

Adam to Joseph, and in like manner "the name of priesthood" from John', &c.¹ Now this appears to be an important factor in Aphraates' theology, and it is in the light of this statement that we should approach the arguments of Homily xvii, if we wish to understand them in their entirety. It is in this sense that 'we call Jesus God like Moses, and First-born, and Son like Israel, and Priest like Aaron', &c. Not that Moses was in any real sense God, nor that the adoption of Israel was in a complete sense the *υιοθεσία*, nor that Aaron was the great High Priest, who should make atonement for the sins of the whole world. But in each of these, and in a great many others, some one, or more than one, of those aspects or potentialities had been partially manifested, which ultimately found their complete expression in Jesus the God-Man.

In conclusion it may be remarked that though the 'creed passage' is undoubtedly a very inadequate expression of Aphraates' theological position, yet it would be wrong to minimize its doctrinal significance. It is in any case an immense advance on the point of view set forth in his friend's confession of faith. In it we have mention of the three persons of the Trinity, 'God the Lord of all, His Spirit, and His Christ,' while the visible Church and the Sacraments are at least implied in the last article.

The text of the *Homilies* itself is of course the best commentary on this confession, while the 'Creed of Aphraates' as 'reconstructed' by Dom Connolly may safely be regarded as the fullest expression which we possess of the theological position of their author.

H. LEONARD PASS.

THE APOSTOLIC PREACHING OF IRENAEUS.

In the *Apostolic Preaching* Irenaeus occasionally moralizes in a lofty strain on our duty to God and man. His theological statements are equally casual and invaluable. For in some places they throw more light on the problem of the relations of the Divine Persons to One Another than is to be found in the treatise *Adversus Haereses*. The dominant ideas of the Tract are, as in the Treatise, (1) immortality (*ἀφθαρσία*) conferred on man by the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit; (2) the image and likeness of God restored to man by both the Son and the Holy Spirit, and (3) communion with God established through Christ. This last is pressed home by a quotation from Baruch (iii 29—iv 1). That work had been already cited in *Adv. Haer.* IV 20, 4, with the

¹ *Hom.* xxiii Wright p. 473.

same application 'per quem commixtio et communio dei et hominis facta est'. But Irenaeus is here principally concerned with the Old Testament prophecies relating to the Messiah, as Son of God, as Pre-existent, as Incarnate, Risen, Ascended, and as our future Judge. His treatment and readings of these prophecies, which he interprets in the same *typical* manner as in the Treatise, to which he incidentally refers in c. 99 (e.g. IV 31, 1, *typum quaerere*), have many points of interest in biblical and patristic literature. One excellent point is given indirectly. The Armenian text of the fourth book of *Adv. Haer.*, which was found bound with this Tract, assigns in IV 7, 1 the *Magnificat* to Elisabeth, in agreement with the Clement and Voss MSS of the Latin Irenaeus, some MSS of the Latin gospels (*a* and *b*) and Niceta of Remesiana.

I. LITERARY AFFINITIES OF THE TRACT.

In the first place, we find in this Tract many literary affinities with Justin Martyr's *Apology* and *Dialogue*, and also with Irenaeus's own *Adversus Haereses*. For instance, we have the same symbolic use of the Old Testament, the parallels of Mary and Eve, and of the tree of knowledge and the Cross, which are elaborated in both the *Adv. Haer.* and the Tract; the *recapitulation* (*ἀνακεφαλαιώσις*) or summing up of all things in Christ; the jealousy of the Devil; 'the prophetic Spirit'; the indescribable generation (*inenarrabile genus*) of the Christ; the name 'Immanuel'; the prominence given to Moses 'the first of the prophets' (*Apol.* I 32); and many other ideas which are drawn from the *Apology* and the *Dialogue* of St Justin. While, as a matter of course, Irenaeus repeats in a slightly altered form many of his own ideas and expressions: e.g. 'the rule of the truth' becomes 'the rule of the faith'; while the Son is 'the image of God' in the *Preaching* c. 22, He is the 'Visible of the Father' in the *Adv. Haer.* (IV 6, 6). The perfecting of men (*τελείωσις*), the resurrection of the body, its incorruption (c. 32 and *Adv. Haer.* III 21, 10), the adoption in Christ, His Incarnation and Virgin-Birth, the Church as the seed of Abraham, Adam and Eve in Paradise represented as boy and girl, innocent and virgin and created from the virgin soil, the free will and responsibility of men, and the founding of the churches by the Apostles—these topics are treated in the same way in both the *Adv. Haer.* and the Tract.

