

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *Bibliotheca Sacra* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_bib-sacra_01.php

ARTICLE IV.

IRENÆUS OF LYONS.

BY C. J. H. ROPES, RES. LIC., UNION SEM.

THE history of the second Christian century has always been the arena of theological controversy, never more than to-day. Critics and apologists of all opinions still find their views represented in this formative period. The present problem of church history is the rise of the old Catholic church. And in the last few years a party has arisen, calling itself by this time-honored name, and claiming to re-establish the old Catholic faith.

This, therefore, is a peculiarly appropriate time to invite attention to the most influential churchman of the second century, to the best representative of its doctrine and polity, to the champion of the old Catholic church in the hour of its greatest peril, to the first uninspired theologian who "on all the most important points conforms to the standard which has satisfied the Christian church ever since"¹—to Irenæus of Lyons. And yet, when we seek the foundation for these statements in the character of Irenæus, in his life, in his book which describes the home of the church as a fortress against the gnostics, we may meet with disappointment; for in him we find no trace of the rugged individuality of Ignatius, of the brilliant rhetoric of Tertullian, of the wide range of Origen's speculation, of the creative intellect of Augustine. The individuality of Irenæus seems almost lost in his catholicity; his rhetorical armory is the Bible, his speculation moves in the plane of the Scriptures, and his creations in theology are almost unnoticed, because so familiar. In fact, the great difficulty in characterizing

¹ Dr. Lightfoot, in *Contemp. Rev.*, May 1875, p. 827, cf. Harvey's *Irenæus*, i. p. clxxiii.

Irenæus springs from the naturalness of his expressions, which relaxes the critical attention.

The worth of Irenæus lies in his peculiar position, and in the fact that he was the right man to fill it. Many lines meet in him. Two long lives, overlapping by nearly thirty years, link Irenæus with the Founder of Christianity. Polycarp was a faithful disciple of John, but a zealous student of Paul; and in Irenæus we find united the anthropological, practical tenets of Paul and the sublime theology of John.¹

Again, the youth of Irenæus was spent in Asia Minor, the cradle of theology; but his life-work was done in Gaul, under the practical influences of the Western church. So we find in him head, heart, and hand joined together in many-sided work. Lipsius has ably described the change which turned the attention of Christians in the second century from the heavenly to the earthly kingdom.² They were no longer to "stand gazing up into heaven," but to extend and defend the faith. Here, again, Irenæus unites both motives. He holds to the strong chiliastic hopes, and even to the gross realistic conceptions of the future; but he puts his hand vigorously to the work. We think of him as the great antagonist of gnosticism; and this he was. But while his book against the gnostics occupied a few of his later years, all his manhood's strength was given to his missionary work in Gaul. Trained in the school of John, and having all the advantages of a liberal education, growing up in the affluence of all Christian and intellectual privileges, he went in his prime as a missionary to the Celts of Lyons and Vienne. Before many years came the terrible persecution of A.D. 177. He escaped; but the bishop was martyred, and Irenæus took the dangerous position. The work went on uninterruptedly until the dawn of the third century. Then another persecution; and, if a late tradition does not speak

¹ Such thoughts as these may be found more fully in the introductions to Duncker's *Christologie des Irenæus* and Graul's *Christliche Kirche an der Schwelle des Irenæischen Zeitalters*.

² Von Sybel's *Historische Zeitschrift*, 1872. p. 241 sqq.

falsely,¹ Irenaeus fell at his post, as Pothinus had done before him. Without touching on the wider personal influence of Irenaeus, let us notice some of the lines of doctrine which begin with this Father.

First, of the Bible. He first recognizes a definite canon, nearly co-extensive with ours, and rejects uncanonical writings. He first puts the same estimate that we put on the books of the New Testament. He first states, and in the main observes, a number of rules for exegesis. He even gives the first hint of text criticism, by deciding for the reading of "all the good and old copies."² Irenaeus is a most important witness to the use and authority of the whole Bible. He makes a truly Protestant use of the Scriptures, though of course he falls into many mistakes from which we ought to be preserved.

Secondly, of theology. We find for the first time a biblical theology, every doctrine moving along a road on which texts of Scripture are the milestones. Irenaeus starts with the foundation thought that God and man are not naturally wide apart nor uncongenial; but "the glory of God is a living man, and the life of man is to see God."³ He can from this meeting-point follow theology to the sublimity of John's conception, and anthropology to the depths of Pauline doctrine. Irenaeus has the first Christology, as distinct from a Logos theology, and the first clear signs of a doctrine of the person of Christ, derived from his fundamental principle. In him we first find any fulness of expression about the Holy Spirit.

Even more prominent is Irenaeus as having the first scheme of anthropology. Irenaeus grasps firmly the organic unity of the race, the fall of Adam and its consequences to all, the redemption in Christ and its efficacy for all. These doctrines he elaborates with great minuteness, basing his teachings on the Pauline Epistles. His doctrinal influence

¹ Cf. Harvey's *Irenaeus*, i. p. clix sq. Jerome and the *Questiones ad Orthodoxos* are the earliest witnesses for this tradition.

² Massuet's ed., v. 30, § 1. Oxford Trans., p. 519.

³ *Ibid.*, iv. 20. § 7. Oxford Trans., p. 369.

on later times may be illustrated from the fact that he first distinguishes between the image and the similitude of God in man,—a distinction which lies at the root of the Roman Catholic doctrine of man's constitution,—and that Luther quotes him in support of his own view of the sacrament.¹

So much, in general,² to hint at the claims of Irenæus for attention and interest. We shall return to these topics in the examination of the theology of Irenæus, which is the main object of our study.

It is usual to preface such an examination with a detailed account of the man himself. This, however, must be given either with new materials, or at least from a new point of view. The latest editor of Irenæus,³ Mr. Harvey, has supplied both, in that he defends with great plausibility the hypothesis that Irenæus was a Syrian. Mr. Harvey argues that, while the name of Irenæus does not at all necessarily show him to be a Greek, its rarity suggests the contrary. He further finds, in the Preface to the *Adversus Hæreses*, a confession that Irenæus is not at all at home with the Greek language. He discovers that Irenæus was well versed in Hebrew; and, to crown all, he exhibits most extensive evidence that Irenæus very frequently quotes from the *Peschito*. It must be confessed that this theory puts all the facts previously ascertained about Irenæus in a new and, if it be true, a most perplexing light. Candid dealing compels us to consider it, before we can have any certain basis for the further examination of Irenæus; and the discussion of it will give an incidental opportunity for noticing some interesting facts respecting the date and education of Irenæus and the Bible he used, which have never hitherto been brought

¹ In the Erlangen ed. (in 67 vols. 1826–1857), Vol. xxx. pp. 144, 166 sqq.

² These *first* doctrines must be taken for what they are worth; although founded on a survey of the previous literature, and in most cases on other authority besides, yet some previous signs of these doctrines may have been overlooked.

³ *Sancti Irenæi Episcopi Lugdunensis libros quinque Adversus Hæreses* edidit W. Wigan Harvey. Cantabrigiæ, MCCCCLVII. 2 vols. 8vo. (References to this work being numerous, will be made only by numbers indicating volume, page, and note).

together under his name. As we have hinted, it would be unjust to pass Mr. Harvey's theory by as if it were to be classed with the opinion expressed by Oecumenius that Irenaeus was a Gaul,¹ or with the assumption of Erasmus that he wrote in Latin.² The learning and authority of Mr. Harvey, his other publications in the department of patristic study,³ the selection of him by the syndics of the Cambridge University Press to edit the works of Irenaeus, the amount of labor he expended on the preparation of the edition,⁴ the high commendation accorded to it,⁵ the countenance⁶ and even partial assent⁷ given to this very theory, last, and principally, the arguments already mentioned⁸ in support of the theory — all combine to show that a candid examination of the question is necessary — all demand proof from us, if we are to hold that Irenaeus was not a Syrian.

In opposition to Mr. Harvey's theory it will be my purpose to prove that we need not abandon the opinion that Irenaeus was a Greek. This purpose will be best accomplished by establishing the antecedent probability that Irenaeus was a Greek, and by showing that the arguments adduced on the other side do not destroy that probability.

In support of the antecedent probability that Irenaeus was a Greek, it is to be noticed that :

I. The facts and dates of the early life of Irenaeus, so far

¹ Stieren, *Hallsche Encyklopaedie d. W. u. K.*, s. v. Irenaeus, note 2.

² *Ibid.*, n. 71. Massuet *Diss.* ii. § 51. *Erasmi Epist. nuncupatoria.*

³ *Ecclesiae Anglicanae Vindex Catholicus*, 1841. *History and Theology of the Three Creeds*, 1854. He has also published *Prolusio Academica on Prov.* viii. 22, and *University Sermons.*

⁴ *Athenaeum*, 1858, Vol. i. p. 117. Mr. Harvey speaks of the preparation of one of the appendices to the work as "having kept him at work for several weeks during the summer months from five, and even four, o'clock in the morning till eleven at night."

⁵ *Bib. Sac.* Vol. xvi. p. 250; *Journal of Sac. Lit.*, Vol. xxi. p. 208; *M'Clintock and Strong's Cyclopaedia*, s. v. Irenaeus.

⁶ *Journal of Sac. Lit.*, l. c.; *M'Clintock, etc.*, l. c.; *Ante-Nicene Christian Library*, Irenaeus, Vol. i. p. xviii.

⁷ *Anto-Nic. Lib.* l. c. p. 14, n. 8.

⁸ These arguments will be quoted in full when we come to examine them, they may be found, i. p. cliii sq.; cf. i. Preface, p. v.

as they can be ascertained, leave no room for the hypothesis that he was a Syrian.

