus' from vg.: Harvey's note is misleading.
 $\tau \hat{\omega} v \dot{\alpha} \kappa о v o ́ v \tau \omega \nu$, probably in contrast to оікодо $\mu \dot{\eta}$.

7 (p. 59): quidam eorum dicunt \&c.] cf. v 1 (p. 19)' 'quemadmodum dicunt hi' \&c.
nemo ab his] 'ab his', from the Apostles ; 'nemo' i.e. no one whatsoever.
prius] seems rather too far from $\mu \hat{\alpha} \lambda \lambda o \nu$, which we should expect. In any case he means that the same will apply with at least equal force to the Lord's own teaching: apparently they say that He too spoke only economically.

Nec hi ergo] the Gnostics. Their own previous opinion regulated he revelation made to them.
omnes discipuli] ' all disciples', sc. of every one.
sermo ad eum factus est] cf. John x 35 .
Adhuc etiam] A further argument. What the disciples proclaimed was not only not according to the hearers' opinion, but an affront to it. eorum] om. with Cl .
eum Patrem, \&c.] i.e. they would announce the Father above the Demiurge, if they really believed in Him.
ipsi] 'ipsis' should be read with Cl .
superiorem Salvatorem] the Gnostic theory of the Upper Soter would have enabled them to impute to the Jews a much less grievous crime.
(p. 60) : cum fiducia ] again a clear mistranslation for 'openly'.
idola demoniorum] from v.l. of Ps. $\mathrm{xcv(i)} 5$ : cf. note on vi 2 (p. 23). Ethnicorum] prefix 'et' with Grabe from Voss.

8：autem（post Petrus）］probably an interpolation，the Gk．being right（only a comma to be placed after the quotation）．
hoc ideo quoniam］$\tau 0 \hat{v} \theta$＇${ }^{\text {öt }} \boldsymbol{\iota}$ ，apparently＇that is to say，that＇．
aưrov， $\boldsymbol{o}^{\nu}$ ］i．e．God．
（p．61）：〈Filii〉 agnitio〉 Perhaps＇Filii＇should be added from the Gk．，as Gr．，Mass．and Harv．suggest ；cf． 9 （p．6r）＇Filium ergo Dei＇ but $\dot{\eta} \gamma v \hat{\omega} \sigma \iota s$ may also be used absolutely，cf． 6 ad fin．（p．59）．

9 （p．62）：uniuscujusque，\＆c．］Probably another case of the translator misunderstanding gen．abs．：Dià тойто каì тоíкıдає ai $\gamma \nu \omega \mu a i ̀ ~ a v ̉ \tau \omega ิ, ~$

ro：occisionem］＇victimam＇（Cl．Ar．），ė $\pi i \begin{gathered}\text { } \\ \sigma \phi a \gamma \eta ́ r\end{gathered}$ ，a widely spread （though by no means universal）O．L．rendering in Isa．liii 7 ．

Credo \＆c．］The earliest evidence of the interpolated verse Acts viii 37


11 （p． $6_{3}$ ）：द̀ $\left.\gamma v \omega \rho i \sigma \theta a \_\right]$shews that Eph．iii 3 is meant：otherwise ＇manifestatum＇would have suggested Rom．xvi 25，which Irenaeus apparently never quotes．
tractatur］$d e$ have literally＇curatur＇，easily glossed into＇tractatur＇ from $\psi \eta \lambda a \phi \eta^{\prime} \sigma \epsilon \omega^{2}$（tractare）in v．27．Harvey＇s Syriac is therefore a delusion．
［fecerit］qui fecit］ Cl ．＇s＇fecerit qui＇needs only to be changed to ＇feceritque＇to give the Gk．［Cl．has＇feceritq；＇］