It is interesting to observe that, while Irenaeus has taken over from the Gnostics 'the seven heavens' of which he writes (*Adv. Haer.* I 5, 2, and c. 9 of the Tract), he has abandoned his previous explanation of the name Satan which he had taken from Justin Martyr. In his *Dialogue* (c. 103) Justin had explained this name as consisting of two parts, *σαρά*, which he says in the Hebrew and Syriac languages means

ἀποστάτης (apostata), and *vās*, which according to him means 'serpent'. In *Adv. Haer.* V 21, 2, Irenaeus writes 'Satana enim verbum hebraicum apostatam significat', and alludes in the course of this work to the 'apostata angelus' (IV Praef.). But before he wrote the Tract Irenaeus had found out that Satan was the Hebrew שָׂטָן, adversary, and in c. 16 writes: 'and was called Satan, which in the Hebrew language means adversary.' This is doubtless the reason why we do not meet the *apostasias* which figures so largely in the *adv. Haer.*, e.g. V 1, 1. But he seems to be still under the impression that our Lord was over forty years of age at His crucifixion, for he says that Pontius Pilate was procurator under Claudius (A.D. 41), in order to bring the chronology of our Lord's life into line with St John viii 51, or rather with the opinion which certain ancient teachers who influenced Irenaeus had founded on it. See *Adv. Haer.* II 22 and Tract c. 74. However, Irenaeus seems to have changed the views he had expressed in *Adv. Haer.* V 33, 4 of Isa. ii 6-9. In the *Adv. Haer.* he had given a literal interpretation; here he follows a symbolic one. There he sees in the words a prediction of the return of the animals to their former state of subjection to man at the return of Christ as universal King; here (c. 61) of the reunion of mankind, a modification of his millenarian views.

An allusion to the *Adv. Haer.*, compiled about A. D. 195, is made in c. 99, and there is a reference to the political situation and to the state of the Church in c. 48, where Irenaeus refers to 'kings who now hate Him and persecute His name'. This refers, doubtless, to the persecution of Severus A. D. 202; so that the inference is that the Tract was composed at about that time. And in *Adv. Haer.* II 35, 4 he refers to the 'praedicatio apostolorum' (which may have suggested the title of this Tract, ἐπίδειξις τοῦ ἀποστολικοῦ κηρύγματος: Eus. *H. E.* v 25) among other divisions of scripture or sections for catechetical instruction such as 'Domini magisterium', 'prophetarum annuntiatio', 'Apostolorum dictatio', and 'Legislationis ministratio'; while he speaks of 'the Teaching of the Twelve Apostles', hardly the document known by that name in the *Preaching*, c. 46. He speaks of 'the economy of our redemption' (c. 47) and 'the economy of the Incarnation' (c. 99) to which he had referred in the words of *Adv. Haer.* I 10, 1: τὸ διὰ τῶν προφητῶν κεκρυμμένον τὰς οἰκονομίας, and says 'the holy oil' of Ps. xlv 7-8 is the Holy Ghost with whom Christ is anointed (c. 47), while in *Adv. Haer.* III 6, 1 he writes 'He who is anointed is the Son and He who anoints is the Father', and in III 18, 3 he writes 'Unguentem Patrem et unctum Filium et unctionem qui est Spiritus'. And he declares in the same chapter of the Tract that 'His fellows are the prophets, the righteous ones, and the apostles and all they who have part in the fellowship of His kingdom, that is His disciples'—words which find

a remarkable echo in our ancient collect from the Sacramentary of Leo for the Third Sunday after Easter—'Grant unto all them that are admitted into the fellowship of Christ's religion that they may eschew those things that are contrary to their profession and follow all such things as are agreeable to the same.' There are also many affinities, literary and spiritual, with the Church Catechism in this Tract.