Our knowledge of Irenaeus begins with the undisputed fact that he was the pupil of Polycarp. Let us look at the oft-quoted passage in the letter of Irenaeus to Florinus, which describes this connection :

“ For I saw thee when I was still a boy (*παῖς ὄν ἔτι*) in Lower Asia, in company with Polycarp, while thou wast faring prosperously in the royal court, and endeavoring to stand well with him. For I distinctly remember (*διαμνημονεύω*) the incidents of that time better than events of recent occurrence ; for the lessons received in childhood (*ἐκ παιδῶν*), growing with the growth of the soul, become identified with it ; so that I can describe the very place in which the blessed Polycarp used to sit when he discoursed, and his goings out and his comings in, and his manner of life, and his personal appearance, and the discourses which he held before the people, and how he would describe his intercourse with John, and with the rest who had seen the Lord, and how he would relate their words. And whatsoever things he had heard from them about the Lord, and about his miracles, and about his teaching, Polycarp, as having received them from eye-witnesses of the life of the Word, would relate altogether in accordance with the Scriptures. To these (discourses) I used to listen at the time with attention, by God’s mercy which was bestowed upon me, noting them down, not on paper, but in my heart ; and by the grace of God I constantly ruminates upon them faithfully (*γνησίως*). And I can testify in the sight of God, that if the blessed and apostolic elder had heard anything of this kind [referring to the doctrines of Florinus], he would have cried out and stopped his ears, and said, after his wont, ‘ O good God, for what times hast thou kept me, that I should endure such things ? ’ and would even have fled from the place where he was sitting or standing when he heard such words.”¹

1. We notice here, that Irenaeus was very young when he first saw Polycarp. “ Still a boy,” “ in childhood,” with a similar expression in the *Adversus Haereses* : “ (Polycarp) whom we also saw in the first age of our life,”²

¹ ii. p. 471 sqq. Translation by Dr. Lightfoot, *Contemp. Rev.*, May 1875, p. 833.

² ii. p. 12 ; *ἐν τῇ πρώτῃ ἡμῶν ἡλικίᾳ*. Oxford Trans., p. 208.

together with the style and details of his recollections,¹ and his description of the youthful memory which retained them,² all point to a period of life which begins, perhaps, about the eighth year. And the date is fixed by the reference to the royal court, according to an ingenious and appropriate suggestion of Dr. Lightfoot.

"About the year 136, T. Aurelius Fulvus was proconsul of Asia (Waddington, *Fastes des provinces Asiatiques*, p. 724). Within two or three years from his proconsulate he was raised to the imperial throne, and is known as Antoninus Pius. Florinus may have belonged to his suite, and Irenæus in after years might well call the proconsul's retinue, in a loose way, the 'royal court' by anticipation. This explanation gives a visit of sufficient length, and otherwise fits in with the circumstances."³

This conjecture, combined with the preceding inferences, seems to show that Irenæus was at least eight years old in A.D. 136. And this accords with the approximate date which Irenæus gives for his own birth. Speaking of the Apocalyptic vision, he tells us, "at no long time ago was it seen, but almost in our generation, in the end of Domitian's reign."⁴ The end of Domitian's reign is A.D. 96, and if we take a generation⁵ roughly, as twenty-five to thirty years, and allow

¹ Cf. A. Reville in *Rev. d. Deux Mondes*, Feb. 1865, p. 1003; Beaufron, *Account of S. Irenæus*, p. 2 sq.

² Cf. Dr. Lightfoot, *Contemp. Rev.*, May 1875, p. 834.

³ *Contemp. Rev.*, May 1875, p. 833 sq., note. The rest of the note shows that no other reference has so much in its favor as this to A.D. 136. Dr. Lightfoot's suggestion, may, perhaps, have been anticipated by Tillemont, who, however, did not elaborate it. Cf. his *Hist. Eccles.*, Vol. ii. p. 362, and note. "A la cour de l'empereur." "D'Adrien, qui fut souvent en Orient jusqu'en 134, ou plutôt d'Antonin puisque S. Irenée ne naquit apparemment que vers l'an 120." A.D. 120 is exactly the date Dr. Lightfoot (*Contemp. Rev.*, Aug. 1876, p. 415) assigns for the birth of Irenæus on the basis of his note, which we have quoted in the text. Still it must be doubted whether Tillemont (who put Polycarp's martyrdom as late as about 167) does not mean the Emperor's journey in the East, A.D. 154-157 (cf. Lipsius *Zeitschr. für wissensch. theol.* 1874, p. 190) rather than his proconsular stay there in 136.

⁴ ii. p. 410; Οὐδὲ γὰρ πρὸ πολλοῦ χρόνον ἐωράθη, ἀλλὰ σχεδὸν ἐπὶ τῆς ἡμετέρας γενεᾶς, πρὸς τῷ τέλει τῆς Δομιτιανοῦ ἀρχῆς. *Oxford Trans.*, p. 521.

⁵ Cf. Leimbach. *Zeitschr. für Luther. theol.* 1874, p. 472 sq., *ibid.* 1873, p. 626 sq.; Dr. Lightfoot, *Contemp. Rev.*, Aug. 1876, p. 415 note.

a little margin for the *almost*, we reach the conclusion that the birth of Irenaeus is to be placed A.D. 125–130. If the date A.D. 136 is to be accepted, then Irenaeus could hardly have been born later than A.D. 128, and it was possibly several years earlier; Dr. Lightfoot suggests A.D. 120. Leimbach and, following him, Hilgenfeld¹ have decided for about A.D. 126. I am inclined to think that the expressions used in the letter to Florinus point to an earlier age than sixteen, and the more probable inference from the date of the Apocalypse is in favor of a later date than A.D. 120. In this connection the opinions of earlier authorities deserve notice.

“Those who have placed it (the birth of Irenaeus) as late as A.D. 140, have chosen this date on the ground of the relation of Irenaeus to Polycarp in his old age,² and on the supposition that Polycarp was martyred A.D. 167. Since, however, it has recently been shown that Polycarp suffered A.D. 155 or 156, it may be presumed that these critics would now throw the date of his pupil’s birth some ten or twelve years farther back, i.e. to about A.D. 128 or 130.”³

Thus the testimony here cited would be in favor of A.D. 128 rather than 120. Therefore, while all is guesswork, perhaps about A.D. 126 is the most probable date. All, however, that we need to establish here is, that Irenaeus first listened to Polycarp in early boyhood, and this, while implied in his language to Florinus, is confirmed by all the data.

¹ Leimbach. l. c. Hilgenfeld, *Zeitschr. für wissenschaft. theol.* 1874, p. 319.

² It should be mentioned, as Dr. Lightfoot notes, (as also Leimbach, l. c. 1873, p. 620) that these authorities had an unsound reason for their late date of Irenaeus, since they connected *πάνυ γηραλέος* (ii. p. 12) with the time when Irenaeus saw Polycarp, not, as the order plainly indicates, with the time of his martyrdom, — *ὅν καὶ ἡμεῖς ἐσώρακαμεν ἐν τῇ πρώτῃ ἡμῶν ἡλικίᾳ ἐπὶ πολλῷ γὰρ παρέμεινε, καὶ πάνυ γηραλέος, ἐνδόξων καὶ ἐπιφανέστατα μαρτυρήσας, ἐξῆλθε τοῦ βίου.*

³ Quoted from Dr. Lightfoot, *Contemp. Rev.*, Aug. 1876, p. 415. For the new date of Polycarp’s martyrdom, cf. Waddington, *Memoires de l’Academie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres*, Tom. xxvi. Part i. 1867, p. 203 sqq. Lipsius, *Zeitschr. für wissenschaft. theol.* 1874, p. 188 sqq. Hilgenfeld, *ibid.*, pp. 120, note, 325 sq. Gebhardt, *Zeitschr. für hist. theol.*, 1875, p. 377 sqq. Dr. Lightfoot, *Contemp. Rev.*, May 1875, p. 838.

2. It is to be noticed, secondly, that Irenaeus remained some time as a pupil of Polycarp. The style of the references to the venerable elder point to this. The minute acquaintance with his ways and habits, the constant reference to certain actions as customary with him, even to the prediction of what he would do and say under certain circumstances, — the fact, in short, that Irenaeus had learned Polycarp by heart, — indicates a prolonged intercourse. The expression, “in the first age of our life,” would sanction a similar inference. There are hints, moreover, that Irenaeus was with Polycarp *at*, and therefore probably *up to*, a very late period in the life of the latter. In his letter to Victor, Irenaeus speaks of Polycarp’s visit to Rome, and gives details of his discussions with Anicetus and their agreeing to differ on the subject of the Eucharist.¹ In another place, speaking of the same visit to Rome, he asserts that Polycarp “converted to God’s church many of the forementioned heretics,” and describes minutely his meeting with Marcion, which was probably, at the same time and place.² When, therefore, we find that Polycarp was in Rome only a year or two before his martyrdom, and that Irenaeus was probably in Rome at the time his teacher was martyred,³ we reach the presumption (against which, so far as I know, nothing can be alleged) that Irenaeus was the companion of the aged Polycarp on his journey to Rome, and was left there, when the latter returned to meet his end in Smyrna. The probability, then, — for it is, of course, no more, — seems to be, that Irenaeus was a pupil of Polycarp from early boyhood to developed manhood. Hence, if he ever learned Syriac, it must have

¹ ii. p. 476. Oxford Trans., p. 541 sq.

² ii. p. 12 sqq. Oxford Trans., p. 208. Zahn (Ignatius von Antiochien, p. 476) thinks that the meeting with Marcion did not occur in Rome; but cf. Hilgenfeld, Zeitschr. für wissenschaft. theol., 1874, p. 323, and note, Lipsius, *ibid.*, p. 206 and note.