12 （p 65）：ostendimus］points，Grabe says，to another treatise：Mass． （doubtless rightly）prefers Book V of the present treatise，referring us to the promise in III pref．and IV fin．Hence Harvey＇s alternative ＇ostendemus＇is right．
nisi ex ipsis scripturis］i．e．，apparently，＇without actual quotations＇．
14 （p．66）：Actibus］＇actibus＇，not the book，but the literal＇acts＇．
et a semetipso］＇even of his own accord＇．
15：Deserti，\＆c．］An evident allusion to r Cor．viii I ，cited and dwelt upon in II xxxix I（p．345）．
（p．68）：statim］＇at once＇：see next line．
fabricatorem $2^{\circ}$ ］＇factorem＇with Cl ．
propositum initii sui tolerabiliorem］．Probably $\tau \grave{\eta} \nu \pi \rho^{\prime} \theta_{\epsilon \epsilon \sigma \iota \nu}^{\tau \hat{\eta} s}$
 than their beginning（see＇statim＇）．The translator seems to have misunderstood the Greek genitive，unless he meant his Latin gen．to express comparison．
naturaliter」 here almost $=$＇originally＇，in contrast to a secondary process such as is implied in the Valentinian theory．
sectam］ai $\rho \in \sigma \tau \nu$（almost as $\pi \rho o a i \rho \epsilon \sigma t \nu$ ），a purpose or disposition， a sense found chiefly in Polybius，but also elsewhere．

16：Quoniam］here probably means＇since＇．
evocabantur] probably $\boldsymbol{\epsilon} \xi_{\epsilon \kappa \alpha \lambda о} \boldsymbol{v} v \tau o$, which is deponent, 'challenged',
 $\dot{\epsilon} \kappa \kappa \alpha \lambda \epsilon \hat{\epsilon} \sigma \theta a \iota \tau \grave{\eta} \nu \dot{\alpha} \nu \theta \rho \omega \pi \dot{\tau} \eta \eta \tau \alpha$, and in an evil sense Paed. ii 20 fin. p. 178

haec docens] teaching these doctrines ( $\tau \alpha \hat{v} \tau a$ ); or perhaps better $\tau \grave{\alpha}$ aủzá: i.e. the vision rewarded and confirmed his teaching.

Implevi] is unique (LXX $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \lambda \dot{\eta} \theta_{v} v a$ ), the other rendering (Hier. and even Iren. IV xxxiv 6) having 'multiplicavi', as the context here requires.
fiducia] Irenaeus's sense of mappqбia comes out clearly here as 'openness'.
accepisse] perhaps $\lambda \alpha \beta o ́ v \tau a$.


 On the whole sentence cf. xi 5 (p. 38).
non habuisse, \&c.] sc. since circumcision was part of the service of God for the Jews.

18: Caeterum, \&c.] sc. if they had slighted the God of the Jews.
conterritus] cf. xii 9 (p. 61). No sufficient reason to disturb the text : he was affrighted in his exclusiveness by the vision; yet he still retained a fear of the Law.
 'requieverat' below (p. 72) suggest that Irenaeus read not $\overline{\epsilon \pi \epsilon \epsilon \pi \epsilon \sigma \epsilon \nu}$ or


19: concedentes nos Spiritui Dei] must be an allusion to $\phi є \rho о ́ \mu \epsilon v o t$

xiii I (p. 72) : qui Deum] Harvey rightly points out that 'Dominum' must be read here and just below for 'Deum'.

2 (p. 73) : sicut . . . Deum Patrem] a parenthesis (as 'Pater autem veritas' above) : the question mark should come after 'eis Filium'.

Jesum Christum] om. 'Christum' with Cl.
(p. 74) : ascendi in H.] om. 'in' with Cl . against Ar.
ascendisse] 'Ascendi', following Cl .
xiv i: productus] certainly $\pi \rho o \eta \chi^{\theta}$ és (cf. Grabe), urged, induced.
nos venimus] introduced strangely enough by Irenaeus for кат $\kappa \eta \quad \beta \sigma v$ or кали́vтך ${ }^{2} \alpha$.
p. 75: Veniens] still free citation, for $\Delta_{\text {caßás }}$ : moreover 'Paule' is an insertion.