II. USE OF JUSTIN'S WORKS AND TEACHING.

There are just a few points to which attention may be called in connexion with the use of Justin's works and teaching. In c. 53, when explaining the name Christ, Irenaeus says: 'He is for example called Christ because the Father hath *anointed* and adorned (*gesalbt und geschmückt*) everything through Him.' Irenaeus is here following the explanation given of the name Christ by Justin, who wrote (*Apol.* II 9, 6) *κατὰ τὸ κεχρῖσθαι καὶ κοσμηῆσαι τὰ πάντα δι' αὐτοῦ τὸν θεὸν λέγεται*, where Scaliger suggested *κατὰ τὸ καὶ χρῖσαι*, and Grabe took *κεχρῖσθαι* in an active sense. Scaliger's emendation finds support from an unexpected quarter. Justin Martyr (*Apol.* I 32) and Irenaeus (*Preaching* 58-59) both cite the prophecy of Isa. xi 1-10 of the stem and the flower (both interpreting *צפֿר* as *ἄνθος*, the root meaning 'to bloom') in connexion with the explanation of Gen. xlix 10-11, 'the cloak and the juice of the grape'. Both master and pupil seem to have followed here and elsewhere some common collection of scriptural proofs. Again both master and pupil cite Isa. xxxv 3-6, Justin in *Apol.* I 48 and Irenaeus in *Preaching* c. 67, as a prediction that Christ would perform works of healing. Both refer to Isa. lii 12-liii, Justin in *Apol.* I 50 and Irenaeus in *Preaching* c. 68, as a prophecy of the fact that our Lord would suffer and be treated with ignominy; and both (Justin in *Apol.* I 35 and Irenaeus in *Preaching* c. 68) make the same comment on the psalms prophetic of such suffering, i.e. that David himself never suffered. Justin (*Dialogue* 53) and Irenaeus (*Preaching* 76) cite Zechariah xiii 7 as a prediction of the scattering of all the disciples, and both make the comment that they did not believe in Him until He had risen. Irenaeus (c. 78) also cites the Apocryphal saying: 'And the Lord the Holy One of Israel remembered His dead, &c' as Jeremiah's. Justin had also ascribed it to Jeremiah in *Dialogue* 72. In III 20, 4 of the Treatise Irenaeus had ascribed it to Isaiah, but to Jeremiah in IV 22, 1. Like Justin, who described our Lord as *ἄτιμος καὶ ἀειδής*, *Dial.* 14, 14, *Apol.* I 52, Irenaeus (c. 71) speaks of 'the mean and contemptible appearance of His body'. Like Justin, who identified the Spirit with the Word in *Apol.* I 33, *πνεῦμα οὖν . . . οὐδὲν ἄλλο νοῆσαι θέμις ἢ τὸν λόγον*, Irenaeus writes (*Preaching* 71) 'the scripture points out that Christ, being the Spirit of God, would become a man capable of suffering'.

Like Justin, who quoted Isa. lvii 2 with the punctuation ἡ ταφή αὐτοῦ ἦρται ἐκ τοῦ μέσου (*Dial.* 97), which, however, Irenaeus does not follow, he treated this text as prophetic of the resurrection (*Preaching* 72). And like Justin (*Apol.* I 35) he interpreted 'the government shall be upon His shoulder' (Isa. ix 5) as indicating the power of the Cross to which His shoulder was fastened (*Preaching* 56). But Irenaeus (c. 71) gives an independent explanation of Lam. iv 20, where he follows the LXX reading πνεῦμα προσώπου ἡμῶν Χριστός, which Justin, who read πνεῦμα πρὸ προσώπου (*Apol.* I 55), explained as *breath* in connexion with the remark that the nose through which we breathe has the form of a cross on the face. Irenaeus renders πνεῦμα here as Spirit.

He does not, however, often desert his old master. There is, for example, a passage in the Tract (§ 49) which can only, I think, be explained by a reference to Justin *Apol.* I 36, 37, 38. Irenaeus, speaking of the Spirit of God, says 'He takes form and shape in the prophets according to the character of the Person concerned, and speaks sometimes as Christ and sometimes as Father'. Justin says in the passage referred to that the prophecies uttered by the prophets under the influence of the prophetic spirit were sometimes spoken in the character of the Father and sometimes in the character of the Christ, ποτὲ δ' ὡς ἀπὸ προσώπου τοῦ δεσπότου πάντων καὶ πατρὸς θεοῦ φθέγγεται, ποτὲ δ' ὡς ἀπὸ προσώπου τοῦ Χριστοῦ. As instances of the former Justin cites Isa. i 3 sq., of the latter Isa. l 6-8.