³ This information is contained in a note at the end of the Moscow ms. of the *Martyrium Polycarpi*, and may be found in Pat. Apost. Opp., edd. Gebhardt, Harnack, Zahn. Pars. i. Fasc. ii. (1876), p. 167 sq. Gebhardt (Zeitschr. für hist. theol., 1875, p. 368). A. Harnack (Zeitschr. für Kirchengesch., 1876, p. 121). Dr. Lightfoot (Contemp. Rev., Aug. 1876, p. 417 note), all agree with Zahn, in thinking it probable that Irenaeus was then in Rome.

been (as Mr. Harvey assumes) before he first saw Polycarp. Let us try to unite hypothetically the two theories.

On Mr. Harvey's supposition Irenæus was born in Syria, and early instructed in the Syriac Scriptures. So intense was his application and so earnest his study, that a great part of the New Testament was, word for word, impressed on his memory. This will be conceded by any one who will carefully examine the numerous (over one hundred) texts in which Irenæus deviates (according to the theory) from his Greek text to follow the Syriac. They occur in every book from Matthew to 1st Timothy. They are often concerned with changes so slight as to be retained only by a very accurate verbal memory, which Irenæus does not seem to have possessed.¹ These changes appear, many of them, in passages that would, among us at least, scarcely interest, or be retained by, the youthful mind. And often they are suddenly discovered in a passage of such length that it must have been copied bodily from the writer's Greek Bible manuscript, proving that the influence of memory was, in these places, strong enough directly to induce a change of reading. To crown all, this marvellous memory was exercised in the "Adversus Haereses" fifty years, if not more, after the writer said farewell to the Syriac Scriptures. For he was removed to Smyrna, learned Greek, and, in early boyhood, he was listening easily and attentively to Polycarp, in the newly adopted language. Such a mental history is extraordinary to the point of incredibility when no hint of it appears; and, no doubt, it is Mr. Harvey's consciousness of this which leads him to extend the term "the first age of our life" to the thirtieth year.² But the facts and dates

¹ For, he writes it *Siloa* for *Bethesda*, ii. p. 166; *High-priest's daughter*, for *daughter of ruler of synagogue*, ii. p. 355; *three spies for two*, ii. p. 224; omits all mention of John, Luke vii. 51, i. p. 339; quotes a verse from Mark, which is not found in that Gospel, ii. p. 158; after quoting 1 John ii. 18 cites 2 John 7 as from the *mentioned* epistle, ii. pp. 86, 89; refers one passage to Isaiah and Jeremiah — it is found in neither, ii. pp. 108, 228; cf. Justin, Dial. c. Tryph. c. 72.

² i. p. clv.; cf. p. 331, n. 1; ii. p. 12, n. 1.

of the early life of Irenaeus (though probabilities are all we have to show for them) destroy the chronological basis of Mr. Harvey's theory.

II. The education of Irenaeus is strong evidence of his Greek nationality, and its wide range makes an additional Syriac education very improbable — there is not room for both. Let us notice the names of some of the authors cited by Irenaeus, as evidence of his education.¹ Homer's *Odyssey* and *Iliad* were so well known to him that he even makes a cento of lines from all parts of them, to illustrate the absurd combinations of the gnostics.² Four other references to Homer may be noticed.³ Hesiod, Empedocles, Stesichorus, Aesop, Pindar, Sôphocles, Antiphanes, Menander, Anaxilaus,⁴ all come in for a familiar allusion. A few names of Greek philosophers may also be mentioned — those being selected to whose opinions reference is made. Thales, Anaximander, Anaxagoras, Pythagoras, Democritus, Epicurus, and especially Plato,⁵ are thus cited. Aristotle, the Stoics, and the Cynics are noticed.⁶ Such a list of allusions in a work which has no immediate and special reference to philosophy, argues a wide acquaintance with Greek literature.

At least equal to his classical learning was the familiarity of Irenaeus with early Christian literature. There is scarcely a work that has been preserved to our time from which he does not borrow, and there are some of which we know only what Irenaeus tells us.⁷ Clement of Rome,⁸ Hermas,⁹ Ignatius,¹⁰

¹ Cf. Stieren, *De fontibus Irenaei*, § 19 sq.; Ziegler, *Irenaeus*, p. 17 sq.

² i. p. 87. It may be objected that Irenaeus perhaps only quoted the cento, but in any case he assigns the different lines to their respective places and speakers with an ease which shows he *could* have constructed the cento.

³ i. pp. 110, 289, 322; ii. p. 258.

⁴ i. pp. 296, 226, 294, 192, 275, 326; ii. p. 356; i. pp. 287, 315, 115.

⁵ i. pp. 289, 290, 299, 291; Plato, i. pp. 292, 293, 294, 378; ii. pp. 135, 136.

⁶ i. pp. 295, 296, 373.

⁷ E.g. the writings, or lectures, of the elders, and the treatise of Justin against Marcion; cf. Euseb. *H. E.* iv. 11; Phot. *cod.*, 125 (*Semisch, Justin der Märtyrer*, i. p. 57).

⁸ ii. p. 10.

⁹ ii. p. 213.

¹⁰ ii. p. 403. Cf. *Pat. Apost. Opp.*, edd. Gebhardt, Harnack, Zahn. *Par.* i. *Fasc.* 2 (1876), p. 331, and the references there given.

Polycarp,¹ and Tatian² are quoted and referred to by name. There is at least one exact verbal parallel in Irenæus to the epistle to Diognetus.³ Several echoes of the Epistle of Barnabas must be noticed, and they are too numerous and too exact to be indirect.⁴ Irenæus probably borrowed largely, especially in the exegesis of certain passages, from elders⁵ of whom we know definitely nothing further. So extensive and detailed are these references to "the elders," that Dr. Lightfoot supposes notes of lectures heard by Irenæus to be their source.⁶ Papias of Hierapolis is responsible for "considerable parts of the fifth book of Irenæus."⁷ But greater than to any other writer are the obligations of Irenæus to Justin Martyr. Twice Irenæus cites him by name.⁸ Further, Semisch has collected from Irenæus eight quotations taken from the First Apology, the Trypho, and the Fragment on the Resurrection.⁹ I am

¹ ii. pp. 12, 14.

² i. p. 220; ii. p. 130. There is, however, here no quotation of the works of Tatian, but only of his doctrine. The works of the other Greek apologists, Athenagoras and Theophilus, could hardly be accessible to Irenæus when he wrote.

³ Ep. ad Diognetum, c. vii. (p. 310 ed. Hefele) *βία γὰρ οὐ πρόσεστι θεῶν*. Cf. Irenæus, ii. p. 238.

⁴ Christ laid aside his glory because man could not have endured the sight of it. Ep. Barnab. c. iv.; Iren. ii. p. 293; Isa. l. 8, 9, quoted in a peculiar reading Ep. Barnab. c. vi., Iren. ii. p. 268, very different from the same quotation Justin i. Apol. c. 38 or the LXX. Milk (or butter) and honey as the first food of an infant, used to explain Ex. xxxiii. 3, Ep. Barnab. c. vi.; Isa. vii. 15, Iren. ii. p. 116. This parallel, however, cannot be insisted on, for the idea is a common one, cf. Cotel. ad loc. (Ep. Barnab. c. vi). Allegorical interpretation of "chewing the cud," Ep. Barnab. c. x.; Iren. ii. p. 340 sq. "The day of the Lord is as a thousand years" (Ps. xc. 4; 2 Pet. iii. 8?), used to prove the end of the world in 6000 years from its creation, Ep. Barnab. c. xv.; Iren. ii. p. 403.

⁵ E.g. *ὁ ἀπελθεὶς ἡμῶν*, i. pp. 3, 119; ii. p. 95; *πρεσβύτης*, i. p. 155 sq.; ii. pp. 238, 248, 251, 254, 331, 372, 428 *bis*. Cf. Dr. Lightfoot, Contemp. Rev., Oct. 1875, p. 340 sqq.; Hülfenfeld, Zeitschr. für wissenschaftl. theol., 1874, p. 343 sq.

⁶ Contemp. Rev., Oct. 1875, p. 341, note.

⁷ Ibid., p. 345.

⁸ ii. pp. 158, 396; cf. i. p. 220.

⁹ Semisch (Justin der Märtyrer, Breslau, 1840; i. pp. 59, 83, 148), gives 1 Apol. 15, Iren. i. p. 372; c. 22, i. p. 364; c. 12, ii. p. 8; c. 43, ii. 290; Dial c. Tryph. c. 6, Iren. i. p. 363; c. 84, ii. p. 118; c. 110, ii. p. 272; de Resurr. c. 8, Iren. ii. 335.

able to add to these a number of instances in which the similarity of thought is too great to be accidental.¹ No doubt a systematic comparison would greatly enlarge this list of parallels from Justin; but these are enough, with those which precede them, to suggest the extent and accuracy of the acquaintance of Irenaeus with Christian literature. Let it be remembered that we possess only a part of the works of Irenaeus, and but a small fraction of that early literature which he quotes.² As the treatises quoted were all written in Greek, acquaintance with them creates, so far forth, a presumption of Greek nationality.