Et iterum] apparently a confusion of two different visits to Philippi.
principem] Not Publius but his father was cured.
eo quod, \&c.] The translator changes the construction. The Greek
doubtless was $\delta \iota \grave{\alpha}$ тò $\pi a ́ v \tau a ~ к . \tau . \lambda . ~(w i t h ~ i n f i n) ~ к а i ̀. ~ \pi \rho \epsilon \sigma \beta u ́ \tau \epsilon \rho o v ~ a u ̉ \tau o ̀ v ~$ єivac．．．．
prosecutor］probably áko入ovOós，or some compound：cf．above （p．74）＇inseparabilis et cooperarius＇．
3 （p．76）：magis necessaria］ảvaүкаоóтє $\rho a$, specially necessary．
（p．77）：quae ei nata fuerant］$\tau \grave{\alpha} \gamma^{\gamma} \nu \nu \eta \dot{\eta} \mu \tau a$ ，as Western texts and
T．R．for $\tau$ òv $\begin{gathered}\text { îtov in Luc．xii } 18 .\end{gathered}$
（p．78）：luscos］＇one－eyed＇：probably stands for $\tau v \phi \lambda o u ́ s: ~ n o t ~ i n ~$ O．L．of Luc．xiv 1 ， 2 I ．
xv I ：de Paulo，dicente ipso］＇concerning Paul＇：＇ipso＇，sc．Luke．
（p．79）：dicente］＇dicentem＇must be right，though no authority is given for it．［Cl．has＇dicentem＇．］

Evangelia］＇Evangelii＇Cl．
2：communes］Not the slightest reason to think of ка 月олıкоi．$^{\text {．}}$

（p．8o）：saepius］looks like a corruption of＇se plus＇：that the simple may the more listen to them．
et jam quaeruntur］＇etiam queruntur＇．
discere］right．Irenaeus is speaking disrespectfully of what is＇veri－ simile＇，and says it is a mistake to suppose that truth is the real source of things＇verisimilia＇．See the parallel passage，I pr．：$\pi \iota \theta a \nu \omega \bar{s}$（there ＇suadenter＇），$\pi \iota \theta \alpha \nu \underset{\varphi}{( }$（＇suasorio＇），$\pi \iota \theta a \nu o ́ \tau \eta \tau \alpha$（p． 6 ＇suadelam＇，but p． 2 ＇verisimilitudo＇）．
exquirens fucos］probably $\kappa \alpha \lambda \lambda \omega \pi \iota \sigma \tau \iota \kappa \bar{\eta}$ ，and＇sine fuco＇$\dot{\alpha} \kappa \alpha \lambda \lambda \omega$＇$\pi \iota \sigma \tau о \varsigma$.

parvam ovem］＇parvum ovem＇（Cl．Ar．），$\pi \rho o \beta a ́ a i o v($ as Aristoph． Pl． 922 тро $\beta$ átıov 及íov $\lambda \epsilon ́ \gamma \epsilon \epsilon$ ）．
imitationem］either＇imitatione＇（Cl．＊）or＇initiationem＇（sine teste）．
（p．8r）：bonam conversationem］？＇bona conversatione＇．The sense seems to be that we must by good conversation attain to，\＆c．
xvi（p．82）：participasse］ко七ү $\omega \hat{\eta} \sigma \alpha \iota$ ，＇imparted to＇． correctionem］＇correptionem＇ Cl ．
xvii 3 （p．85）：omnium］＇hominum＇Cl．：cf．John i 9.
4 （p．86）：occulte，\＆c．］as yet with no outward demonstration，but yet with power：＇omnia＇is absolutely required：＇quoniam＇，seeing that．
in domo David］？＝＇in civitate David＇below．But apparently there is some undiscovered quotation．

6 （p．87）：et natum］After this insert from Syr．（No．VII，p．437）： ＇et hunc esse Jesum ；alterum autem qui in eum descendit，et＇：the omission being caused by homaot．of＇hunc esse＇．

Demiurgi］with or without ék：＇belonging to the Demiurge＇．
autem］probably＇aut eum＇，as Harvey says．Probably $\hat{\eta}$ tòv $\dot{\epsilon} \kappa ~ \tau \hat{\eta} s$
oiкovouias $\hat{\eta}$ тòv $\bar{\epsilon} \xi$ 'I $\omega \sigma \dot{\eta} \phi$ : i.e. these are the phrases of two different sects. The rest of the Syr. variants are free, and probably incorrect.

8 (p. 89) : rursum] Something like 'diversum' is wanted.
9 (p. 9r): simul autem,] 'Simul autem' (? $=\tilde{\alpha} \mu a \delta^{\prime}$ ), a very strange insertion, found only in $d$.
 $\dot{i} \pi o \delta$. used in various senses of divisions, not merely of those subordinate to other divisions.

Unum quod non] interpreted by Grabe 'parum est quin', which seems to give the sense.