III. INDEPENDENT USE OF JUSTIN'S READINGS AND LXX.

Many quotations from the prophets in the Tract are after the version of Justin, and in some places are similar to the LXX, but in other places shew independence, e.g. c. 59—'And his *rising* shall be glorious' (Isa. xi 10). LXX has, after Heb., ἀνάπαυσις, rest. The word in Irenaeus is probably due to confusion of some part of מַצֵּבָה or derivative, e.g. מִצְבֵּה 'standing place' with מִנְבֵּה. In c. 58 he cites Num. xxiv 17, 'A star will rise out of Jacob and a *leader* be raised out of Israel'. Here LXX has ἀνθρωπος, but Heb. מַצְבֵּה, staff or sceptre, the constr. plural of which, מַצְבָּהִים, means rulers in 2 Sam. vii 7. Micah v 1 is cited in c. 63 differently from LXX and Hebrew, but after Justin *Apol.* I 34 ὅστις ποιμανεῖ τὸν λαόν μου; while Hosea x 6 is cited in the LXX form καὶ αὐτὸν εἰς Ἀσσυρίους δῆσαντες ἀπήνεγκαν ξένια τῷ βασιλεῖ Ἰαρείμ both by Justin *Dial.* 103 and by Irenaeus Tract c. 77. Isa. liii 4 is cited after Matt. viii 17 and not after LXX or Heb. in c. 67. Zech. ix 9 is cited in c. 65 after LXX, but omitting δίκαιος and σώζων with Justin *Apol.* I 35. The whole discussion on Isa. lii 12-liii in cc. 68-69 bears a close resemblance to its treatment and readings in Justin's *Apology* and *Dialogue*, e.g. in c. 69, 'through His stripes we have healing' (Isa. liii 5) is after

Justin's *Dial.* 95 and 17 which latter has δι' οὗ τῶν μολώπων ἴσους γίνεται, where Justin evidently regarded the niphath form מַלְוִי as substantive, the LXX reading *ιάθημεν*, as Justin does in *Dial.* 32 where he also has the sing. τῷ μώλωπι after Heb. and LXX: cf. *Dial.* 43. But in his interpretation of Isa. liii 8 Irenaeus was unhappily led astray by both Justin (*Apol.* I 50) and LXX, who read ἡ κρίσις αὐτοῦ, through overlooking ו before מַלְוִי. Irenaeus gives a different reading from Justin and LXX of Zech. xiii 7 in c. 76—'Sword, awake against the man who is my companion'; LXX ἐπὶ ἄνδρα πολίτην μου, Justin *Dial.* 53 ἐπ' ἄνδρα τοῦ λαοῦ μου, reading 'מַלְוִי for 'חֵיבִי, 'my fellow or fellowship'. Irenaeus is nearest to the Hebrew. In c. 75 he follows the LXX version of Ps. lxxxix 39-46, reading 'help of His sword' (βοήθειαν, but Heb. מַלְוִי acies); and in c. 84 the LXX of Ps. xxiv 7, reading οἱ ἄρχοντες, evidently through confusion of מַלְוִי prince and מַלְוִי gate; but in c. 85 he follows the Hebrew reading of Ps. xix 7, 'And nothing (חַס) remains hid from the heat thereof', while the LXX and Justin have οὐκ ἔστιν ὄσ. In c. 86 he reads 'messengers' in his version of Isa. lii 7; but Heb. and LXX have the singular. In c. 49 he reads Isa. xlv 1, 'The Lord said to my Lord the Anointed' instead of 'to Cyrus mine anointed', through confusion of κύριος (LXX and Hebrew) and κυρίως. But in c. 96 he gives a nearer version of the Hebrew חָרַץ, to break or cut the neck, than the LXX, which reads ἀποκτενῶν. The German is *würgen*, to strangle. And in c. 68 he wrongly renders מַלְוִי of Isa. liii 12 as passive, i.e. 'is known.' LXX and Justin have συνήσει and Vulgate *intelliget*.

IV. NEW TESTAMENT READINGS AND REFERENCES.

Of Irenaeus's New Testament readings one is to be noted. He read ὄξος instead of οἶνον in Matt. xxvii 34. In this matter he keeps company with Cod. Alexand. and Cod. Sangall. 'written in Latin (most probably by Irish) monks in the west of Europe during the 9th [rather 10th] century' (Scrivener). This is an interesting link between the Irish Church and Irenaeus, whose writings had a great influence upon the life and thought of St Patrick. See *Hermathena*, 1906, in which I have tried to establish this point. There is an indirect reference to Heb. xii 23 in c. 94, where he writes: 'The Lord Himself has saved us by giving many children to the Church, the *assembly of the firstborn*, which recalls πανηγύρι καὶ ἐκκλησίᾳ πρωτοτόκων. But owing to his following the principle of citing Old Testament authorities rather than New in this work, he does not indicate the source. He, however, distinctly ascribes John i 14 to 'His disciple John' ('Johannes discipulus Domini' of *Adv. Haer.* IV 30) in c. 94, and John i 1 to 'His disciple John' in c. 43—another link between the disciple John and the Fourth Gospel.

F. R. MONTGOMERY HITCHCOCK.