It would seem probable that the studies which supplied these references were prosecuted mainly before the departure of Irenaeus from Asia Minor. Some of the books would hardly be accessible in Gaul, and we know that the missionary zeal of Irenaeus led him to make so constant a use of the language of that country that he felt it to be destructive of the elegance and polish of his vernacular style.³ We may, perhaps, infer that during the period when he wrote

¹ Apparent contradictions of Scripture, Tryph. c. 65; Iren. i. p. 351. *raptores*, Isa. vii. 14; Tryph. c. 67; Iren. ii. p. 110 sqq. Authority of the LXX, Tryph. c. 68; Iren. ii. p. 111 sqq. Symbolism of the Cross, 1 Apol. c. 54; Tryph. c. 91; Iren. i. p. 339; ii. p. 272. Amalek destroyed by the cross, Tryph. cc. 91, 131; Ep. Barnab. c. xii.; Iren. ii. pp. 232, 256. Christ in the burning bush, 1 Apol. cc. 62, 63; Tryph. 60, 127; Iren. ii. p. 172. Prophecy unfulfilled because to be realized in Christ, 1 Apol. c. 35; Iren. ii. pp. 270 sq. Christ's descent into hell foretold by Jeremiah, Tryph. c. 72; Iren. ii. p. 228. Argument for resurrection of the body, 1 Apol. c. 19; Iren. ii. p. 326. Eve and the Virgin Mary, Tryph. c. 100; Ep. ad Diognet. c. xii. (p. 320 ed. Hefele); Iren. ii. p. 376. Simon and Helena, 1 Apol. c. 26; Iren. i. p. 190 sqq. How Adam died on the day of the fall (Ps. xc. 4; 2 Pet. iii. 8?), Tryph. c. 81; Iren. ii. p. 387. Moral freedom and responsibility, 1 Apol. c. 43; Iren. ii. p. 286 sqq. Etymology of the word *Satan*, Tryph. c. 103; Iren. ii. p. 383. The Eucharist, 1 Apol. cc. 13, 66; Tryph. cc. 41, 70, 117; Iren. ii. pp. 197 sq., 318 sq., etc.

² To take a single example which will illustrate the probability that Irenaeus's obligations to Christian literature were far beyond what we can now detect; we know Justin wrote a work against all heresies (cf. 1 Apol. c. 26), as well as his treatise against Marcion. Irenaeus quotes the latter at least once, how much more we can only guess. But the former would probably yield him a far greater store of knowledge, if we may judge by the quotations of Hippolytus and Epiphanius from Irenaeus.

³ i. p. 6 (praefatio).

the *Adversus Haereses* his Greek studies would be principally confined to those heretical treatises which he undertook to refute.¹ The Greek education of Irenæus makes it probable that he was a Greek; since it is too thorough to be a secondary layer on previous Oriental learning, and too broad to have left opportunity for the anterior acquisition of Syriac.

III. Silence furnishes us with an argument against the supposition that Irenæus was a Syrian. Why does Irenæus nowhere speak of the Syriac language or literature, even when he is dealing with gnostic teachers, many of whom "learned their craft in Syria"?² Why did Irenæus seek to hide his Syrian origin? And how did he succeed in concealing it not only from open mention, but even from the slightest incidental allusion by himself or any of his contemporaries and near successors?³ Why, in short, did no one ever suspect that Irenæus was a Syrian, till the year 1857, when a scholar, whose specialty is confessedly Syriac,⁴ discovers some Syriac analogies in the biblical quotations of this Father, and infers his Syrian nationality?

IV. We have already prepared the way to our last argument here — the consensus of authorities that Irenæus was a Greek. If we value, in such questions as this, the opinion expressed by intimate friends, then should the conviction of those who have long and laboriously made the acquaintance of Irenæus in his writings here carry weight as an argument from the general impression received by them. That Irenæus was a Greek is the almost unanimous opinion of those who have made this Father a study.⁵ Oecumenius is an

¹ Cf. Stieren, *de fontibus Irenæi*, Harvey's *Irenæus*, i. pp. 4, 242.

² i. p. lxxv.

³ Those adduced by Mr. Harvey being omitted till their value is ascertained.

⁴ Mr. Harvey's edition of Irenæus shows this; cf. also Athenæum, 1858, Vol. i. p. 117.

⁵ E.g. Dodwell, Grabe, Tillemont, Massuet, Stieren, Ziegler, Kling (in Herzog's *Encyclopædie*), Reville, l.c. p. 1003 s. etc. Those who express no decided opinion are, of course, not reckoned, e.g. *Ante-Nic. Lib. Iren.*, i. p. xviii., McClintock and Strong's *Cyclopædia*, s.v. Irenæus.

exception; but even with him the epithet "Gallic" may be intended rather for the bishop than for the man.¹

Mr. Harvey's theory has, therefore, against it the weight of authority. We must conclude that—from the dates and events of the life of Irenaeus, from his education as shown in his writings, from his otherwise unnatural silence respecting Syriac and kindred subjects, and from the consensus of those (Mr. Harvey, of course, excepted) who are best qualified to judge—there exists a strong antecedent probability that Irenaeus was a Greek, and not a Syrian.

With this probability to aid us, let us proceed to examine the arguments of Mr. Harvey.

I. "The name *Ειρηναῖος*, of no common occurrence in Greek nomenclature, may have been the substitute for some Syrian equivalent, as Saul became Paul, and as the Orientaly descended philosopher Malcho became known by the adopted name of Porphyry; the more obvious equivalent, Basileides, having been already appropriated by a predecessor from the East."²

It is true, Irenaeus is not a common name; but it is not very rare. Besides appearing at least six times in Attic monumental inscriptions, it was borne by an epigrammatic poet of the anthology, by an Alexandrian grammarian (Pacatus), and, later, by a bishop of Tyre.³ The analogy of Saul and Paul is of no weight here; for it is a change from Hebrew to Latin for a person who spent most of his subsequent life among Greeks, and we do not know either the motive or the nature of the change. Paul is not a translation of Saul. Perhaps the best conjecture is that it was Saul's Roman name as a citizen of Tarsus, and therefore naturally used by his Gentile friends.⁴ On the other hand, Irenaeus is (by the supposition) a translation from Syriac to Greek. There is no assignable motive for the change;

¹ Stieren, *Hallische Encyklop.* p. 358. Feuarent, *de vita Irenaei.*

² This argument would seem to be borrowed from Dodwell (*Diss. in Iren.* (Oxon. 1689), *Diss.* v. § 1), who attaches no weight to it.

³ *Stephani Thesaur.* s. v. *Ειρηναῖος*; cf. also Pape, *Wörterbuch der Griech. Eigennamen*, p. 336. An Irenaeus, bishop of Ululi, attended the Council of Carthage, A. D. 256.

⁴ *Smith's Bible Dict.*, s. v. Saul, No. 3.

since, if it had been made in order to be understood, we should expect that later, in Gaul, he would alter his name (like his namesake, the grammarian) to Pacatus. The change from Malcho to Porphyry is appropriate, so far that it is a translation, though a loose one; but it is obvious that many motives might lead a Neo-platonist philosopher to translate his name, particularly when that name meant "king," and could be rendered (as we should say) "born in the purple." But no such motives would apply in the case of this modest Christian Father; no advantage would accrue from translating a name meaning peaceable. Of course, the most natural supposition is that Irenæus was the only name this Father ever bore; since there is no trace whatever of any other, and since it is probable, on other grounds, that he was a Greek.

II. "Irenæus apologizes for his roughness of style, as betraying the conscious imperfection of a writer who is not handling his own vernacular language, and hardly feels at home with the idioms that force of circumstances has compelled him to use. If Greek had been his native tongue, there would have been little danger that his style should be debased through barbarian contact."

The apology referred to runs thus:

"But thou wilt not require of us, who dwell among Celts, and converse for the most part in a foreign language, skill in discourse which we have not learned, nor power of composition which we have not practised, nor eloquence of phrase, nor persuasiveness, of which we know nothing. Rather in simplicity and truth and plainness the things which are written to thee lovingly, thou wilt lovingly accept, and what is more, wilt cherish them within thyself, as being more competent than we are, receiving them from us as a kind of seeds and principles. That which we have briefly expressed, thou wilt cause to bear much fruit in the wide field of thine understanding, and wilt forcibly represent to them that are with thee what we have but faintly detailed."¹

The general tenor and tone of this preface, laudatory of the reader, deprecatory of the writer, is perfectly natural and usual in an ancient work, without any suspicion of the

¹ Oxford Trans. pp. 2 sq.

use by the author of a language not his own.¹ There is here no apology for "roughness of style," but only for plainness and simplicity; and the reason given for it is not the general "barbarian contact," but the specific "converse for the most part in a foreign language." It is difficult to see why Mr. Harvey should assume that, if Irenaeus were a native Greek, his style would not thus suffer in point of rhetorical elegance. It is an experience familiar to any one who has resided for some years in a foreign land, and used its language almost exclusively, that his command over the literary resources of his vernacular becomes very much weakened, even while his power of conducting an ordinary conversation with a fellow-countryman remains comparatively unimpaired. Most foreign missionaries can bear testimony to the truth of this; and Irenaeus was a Greek missionary sent to the Gauls of the Rhone valley. It appears, then, that this apology, in all its details, is perfectly natural from a Greek who was compelled to be constantly using the Celtic or the Latin language. The very expression *βάρβαρον διάλεκτον* for a foreign language marks the writer as a Greek.² Further, this apology would be unnatural, almost disingenuous, in one who was really writing in a foreign language, since it fails to mention that fact here, where, if anywhere, it would be expected.

Another fact should be noticed in this connection. It would certainly be a strange thing for Irenaeus, if a Syrian, to discuss the style of an author who used the Greek language. Yet we know, from his own words, that he wrote a treatise on the "transpositions" so common in the Pauline Epistles.³

But the style of Irenaeus does not need the apology, for it is neither "rough" nor "debased." We have seen that the terms of the apology could not be used to prove that Irenaeus wrote in a foreign language. Now we may advance a step, and assert that the apology proves nothing but the

¹ If an instance be needed, cf. Cyprian, *Epist. ad Donatum*.