Quoniam nolite] 'quoniam: Nolite'.
 used rarely in late Gk . for suffering violence generally.
 ঠ̀ $\theta \in o ́ s, \tau \hat{\eta} \kappa \lambda \eta \rho о v o \mu i ́ a ~ \sigma o v . ~$
humectationem] In I xxviii 2 (p. 228) apparently for iкцáda.
aquae laboriosae] water that requires the labour of drawing from the well.
salientem] 'saliens' Cl.
quam] 'Quod' Cl. The Athanasian (and Tertullianic) notion of the Spirit out of the Father through the Son.
ipso] probably the Lord.
2: fieri ros] something wrong about the construction : ? 'ros' neuter here, though not just below.

Paracletum] the sense of this fixed by 'accusatorem'.
suum hominem] specially His now that He had become man. Here again the relation of the Son to the Spirit.

3 (p. 94) : ostendunt] 'dividunt eos, ostendunt enim' Syr. (Harv. p. 439) : probably right, but not certain.

Scripturae] 'scripturae', Irenaeus's own book.
similia] sc. 'fidelibus'.
xix 2 (p. 95) : replasmare] ? '-ri'.
indubitate] perhaps with 'adhortans': cf. xx I ( $\mathrm{p} . \mathrm{ro3}$ ).
(p. 96) : infert] $\boldsymbol{\epsilon} \pi \iota \phi \epsilon \rho \epsilon t:$ so 'intulit' (p. 97).
escis] This suggests that possibly the clause on the Bread has been lost by homoooteleuton.

3 (p. 97) : sermo] 'Sermo', $\delta$ dópos, personal.
4 (p. 99) : concedimus] probably as Grabe says = 'committimus', referring to II xliii 3 (p. 357) 'tales quaestiones concedamus Deo'.

5: quasi duorum existentium] gen. abs. : 'if there were two', the despised Jesus of the lower region is worthier of homage.
(p. roo): pro patribus certans]? [But now we have a parallel in vol. XXXIII.

Dem. 3 I: 'so that He might draw near and contend on behalf of the fathers'.]

6 : conjunctus] 'counitus', with Cl .
 genuine here. Irenaeus said 'assumeret hominem', as the Te Deum 'Tu ad liberandum suscepturus hominem'. The idea remains in
 fear of Nestorianism. Grabe very properly refers to IV xxxiv 7 (p. 218) 'hominibus quidem ostendens Deum, Deo autem exhibens hominem'; but Theodoret must have combined the two passages together.
(р. гог) : advocationem] $\pi \alpha \rho \dot{\alpha} \kappa \lambda \eta \sigma \tau v$, help, ministration.
peccato . . . peccator] probably with reference to St Paul's á $_{\mu} \alpha \rho \tau \omega \lambda$ òs市 $\dot{\alpha} \mu a \rho \tau i ́ a$, Rom. vii ${ }_{3} 3$.
 'He is the Rock, his work is perfect'.

xx I: nude tantum] 'nakedly say that He was only man': $\psi i \lambda \hat{\omega} \mathrm{~s}$ $\mu_{o}{ }^{\prime} o v$, Harvey, rightly referring to xxv 2 (p. 116).
 Harvey's doubts without reason: дेचакє $\rho$. and $\sigma v \gamma \kappa \epsilon \rho$. freely so used

 $\mu e ́ v \eta \nu ~ \tau o \hat{v} \kappa v \rho i ́ o v ~ \pi \nu \epsilon \grave{\mu} \mu a \tau t$.


(p. ro3): Verbum Dei homo] Contrast Irenaeus's Cur Deus Homo with Anselm's.
commixtus Verbo Dei] pr. 'ut homo', rightly supplied by Harvey in his note from the Gk. : entirely confirmed by 'et' in Cl . instead of 'ut'. The phrase is altered by Theodoret to $\chi^{\omega \rho \eta} \boldsymbol{\eta} \sigma \alpha$. See Grabe's excellent note, partly founded on Feuardent. The passages which speak of mixture in relation to the Incarnation must not, however, as he rightly says, be taken as equivalent to what is said here of mixture for the human race generally.

2 (p. ro4): secundum eum] as He is, in the same absolute manner.
praeclaram praeter omnes] probably $\mathfrak{\epsilon} \xi a i \rho \epsilon \tau o v ~ \pi a \rho a ̀ ~ \pi a ́ v \tau a s ~ . ~ . ~ \tau \grave{\eta} \nu$



3: absorpto] Neither Gk. nor Lat. satisfactory : each seems to have something of the sense. Perhaps 'in' has been lost before 'homine'. The sense seems to be that the Word was in active harmony with the Man in these acts or triumphs. Possibly the phrase was something

xxi I (p. 105) : Magnanimus . . . fuit] In I iv (p. 95) 'magnanimus exstitit' is the rendering of ' $\epsilon \mu \alpha \kappa \rho \circ \theta \dot{v} \mu \eta \sigma \epsilon \nu$.
et magnificentissimam] probably 'to be a most mighty power'. So the Collect.
poenitebit] 'penitebitur' Cl . : the deponent much used in Biblical Latin.
(p. ro6): propriam naturaliter] idiav фv́⿱宀є. The early denial of natural immortality.
circa] probably $\pi \epsilon \rho i$, with reference to St Paul's $\notin v \delta v i \sigma a \sigma \theta a \iota$.
Ingratum, \&c.] 'hoc' is the nominative: 'et excaecabat' (om. by Cl.) seems required. If we read 'homine', the love ceases to be exclusively in our direction; if there is a quotation from St John ( I John iv r6), who has $\dot{\epsilon} \nu \dot{\eta} \dot{\eta} \mu \nu$, then 'obfuscabat' is the opposite of St John's $\boldsymbol{\epsilon}^{\boldsymbol{\gamma}} \gamma \boldsymbol{\nu} \omega^{-}$ $\kappa \alpha \mu \epsilon \nu$. The nom. (comparans . . . judicans) is explained if 'ad non' represents a construction with iva $\mu \dot{\eta}$.

On the sentence see V iii I (p. 325), also corrupt. [Here the Armenian version helps to restore the sense. The parallel is so close that the sentence may be given in full. 'Extolli autem adversus Deum, et praesumptionem suae gloriae assumere, ingratum reddens hominem multum mali inferebat ei, ut nec veritatem simul et dilectionem auferret ab eo, et eam quae est ad eum qui fecit eum.' The Arm. has 'and' (for 'ut nec'), with participle instead of subjunctive ('auferret'), and omits 'et' before 'eam'. See J.T.S. xxxii 381.]

2: operationes] '-is' conj. Grabe.
(p. 1०7) : propter hoc ergo signum] The substitution of 'dat' for 'est'
 words.
xxiii (p. ifo) : í $\theta$ còs к.т. $\lambda$.] with reference to Hab. just quoted, and then Kv́ptos к. $\boldsymbol{\tau} . \lambda$. referring to Isa. lxiii 9 , vii ${ }_{13}$, quoted before.
(p. IIr) : operatus est] èv' $\rho \gamma \eta \eta \sigma \in \nu$, 'inspired'.
et exhaereditatos] 'even disinherited'. [Harv. omits 'et', as does Grabe: but Mass. and Stier. have it, as indeed Cl.]
 тas тov $\theta$ ', which accordingly some editors read: but in Eus. it has no MS authority.
(p. 114): $\lambda \epsilon ́ \xi \epsilon \sigma \iota .$. . ỏvó $\mu \alpha \sigma \iota \nu]$ probably phrases (forms of sentences) and words.
$\left.\dot{a}^{\nu} \nu \alpha \alpha^{\prime} \xi \alpha \sigma \theta \alpha \iota\right]$ Cf. Luc. i i ${ }^{2} \nu \alpha \tau \alpha ́ \xi \alpha \sigma \theta \alpha \iota \delta \iota \eta \gamma \eta \sigma \iota v$. Apparently 'rehearse', as the punished elephant in Plutarch (ii 968 c ) is said to have rehearsed
 means to remember in Biblical Latin (Rönsch 379) : there is seemingly no authority for 'rememoro', or the sense here.

2 (p. II5): autem (post multo)] probably a conjecture of early editors. ('ante' cod. opt.), but seems right.
xxv 2 (p. ir6) : Non pusillum] pr. 'Aкоv́батє $\delta \eta$ ', оікоs $\Delta a v \epsilon i \delta$. It is referred to by Irenaeus himself below (p. I 17 ).