² Cf. Ziegler, *Irenaeus*, p. 14.

³ *ii.* p. 25.

modesty of Irenæus and his devotion to the missionary work. For the style of his book nowhere betrays the defects he mentions. On the contrary, the style of the *Adversus Haereses*, which even Mr. Harvey does not impeach, is a strong argument for the Greek nationality of its author.¹ It will be enough, in this connection, to illustrate the fact, that from Jerome to Ziegler there has been a great unanimity of opinion on this subject.

Jerome bears witness "that the books of Irenæus against heresies are written in a most learned and eloquent style." And Massuet adds: "The Greek text, so far as preserved, is elegant, polished, and dignified, and couched in terms appropriate, expressive, and befitting both the subjects treated and the thought and purpose of Irenæus."²

Even more to our present point, Ziegler: "His management of the Greek, in spite of all his modest words, displays, even in his first book,—alone preserved to us entire in the original,—a command over the language and a facility in its use which would be very surprising in one who was not a Greek."³ And even Erasmus, who supposed the miserable Latin translation to be the original, testifies that "the flow of his discourse on subjects so difficult and obscure is yet elegant, clear, methodical, and connected."⁴ It is true some

¹ Cf. Ziegler, *Irenæus*, p. 14.

² Massuet, *Diss.* ii. § 51. "Hieronymus optimus styli aestimator, testatur in sua ad Theodoram viduam epistola, Irenæi libros *Adversus Haereses doctissimo et eloquentissimo sermone compositos esse* Graecus textus, qui superest, elegans est, nitidus et gravis, verbisque constat propriis significantibus, ac tum ad res ipsas, tum ad Irenæi mentem et scopum accommodatissimis."—Cf. §§ 4, 44. Also Tert. in Val. c. 5; Hier. in Ezech. c. 36; Tillemont, *Hist. Eccles.* Vol. iii. p. 80.

³ Ziegler, *Irenæus*, p. 14. "Seine Handhabung des Griechischen lässt, trotz aller bescheidenen Worte, auch schon in dem ersten, uns allein vollständig Griechisch erhaltenen, Buche seines Werkes, eine Herrschaft über die Sprache und eine Leichtigkeit in ihrem Gebrauche erkennen, die bei einem Nichtgriechen sehr in Verwunderung setzen müsste."

⁴ *Erasmii Epist. nuncupatoria*: "Sermonis cursus in rebus tam spinosis ac perplexis, immo fastidii plenis, dilucidus, digestus, ac sibi cohaerens."—Cf. Dr. Lightfoot, *Contemp. Rev.*, Aug. 1876, p. 418. "His (Irenæus's) work is systematic and occasionally shows great acuteness."

minor criticisms have been made, not wholly without justice, on the style of Irenæus; but none of these are such as to affect his nationality.¹

We conclude, then, the style of Irenæus gives no ground for the supposition that he was a Syrian, but, on the contrary, strongly supports his Greek origin. Any lingering doubt on this subject may be dispelled by a comparison of the style of Epiphanius the Syrian with the Greek of Irenæus.

III. "A respectable knowledge of the Hebrew tongue. It is hoped, also, that the Hebrew attainments (see General Index, Irenæus — knowledge of Hebrew) of Irenæus will no longer be denied."²

This is all that Mr. Harvey says, in general; so we pass to the particular instances adduced. A few words, however, are necessary to show where the argument hinges. Mr. Harvey ascribes every mistake to the ignorance of the transcribers; so that we shall have to distinguish between probable and improbable errors of transcription. I accept most of Mr. Harvey's explanations of the truth at bottom, and heartily believe *him* to be a learned and acute Oriental scholar; but I cannot beg the question, and refer all mistakes to transcribers or (*really* Syrian) heretics, "because the errors are unworthy of the venerable Father."³ The fact that Origen alone of the Ante-Nicene Fathers knew Hebrew,

¹ E.g. Brit. and For. Evang. Rev., Jan. 1869, pp. 3 sq.; Ante-Nic. Lib., Iren. Vol. i. p. xvii.; Reville, in Rev. d. Deux Mondes, Feb. 1865, p. 1007. So far as these criticisms do not apply to the Latin translation only, they seem to be founded on an unhistorical undervaluation of the importance, in the second century, of fully exposing the absurdities of the gnostics and of reiterating the arguments against them. As an extreme instance of this, cf. Theol. of Early Chr. Church, by Dr. J. Bennett (Lond. 1855), p. 21. "We cannot wonder that the well-intentioned Father (Irenæus) was blamed by his contemporaries (?) for so deeply exploring and publishing to the world the ravings of madmen, of which a full length report forms his first book. The second is a repetition of what did not deserve to be told once, and an attempt to reason with men who set reason at defiance." What would those German critics who affirm that *Irenæus* did not sufficiently realize the importance of gnosticism, say to this?

² i. Preface, p. v.

³ Cf. notes; i. pp. 334, 386.

and even he imperfectly,¹ joined to the probability, previously set forth, that Irenaeus was a Greek, makes a more critical estimate necessary.

The first instances adduced by Mr. Harvey to prove the reality and extent of the Hebrew attainments of Irenaeus are the two Marcosian formulae.²

We cite the Greek as more secure from error than the Latin. Here is the first: "Ἄλλοι δὲ Ἑβραϊκά τὰ ὀνόματα ἐπιλέγουσι, πρὸς τὸ μᾶλλον καταπλήξασθαι τοὺς τελειομένους, οὕτως· βασιμὰ χαμοσσή βασιανορὰ μισταδία ροναδὰ, κουστὰ βαβοφόρ καλαχθεῖ. Τούτων δ' ἡ ἑρμηνεία ἐστὶ τοιαύτη· Ὑπὲρ πᾶσαν δύναμιν τοῦ πατρὸς ἐπικαλοῦμαι φῶς ὀνομαζόμενον, καὶ πνεῦμα ἀγαθὸν, καὶ ζωὴ· ὅτι ἐν σώματι ἐβασίλευσας. Mr. Harvey restores the text of the formula thus: βασιμὰ Ἀχαμῶθ Ἄβα οὐὰ νοῦρα μιστάμια Ροῦα δακούδσα βαφοῦρκαν μελάχθει. These words [he adds] are Syriac, and mean: In nomine sophiae Patris, et Lucis, quae vocata est spiritus Sanctitatis, in Redemptionem angelicam. Now, I accept Mr. Harvey's explanation, and am willing to concede that ignorant transcribers might have made the formula of the text out of Mr. Harvey's; though I think it probable Irenaeus did not write it faultlessly. For—and this is noteworthy—Irenaeus says it was Hebrew, Mr. Harvey shows it to be Syriac,³ Irenaeus says it means one thing, Mr. Harvey something differing from that *toto coelo*. Mr. Harvey knows much Hebrew and Syriac, and is probably right. The inference is irresistible that Irenaeus knows little Hebrew, less Syriac, and is inextricably wrong. It is inconceivable that Ἑβραϊκά is a transcriber's error for Συριακά, or the translation in the Greek a simple distortion of that which Mr. Harvey gives; especially as the Latin text, which has an entirely independent history, gives the whole in an exactly similar rendering.⁴

¹ Blunt, *Early Fathers*, p. 158 (but Hegesippus perhaps knew Hebrew (cf. Euseb. H. E. iv. 22), and Melito of Sardis was certainly acquainted with both Hebrew and Syriac, cf. Otto, *Corp. Apol.* Vol. ix. pp. 374 sq., 418; Euseb. H. E. iv. 23; Etheridge, *Horae Aramaicae*, p. 46, note 2; Dr. Lightfoot, *Contemp. Rev.*, Feb. 1876, p. 479).

² i. pp. 183, 184; cf. Hitzig, *Gebet der Marcosier erklärt.*, *Zeitschr. für wissenschaft. theol.* 1858, p. 313 sq.

³ If Irenaeus did not distinguish Hebrew and Aramaic (cf. note 4, p. 306), we can lay no stress on the difference of "Hebrew" and "Syriac" here.

⁴ Except that ἀγαθόν is untranslated in the Latin, as in the second formula *Christi* is unrepresented in the Greek.

If these simple words are not copied with approximate correctness, then no part of our text is to be trusted. The second formula, being exactly like the first in the knowledge (or ignorance) of Hebrew displayed, may be omitted. We come next to some Hebrew etymologies.¹ "Jesus autem nomen secundum propriam Hebraeorum linguam, literarum est duarum et dimidia, sicut periti eorum dicunt, significans Dominum qui continet coelum et terram, quia Jesus secundum antiquam Hebraicam linguam coelum est, terra autem iterum sura usser dicitur. Verbum ergo quod coelum et terra habet, ipse est Jesus." The truth at the bottom of this seems to be that ישו, the abbreviation of the Hebrew for Jesus (יהושע), may possibly be counted as two and a half letters; though this is a matter of conjecture, no instances of such counting being adduced from rabbinical writings by any editor. ישו contains the initials of יהוה, שמים, ארץ (though of course in the last word the initial is *and* (ו), the first letter of *earth* being א), Jchovah, heaven, and earth; and "sura usser" is gibberish pure and simple, in spite of Mr. Harvey's efforts to interpret it essentially thus: sura = s'ma = שמים. usser = user = uers = ארץ (!)

It is easy to see that making Jesus *signify* "Dominum eum qui continet coelum et terram" on the true basis referred to, is a mistake of ignorance, not of transcription; and the exposition is in other ways too distorted to be, in its errors, solely the work of copyists. Not to be tedious by noting all the details, let us merely remark, that Irenaeus makes the whole statement not on his own authority (as one with a knowledge of Hebrew would, cf. Epiphanius), but introduces it with "sicut eorum periti dicunt," which is conclusive as to this Father's well-founded modesty on the subject of Hebrew.