Diligenter] $\dot{\alpha} \kappa \rho \iota \beta \hat{\omega} \boldsymbol{s}$ [as at I i 18 (p. 8o)].
xxvi I ( $\mathrm{p} . \mathrm{rr} 7$ ) : de fructu ventris] Grabe refers to Tert. Marc. iii 20 for a similar argument, and points to ò $\sigma \phi$ vos in Acts ii 30, and Trypho's similar reading, Dial. 68, p. 293. [See now Dem. 36, where many of the same words recur.]
circumscripsit] $\pi \epsilon \rho \iota \epsilon ́ \gamma \rho a \psi \epsilon \nu$ : to enclose in brackets and so cancel.
viri] $\tau 0 \hat{a}$ ảv $\delta$ ós (Joseph).
transmutant] change what was said into, \&c.
transmutent] let them do it in consistency.
 (Ps. cxxxii 17).
caeterum] cf. xxxi 2 (p. 122) for $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \epsilon \epsilon$.
2: Quod autem dixerit] rò $\delta \dot{\text { è }}$ єimeîv.

xxvii: advenisse] 'ait venisse' conj. Harv.
a terral answering to Mary.
summum angularem] together $=\dot{\alpha} \kappa \rho o \gamma \omega \nu t a i \not o v, ~ a s ~ a g a i n ~ I V ~ x x i x ~$ (p. 233).

xxviii (p. I I9) : non Joseph filius] 'not a son of Joseph'.
xxix: qui recapitulatur . . . recapitulatus est] no break between the clauses. The universal and eternal recapitulation (dंvaкєфàaıov́ $\mu \in \nu o s$ ) combined with the temporal recapitulation of the Incarnation ( $\dot{\alpha} \nu \alpha \kappa є \phi \alpha-$ $\left.\lambda a \iota \omega \sigma \alpha^{\prime} \mu \in \nu o s\right)$.
 Dem. 32, where much of this passage recurs.]
generationem Adae recapitulationis] If the text is incorrupt, it seems to mean a birth characteristic of, \&c. Or the acc. and gen. may have changed places.

de terra acceptum] from Gen. iii 9. Cf. p. $122 \tau o ̀ a ̉ \pi o ̀ ~ \gamma \eta \hat{\jmath} \lambda \eta \phi \theta \in ́ \nu$.



Hoc] body and soul.
xxxii r (p. 123): praedestinante] 'praeformante' with Cl.


oportebat, \&c.] i.e. their union, not in itself evil, was premature. [With the whole passage cf. Dem. 14 and 33.]
(p. 124): Lex] i.e. the Pentateuch, referring to o̊ $\tau \epsilon$ 'A $\delta \grave{\alpha} \mu$ кai $\dot{\eta} \gamma v v \grave{\eta}$ av̉rov̂ from the verse just cited, Gen. ii 25 (LXX iii r).
 (p. 204) 'circumlatio' is $\pi \epsilon \rho \iota \phi o \rho \alpha_{\text {.. }}$. There is no trace of any áva $\boldsymbol{\lambda} \epsilon \rho t-$,
 cionem '.]
initium] doubtless $\mathbf{a} \rho \chi \chi^{\prime}$, from same verse (Col. i 18 ).
2 : adimplentem] àvan $\eta \eta \rho \dot{\omega} \sigma \alpha \nu \tau \alpha$.
(p. 125): invictus] probably á $\dot{\eta} \tau \tau \boldsymbol{\eta}$ тos, not allowing himself to suffer defeat.
probationem] бокц $\mu \dot{\eta} v$ or бокццабiav.
primum . . . vas] the first $\sigma \kappa \epsilon$ ves of his possession : cf. the combination $\tau \grave{o ̀ ~ e ́ a v r o v ̂ ~} \sigma \kappa \epsilon \hat{v} 0 \mathrm{~S} \kappa \tau \hat{\alpha} \sigma \theta a \iota$ in r Thess. iv 4.