The next instance in order is in the text a hopeless tangle on the subject of the Hebrew alphabet.² Mr. Harvey has certainly done more than any previous authority to show that it is possible some truth may have originally given rise to a statement now so obscure; but to father the simple assertion of that truth on Irenaeus, in the face of the present text, is impossible. It would take so long and be so fruitless to go into this thoroughly, that we can only recommend those who suspect we are shirking a strong argument to read Mr. Harvey's notes, and judge for themselves how much of the Hebrew belongs to Irenaeus, how much to his learned editor. And

¹ i. p. 334.

² i. p. 335 sq.

here it is appropriate to add that Mr. Harvey's notes¹ show either an entire ignorance or a profound knowledge of Hebrew in Irenaeus—a knowledge superior to that displayed by Epiphanius, the Syrian. The words Baruch,² Eloae and Elocuth, Adonai, Sabaoth, Jaōth and Jaōth³ are all discussed; but I will not weary the reader with a succession of mistakes like those we have reviewed.

It is worth while to compare with these evidences of the Hebrew attainments of Irenaeus the manner and matter of the references to that language in the Panarion of Epiphanius. Here we have a real Syrian, who possessed a respectable knowledge of Hebrew, and whose text cannot have suffered more from the copyists than the Greek text of Irenaeus; for it is the source from which most of the latter is obtained.

The difference between Epiphanius and Irenaeus in point of Hebrew is salient; but we have space only for a few references:⁴ Scytharum, Phares, names of sun and planets, Osseni, Iel Xai, and especially Ps. cix. 3.⁵ Of course, Epiphanius makes mistakes, as e.g. Sadducees, Jer. xvii. 9, adonai canani⁶; but they are very different from the errors of Irenaeus, except where Epiphanius copies Irenaeus without examination.⁷

By Epiphanius the Hebrew is clearly distinguished from the LXX version,⁸ and this brings us to Mr. Harvey's last argument in favor of the Hebrew attainments of Irenaeus. He cites two texts, which are quoted in the fourth book of *Adversus Haereses* in conformity with the Hebrew and different from the LXX.

The first is Ps. cii. 26, "mutabis eos, et mutabuntur,"⁹ where the LXX (Ps. ci. 26) has *ἐλλάξουσ*, not *ἐλλάξουσ*. But among the var.

¹ Cf. i. pp. 335, n. 4; 385, n. 1; 386, n. 2; ii. p. 70, n. 8.

² i. p. 336.

³ i. pp. 384–387; cf. also Satan, ii. p. 383, another etymological error.

⁴ Oehler's edition of the Panarion; cf. also the notes of Petavius, on the passages referred to.

⁵ i. pp. 37, 85, 87, 95, 97; ii. p. 387.

⁶ i. p. 81 (cf. Bib. Dict. s. v. Sadducee), i. p. 275; ii. pp. 125, 545.

⁷ E.g. i. p. 475.

⁸ E.g. Ps. cix. 3, Vol. ii. p. 387; Isa. xxviii. 12, Vol. ii. p. 545.

⁹ ii. p. 151, n. 2.

lect. of the LXX¹ we have these authorities given for ἀλλάξεις, 142. (mutabis), Vet. Lat., Vulg., and others. The reading ἀλλάξεις therefore may have been in the LXX of Irenæus,² or altered by some Latin scribe to conform to the Vetus Latinum or to the Vulgate. The second text is Mal. iv. 1, "et erunt stipula omnes peccatores, qui faciunt injusta."³ The LXX has ἀλλογενεῖς (אֲרִי) in place of peccatores (אֲרִי); while Aquila and the Vulgate are close to the Hebrew with ἐπερηφανοῦς, superbi. But peccatores is not near enough to the Hebrew for any argument to be founded upon it, especially as it stands alone. I have found no nearer parallel than the Vulgate, but the LXX of Irenæus may have escaped the mistake of the version we have. The Hebrew word used in this passage (אֲרִי) is translated in the LXX ἀνομος (Isa. xiii. 11) and παράνομος (Ps. cxviii. 85), either of which might be rendered by peccator, while the direct translation from the Hebrew to the Latin presents too wide a gap to be probable.

Not only does Irenæus not distinguish the Hebrew readings from the LXX version,⁴ but he praises and uses the LXX to the exclusion of the Hebrew.

To prove that *virgo*, not *adolescentula*, is the correct term, Isa. vii. 14, he affirms the miraculous origin and inspired correctness of the LXX which has παρθένος, against the νεάνις of Theodotion and Aquila.⁵ It might be expected that a Hebrew scholar would go back to פָּרְתָהּ for his proof; or, at least, that one able to read the original would not insist on the miraculous correctness of the LXX, without ever mentioning the frequent disagreement of the two.

And the actions of Irenæus are consistent with his words. Without having made any exhaustive examination of his Old Testament quotations, about sixty places may be noted where he has left the Hebrew to follow the LXX.⁶ Even if it

¹ Edd. Holmes et Parsons, Oxon. 1873.

² As Mr. Harvey admits, cf. Heb. i. 12, ἀλλάξεις κD 43. d e f vg. am demid tol etc. (Tdf.).

³ ii. p. 153, n. 2.

⁴ Gelladius and Feuardent (on lib. ii. c. xxx. § 5), maintain that Irenæus did not distinguish the Aramaic dialect of Palestine from Old Testament Hebrew.

⁵ ii. pp. 110-115.

⁶ Vol. i. p. 94, Ex. xvi. 18; p. 163, Isa. xlviii. 22; p. 169, Gen. i. 2; p. 188, Ps. xxxiii. (xxxii.) 6; Vol. ii. pp. 23, 375, Ps. l. (xlix.) 3; p. 23, Isa. xlv. 10; xliii. 10; 1(3) Kings xviii. 21; p. 25, Deut. iv. 19; p. 32, Isa. xi. 3; p. 36, Sam. iv. 20; p. 37, Ps. xc. (xciv.) 6; p. 45, Isa. xlii. 4.

should be deemed barely possible to collect as many quotations in which Irenaeus has followed the Hebrew where our present LXX differs from it, it may be said that the LXX was probably less faulty in the second century,¹ that such verses may have been corrected by the influence of Latin versions, and that we need a particular cause to account for a mistake, but what is correct goes with the whole tide of probability.

Mr. Harvey is the first and only writer, so far as I can discover, who has claimed for Irenaeus a knowledge of Hebrew, and his proofs are precisely those given by Blunt and Daillé² to prove the contrary. Stieren,³ Reville,⁴ and the Ante-Nicene Library translator⁵ all echo the words of Massuet: "Some sciolist seems to have palmed off this stuff on our Irenaeus, who was but little versed in Hebrew."⁶ From the weakness of Mr. Harvey's arguments,

84, Isa. ix. 6; p. 85, Isa. viii. 3; p. 86, Ex. xvii. 16; p. 88, Hab. iii. 2; p. 92, Ps. li. (l.) 12 (13); p. 93, Ps. lxviii. 9 (lxvii. 10); pp. 96, 266, Jer. xvii. 9; p. 102, Deut. xxxii. 4; p. 108, Isa. lxiii. 9; pp. 109, 266, Hab. iii. 3, 5; p. 118, Isa. xxviii. 16; p. 120, Gen. ii. 5; p. 122, Ps. lxix. 26 (lxviii. 27); pp. 120, 202, Gen. iv. 7; p. 147, Isa. xlii. 5; p. 150, Jer. iv. 22; p. 151, Isa. li. 6; p. 154, Ps. xlix. 20 (xlvi. 21); p. 155, Dan. xiv. 3; p. 169, Isa. xlii. 10, 12; p. 172, Ex. xx. 12; p. 173, Gen. xlix. 10, 12; pp. 174, 253, Deut. xxxii. 6; pp. 174, 375, Deut. xxviii. 66; p. 187, Ezek. xx. 24; p. 189, Deut. x. 16; p. 194, Ps. l. (xlix.) 9; p. 195, Jer. vii. 3, 4; p. 196, Jer. vii. 21, Isa. lviii. 6; p. 220, Num. xii. 8, 1 (3) Kings xix. 12; p. 226, Dan. xiii. 42; p. 234, Jer. ix. 2; p. 235, Dan. xii. 3; p. 238, Isa. ix. 17; p. 240, 1(3) Kings iv. 32; p. 265, Ps. xlv. 4 (xliv. 3, 4); p. 267, Jer. xv. 9; p. 268, Ps. xcix. (xcviii.) 1; p. 278, Jer. vii. 29; vi. 18; pp. 279, 405, Gen. vi. 2; p. 304, Gen. iii. 15; p. 305, Ps. lviii. (lvii.) 4; p. 337, Ps. xxii. 30 (xxi. 31); p. 350, Isa. lvii. 16, xxv. 8; p. 360, Gen. ix. 5; p. 379, Gen. ii. 16.

¹ Cf. Semisch, *Justin der Märtyrer*, i. p. 219. The case of Justin Martyr (*ibid.* pp. 211–223), affords an instructive parallel to that of Irenaeus, for while the arguments in favor of his having known Hebrew are many times stronger than for the same in Irenaeus, yet Semisch concludes justly that a review of all the evidence is decidedly against Justin's having known Hebrew, and this mainly from his exclusive use of the LXX, in which Irenaeus follows him step by step.

² Blunt, *Early Fathers*, p. 167. Daillé, on the right use of the Fathers, p. 215.

³ Ed. of Irenaeus, Vol. i. p. 419, n. 2.

⁴ *Rev. d. Deux Mondes*, Feb. 1865, p. 1007.

⁵ *Trans. of Irenaeus*, Vol. i. p. 255, n. 3.

⁶ *Sciulus quispiam, Irenaeo nostro in Hebraicis haud satis perito, hic facum scilicet videtur.* Massuet (Paris, 1710), p. 170, n. 1.

from the instructive parallels with Epiphanius and Justin Martyr, from the undue value attached by Irenæus to the LXX, from the opinions of authorities, we conclude that the mediocrity of the Hebrew attainments of Irenæus favors the belief that he was a Greek.

IV. "A very perceptible familiarity with the Scriptures of the New Testament in Syriac." "The probability that he was born in Syria, and having been instructed as a child in some Syriac version of Scripture, was removed during the years of boyhood to Smyrna." "A point of some interest will be found of frequent recurrence in the notes; which is, the repeated instances that scriptural quotations afford of having been made by one who was as familiar with some Syriac version of the New Testament as with the Greek originals. Strange *variae lectiones* occur, which can only be explained by referring to the Syriac version (see General Index, Syriac Analogies). It will not be forgotten that S. Irenæus resided in early life at Smyrna; and it is by no means improbable that he may have been of Syrian extraction, and instructed from his youth in some Syriac version of Scripture.¹

The argument thus rests upon one hundred and five² instances of Syriac analogy scattered through the libri quinque *Adversus Haereses*. The other arguments advanced having been disposed of, the question of the nationality of Irenæus turns on the strength of this proof, we have a right to demand—as Mr. Harvey admits—that these *variae lectiones* "can *only* be explained by referring to the Syriac version," and also that these *variae lectiones* shall bear evidence by number, force, and probability of origin to Irenæus as their author.

The points which I shall endeavor to make against the theory of Mr. Harvey are two.

1. The Syriac parallels do not necessarily³ argue more

¹ i. Preface, p. v.

² There are many more allusions to Syriac in the notes, but Mr. Harvey does not adduce them in support of his theory, and wisely; for e.g. among those thus omitted are twelve instances where Irenæus and the Peshito confessedly differ (ii. pp. 41, n. 2; 53, n. 3; 55, n. 2; 56, nn. 4, 5, 8; 63, n. 2; 65, n. 3; 69, n. 1; 91, n. 5; 362, n. 3; 363, n. 2).

³ *Necessarily*, because if it can be proved that the so-called Syriac analogies

than a small amount of Syriac influence, and this is easily explained.

2. From the New Testament citations of Irenaeus a much stronger argument may be deduced for the use by him of Codex Bezae, than that advanced by Mr. Harvey for his familiarity with the readings of the Peschito. We proceed to the examination of

1. The Syriac parallels do not necessarily argue more than a small amount of Syriac influence, and this is easily explained. On the supposition that Irenaeus was a Greek to what codex is it most natural to refer his biblical citations? There can be but one answer — to that older manuscript from which, according to Scrivener, our present Codex Bezae was copied, and of which he says “it may well have been brought into Gaul by Irenaeus and his Asiatic companions.”¹

But we have a more complex problem here. Irenaeus was probably translated into Latin about A.D. 200; since the translation seems to have been used by Tertullian about A.D. 208.² From that time to the tenth century (the date of the earliest existing Latin ms. of Irenaeus, the Clermont) the Latin text is entirely lost to view, and it is natural to suppose that it underwent many changes from various Latin transcribers. These scribes would naturally alter the biblical citations of the text to the form of the version current with them,³ both as a needed emendation in their view, and to save the trouble of translation. This practice probably began with the first translator who seems to have had so small a knowledge of Greek; and even Latin, that he would be very glad to let a Latin version of the Scriptures save him the labor of translating some of the nine hundred texts cited by Irenaeus. So extensive has been this substitution

may be referred to another source, consistent with the Greek nationality of Irenaeus, the antecedent probability turns the *may* into *must*.

¹ Scrivener, *Codex Bezae*, Introd. p. xlv.

² Cf. Massuet, *Diss.* ii. § 53; Harvey's *Irenaeus*, i. p. clxiv.

³ For testimony on this point, cf. “*Itala-Fragmenta der Paulinischen Briefe*, by L. Ziegler (Marburg, 1876), Proleg. §§ 5, 21, 22.

that Mill¹ takes it for granted that the ground text of the Latin translation in the Scripture citations made by Irenæus is the old Latin, [disfigured, however, by interpolations from later versions]. Sabatier also has a note on this subject.² It will not be thought strange that the Latin scribe differed so much from the Greek in translating mere proof texts, when we remember that the translator of Codex Bezae, avowedly rendering that particular New Testament Codex into Latin (a very different position from that of the interpreter of Irenæus), swerves from the Greek in nineteen hundred and nineteen instances,³ though in this case the ms. is of the sixth century, and that of Irenæus four centuries later. In view of these facts it will not be thought unfair that we aim to account for the readings ascribed by Mr. Harvey to the Peschito, by reference to the Codex Bezae and the old Latin versions, especially those classed by Tischendorf as *Italiae Codices*.⁴

The Syriac analogies adduced by Mr. Harvey divide themselves at the first glance into two classes: genuine parallels with the Syriac Scriptures, and conjectural *variae lectiones* from it. To this latter class we first turn our attention.

1. The authority of a conjecture is very small at the best. A slight improbability is sufficient to put it on one side.

¹ Proleg. in Nov. Test. § 608; pro saeculo isto haud facile credibilis apparet Italici textus interpolatio.

² On the reading of Irenæus, 1 Tim. i. 4, Sabatier, *Biblia Sacra Latina*, Vol. iiii. p. 866 (Paris ed.), "Ex quo vel uno constat quod et ex aliis locis confirmari potest, hunc interpretem Latinae linguae rudem, in interpretandis variis scripturae testimoniis versionem Latinam vulgatam seu Italicam usurpasse." — Cf. also Westcott, *On the Canon* (ed. iv. 1875), p. 253 and note, though he scarcely appears to appreciate the complexity of the problem.

³ Scrivener, *Codex Bezae*, p. xxxix.

⁴ The New Testament text (N.T.) taken as a standard is that of Tischendorf's eighth ed. crit. maj. "Tdf." refers to the notes of the same. The abbreviations used in that edition are employed here, followed by the authority (Sab. Gb. Ln. etc.), from whom the references are taken. When no authority is given, the references have been taken directly from editions of the different mss. Of course the word *Itala* is used here only as a convenient term, not a correct one. L. Ziegler, *Itala-Fragmenta der Paulinischen Briefe* (Marburg, 1876), together with Rönisch's well-known investigations, has shown that the word *Itala* has properly only a very limited application.

Much more the improbability now accumulated against a Syrian Irenæus.

2. These conjectures are none of the best. With a few exceptions they consist of conjectural alterations of the Syriac text to something usually not slightly different in sound and sense.¹

3. Even if these conjectures were of salient likelihood and authority, they would not apply here, for this is a case of pure memory. On the supposition, Irenæus, with no Syriac ms. before him, remembered certain peculiarities of reading, and wrote them from memory into Greek. Now all these conjectures rest either on a change of the text to something which is supposed to sound like it, or from one to the other of two different meanings of a Syriac word. But the memory works by neither of these channels. We remember quotations first, by their sense; second, possibly, by the exact words as connected with the sense, and in accordance with this, errors of memory in the transmission of MSS. are changes of order, of synonym, of pronouns and of logical connectives.² But Mr. Harvey claims for Irenæus a memory occupied with similar or exactly reproduced sounds apart from their sense. No argument can be drawn from these conjectures in this case; for they are, if anything, possible errors of transcribers or translators.³

It may be well to attempt a brief explanation of the various readings in Irenæus which have given rise to these conjectures.

We begin with eight instances in which the conjecture hinges on the different meanings of some one Syriac word.

Suam legem e contrario statuerunt (ii. p. 177, n. 5) "*νόμος*, scarcely has the extended meaning of the same word in Syriac, which might express *αἰρεσις*."⁴ There is no reference to Scripture here, but Mr. Harvey's meaning seems to be that Irenæus meant something which

¹ E.g. i. p. 1, n. 4; ii. pp. 63, n. 1; 70, n. 8; 386, n. 1.

² Smith's Bible Dict. (Am. ed.), Vol. iii. p. 2127.

³ Ibid. p. 2126.

⁴ Mr. Harvey's arguments may be examined in full by the references. Here they are abridged as much as possible, and omitted where not needed.

would be expressed by *αἵρεσις*, but the Syriac word led him to write *νόμος*, from similarity, and this the translator rendered *lex*. But there is no possible reference to *αἵρεσις*, for here *suam legem* is set over against *lex data per moysen*.

Matt. i. 23: *ecce virgo in utero accipiet* (ii. p. 31, n. 2); N. T. ἡ παρθένος ἐν γαστρὶ ἕξει. "Here the Syriac word expresses either ἐν γαστρὶ ἕξει or λήψεται of the LXX." Irenaeus quotes this text four times,¹ thrice with the LXX as above, once with N. T., i. e. *concupiet*, so no certain conclusion can be drawn as to his original reading, though if it was λήψεται, the LXX explains it.

Luke ii. 22: *imposuerunt* (ii. p. 38, n. 2); N. T. ἀνήγαγον, but: e *imposuerunt*.