xxxiii r : Hic est] ' But this (man) is Adam . . . even that', \&c.
primiformis] $=$ 'protoplastus' (Grabe) xxx (p. 120).
(p. 126): ultionem] either 'tuitionem' or 'ultionem' makes sense: but it is safer to follow the MSS. [This seems to mean that 'tuitionem' of Cl., \&c., is to be preferred to 'ultionem' of Ar., \&c. The Arm. version of books IV and V has, however, shewn that Ar. is often right against Cl . Moreover, it now appears that Cl . has 'uicionem', which is nearer to 'ultionem'.]
non relictis] Grabe's objection to ' non' is valid, if the sentence runs on. But the hypothetical sentence seems to end at 'inimicis', what follows being a statement of what did actually take place.
 (p. 17 ), i 16 (p. 70 ).
converti in] not 'be changed into', but 'return unto' ( $\boldsymbol{\epsilon} \omega \boldsymbol{s}$ тov̂ à áo-

et, inquam] 'ei' for 'et' conj. Mass.
apostasiae] The true reading 'apostata' (Cl.) alone would justify ' principi abscessionis' against Grabe's doubt ; but it may be a duplicate rendering (of $\tau \hat{\omega} \pi \rho \omega \tau a \pi \sigma \sigma \tau a ́ \tau \eta$ or $\dot{\alpha} \rho \chi a \pi o \sigma \tau a ́ \tau \eta$ ). If genuine, 'principi abscessionis' is probably $\tau \hat{\varphi} \dot{\alpha} \rho \chi \gamma \gamma \hat{\varphi} \tau \hat{\eta} \mathrm{s} \dot{\alpha} \pi$ тoctacias [as at IV xl (p. 30r)].
 Adam and Eve fell under temptation: but of Cain no tempter is spoken of: hence 'ipse maledictionem portavit'. See what follows.
xxxv I (p. 128): indolem] probably 'inborn promise': 'indoles' is properly the natural force of virtuous character, which gives promise for
 (p. 331) 'Quia autem triginta annorum aetas prima indolis est juvenis', where 'indolis' (as Gr. took it) is probably the nom. (like 'famis, nubis', Rönsch 263 ).

2: causam] 'causas' Cl. : ràs airias, probably of Adam and of herself. quod fuerat factum] đò $\gamma \epsilon \gamma$ ovós.
increpatione] 'increpatio', with Cl .
(p. г29) : circa eum] as a clothing.

Prohibuit] éќ́ $\lambda v \sigma \epsilon \nu$, stopped it short.
xxxvi : observantes] from LXX aủrós $\sigma o v ~ \tau \eta \rho \eta ́ \sigma \epsilon \iota ~ \kappa є \phi а \lambda \eta{ }^{\prime} \nu, ~ \kappa \alpha a ̀ ~ \sigma \grave{v} \tau \eta \rho \eta^{\prime}-$ $\sigma \epsilon \iota \stackrel{y}{c}$ aủrov̂ $\pi \tau \epsilon \in \rho v a v$ [cf. IV lxvi 2 (p. 304), V xxi i (p. 38i)]. 'Observo' is a common O.L. rendering here from Cyprian onwards.
 fairly, of a serpent's bite.
xxxvii (p. 130) : suadens] 'dissuadens' Cl. Ar. : probably $\pi a \rho a \pi \epsilon i-$ $\theta \omega \nu$, 'beguiling'.
vidit] ' vicit' Cl .
xxxviii ( p . 131): undique] MSS against this. But Mass. may be right in conjecturing 'ubique' for 'utique'.
aspiratio] 'ad inspirationem' Cl. ; 'ab inspiratione' Voss. Feu. cod.
(p. I32) : operationem pessimam] A spiritual évépyєıa which is not that of the Holy Spirit.
nitidissimum fontem] water and blood.
2 : fluctuati] probably $\kappa \lambda v \delta \omega \nu \iota \zeta_{o ́ \mu \epsilon v o t ~ a s ~ E p h . ~ i v ~} 14$.
scientiam] 'sententiam' Voss. Feu. marg.
xl ( (p. $\mathrm{r}_{34}$ ): ex utrisque] The division destroys not one but both.

xlii 1 (p. 137) : ex errantia corruptelam] èк $\pi \lambda a ́ v \eta s ~ \phi \theta o \rho a ́ v . ~$
2 : improbiorem] 'impropriorem' Cl . ? àvouкєьotépav.
Prorogavimus] 'prorogabimus' Cl., 'praerogavimus' Ar.
P.S. By way of apology for the particular choice of notes here presented, it should be said that the selection was primarily intended for personal use, and was dictated by my own interest in the elucidation and illustration of the Latin text. The task of compilation was rendered the more manageable by the publication of Novum Testamentum S. Irenaei, since Dr Hort's comments on the N.T. quotations could properly be omitted as having been before the eyes of the careful editors of that monumental work. J. Armitage Robinson.