Acts xv. 14: *quemadmodum deus excogitavit* (ii. p. 69, n. 3); N. T. καθὼς πρῶτον ὁ θεὸς ἐπεσκέψατο. Here Irenaeus omits πρῶτον, with Sah (Scholz), but the Syriac does exactly the opposite; for, by emphasizing πρῶτον at the expense of ἐπεσκέψατο, it reads *coepit*.² Mr. Harvey asserts that the Syriac embodies both πρῶτον and ἐπεσκέψατο in one word which means *to begin* and *to purpose*. But this is impossible, for, in any one place, the word can have only one of the two meanings. To make a combination of the two is as mistaken as to translate ܣܘܗܢܕܥܟܠ³ *Suehndeckel*,³ when it may mean either *Suehne* or *Deckel*. If, however, this Syriac word does mean *to purpose*, it is certainly nearer to the reading of Irenaeus than the N. T. is.

Per occasionem immortalitatis (ii. p. 125, n. 2), "cf. Rom. vii. 11, 13. There the Syriac word would correspond either with ἀφορμὴν, as used by the apostle, or προφάσει as expressed by the context in this place and also in the opening of c. xxxv." If we are to connect the words of Irenaeus here with ἀφορμὴν, Rom. vii. 11, it may be said that *occasio* is a common translation of that word;⁴ if, however, (as Grabe suggests) *occasio* renders προφάσει, it is only what we find twice before in Irenaeus.⁵ In either case the Syriac is superfluous.

Rom. x. 7: *liberare*; N. T. ἀναγαγεῖν (ii. p. 96, n. 1). Slav. 5. 8. have εξαγαγεῖν (Gb.), which might explain *liberare*, but their

¹ ii. pp. 31, 83, 216, 230.

² Schaaf. Nov. Test. Syr. ad loc.; Michaelis, Curae Syriacae, p. 74. Tdf. ad loc.

³ As in Exodus, in Lange's Bibelwerk, *passim*.

⁴ E.g. Irenaeus, i. pp. 5, 214, also f vg.

⁵ i. pp. 2, 14.

authority is insufficient; g translates *reducere* v.g. *revocare*. *Liberrare* may be regarded as a free translation.

1 Cor. xi. 10 : Δεί τὴν γυναῖκα κάλυμμα ἔχειν. *Opportere mulierem velamen habere* (i. p. 69, n. 3) ; N. T., ὀφείλει ἡ γυνὴ ἑξουσίαν ἔχειν. "Here the Syriac word is the exact equivalent for *ἑξουσία*, but it also means anything worn on the head, i.e. the turban or other ornament, serving to distinguish the satrap's rank. As referring to female costume, this could only be the veil." But the context gives a sufficient cause for the interpretation of *ἑξουσία* as referring to a veil. If Mr. Harvey's note be correct, it is strange that no commentator in the abundant literature of this verse has hit on an explanation that lay so near at hand. But Mr. Harvey's explanation does not apply here. We can understand that this Syriac word (from the same root as *sultan*) may mean the turban as a sign of the satrap's rank, but from this to "anything worn on the head" is a long step. Even if we concede that it may be applied to anything worn on the head as a sign of rank, this is very different from the veil worn as a sign of subjection — of power, indeed, but of power exercised *over*, not *by*, the wearer.¹ Thus, Chardin says of the veil worn by Persian ladies ; "only married women wear it, and it is the mark by which it is known that they are under subjection."² Meyer cites from Diodorus Siculus ἔχουσαν τρεῖς βασιλείας ἐπὶ τῆς κεφαλῆς ; and this use of *βασιλείας* is analogous to Mr. Harvey's alleged meaning for the Syriac word. But it is hard to believe that Irenaeus took his idea (if it was his) of translating *ἑξουσία*, a *veil*, the sign of subjection, from a Syriac word which signifies a *turban*, the sign of power. As authorities for the gloss *κάλυμμα* may be cited Schol. Hier., Beda (Sab.), harl. Aug. Or. cf. Lc. Brug. pro *potestatem* non scribas *velamen* (Tdf.)

1 Cor. xv. 50 : *non apprehendunt* (i. p. 289, n. 6) ; N. T. κληρονομήσαι οὐ δύναται. We find this text cited in different ways nearly twenty times. The rendering which occurs most frequently in the translation will, perhaps, best represent Irenaeus himself. *Possidere non possunt* appears twelve times, *haereditare non possunt* twice,³ *apprehendunt* only once. Both the former readings represent

¹ Cf. Meyer's Commentary, ad loc.

² Lange's Bibelwerk, ad loc. So Theophylact. τὸ τοῦ ἑξουσιάζεσθαι σύμβολον τοῦτ' ἔστι τὸ κάλυμμα (Massuet, ad loc., Stieren's Irenaeus, ii. p. 602).

³ ii. pp. 343 bis, 345 bis, 346 bis, 348 bis, 356, 359, 360, 382 ; *haereditare*, pp. 341, 344 ; *possident*, p. 345 ; *possidebunt*, p. 348.

κληρονομῆσαι οὐ δύνανται, as is easily seen by a comparison of other Latin versions.

We now come to two texts cited from heretics, for the readings of which Irenæus is not answerable.

Matt. xi. 25; Luke x. 21: οὐά, *ita*; N. T. και (i. p. 180, n. 1) οὐά is a Syrian exclamation of joy, but is not found here, nor, it would seem, elsewhere in the Syriac New Testament. It is, however, also a Greek word, and occurs in Mark xv. 29, so that the probability is in favor of its Greek origin here.

Luke xii. 50: και πάντ ἐπείγομαι εἰς αὐτό, *et valde propero ad illud* (i. p. 182, n. 2); N. T. και πῶς συνέχομαι ἕως ὅτου τελειθῆ. Epiphanius cites a somewhat similar verse ποτήριον ἔχω πίειν και τί σκευδα ἕως οὐ πῶ αὐτό· κ. τ. λ. (Tdf.) and Philastr. Brix. de haeres; *baptisma habeo baptisari et quam festino si scietis* (Sab.). These show that this quotation in Irenæus is not without a parallel. Grotius remarks: Veteres scriptores saepe utuntur testimoniis ex Scriptura, sed, ita ut appareat, codicem ab illis non inspectum, cum tamen sententiam satis recte ex memoria reddant. Tale est quod hunc locum ita citat Irenæus.¹ So Mr. Harvey's explanation, which supposes Irenæus confused the Syriac word for συνέχομαι with a similar Hebrew word meaning ἐπείγομαι, seems unnecessary as well as improbable.

Two instances occur in which a varia lectio of the mss. of Irenæus is adduced as a parallel to a varia lectio contrived from the Syriac.

Eph. iv. 6: Clerm. ms. reads *et ipse per omnia* (i. p. 256, n. 4). N. T. και διὰ πάντων. This text is cited four times by Irenæus,² and *ipse* (on which the supposed parallel is based) is supported by only one ms. in this one place.

John iv. 36: *gaudeant*; N. T. χαίρη (ii. p. 230, n. 1). Here "*gaudeant*, sic Feuard. in marg. Arund. Merc. ii. Voss. et Mass., in ceteris, *gaudeat*."³ So the Clerm., the oldest and best ms., has *gaudeat*. The transition from *gaudeat* to *gaudeant* would be easy in copying mss.; for not only does either make good sense, but also a heavy line crossing the *t* might be mistaken for the line over letters in mss. which marks the omission of an *n*.

¹ Critici Sacri, Vol. vi. p. 553.

² i. p. 256, n. 4; ii. pp. 214, 255, 374.

³ Stieren's Irenæus, i. p. 638, n. 3.

The rest of the conjectures are readings of Irenæus, for which Mr. Harvey has constructed a corresponding set in the Syriac.

Matt. xxvi. 38: *quam tristis est anima mea* (i. p. 70, n. 4). Irenæus (Gk.) with N. T. *περίλυπός ἐστιν ἡ ψυχὴ μου*. The text is cited again, ii. p. 122, and there we have the Greek *εἰρήκει ὅτι περίλυπός ἐστιν ἡ ψυχὴ μου*, while the Latin is *dixisset quod*, etc. This makes it probable that *quam* (a mistake in copying, according to Grabe and Stieren, from *qm*, i.e. *quoniam* in the mss.) and *quod* are both translations of the *ὅτι*. The concurrence of the Latin versions in both places makes the Greek of the second citation more probably original than that of the first. Yet cf. plerique mss. *valde tristis*. Tert. *quid anxia* (Sab.).

Luke xvi. 9: *fugati fueritis* (ii. p. 251, n. 1); N. T. *ἐκλίπη*, but Irenæus probably read *ἐκλίπητε* with 5. Tdf. accepts *fugati fueritis* as a translation of *ἐκλίπητε*, and Grotius notes: *Irenæi interpretis citat hunc locum: fugati fueritis et sane solet ἐκλείπειν etiam hunc sensum habere.*¹

Luke xviii. 8: *Putas cum filius hominis eenerit* (ii. p. 265, n. 3); N. T. *πλὴν ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐλθὼν*. *Putas* with a c f ff² vg. (Tdf.).

John i. 10: *in hoc mundo* (ii. p. 41, n. 4); N. T. *ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ*; hoc with Cyp. Amb. Aug. Gaud. Brix. in serm. vg. (Sab.) e fu.

John i. 13: ... *sed ex voluntate dei verbum caro factum est* (ii. p. 83, n. 5); N. T. *ἀλλ' ἐκ θεοῦ ἐγενήθησαν. καὶ ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο*. Cf. b (John i. 12–14) *credentibus in nomine ejus qui non ex ... sed ex deo natus est. Et verbum caro factum est*. The text is cited by Irenæus three times more,² but nowhere with any attempt at exact conformity to Scripture. Amb. Aug. (Tdf.) and Tert. (Grabe) have similar misquotations.

John viii. 44: *quoniam mendax est ab initio et in veritate non stetit* (ii. p. 386, n. 1); N. T. *ἐκεῖνος ἀνθρωποκτόνος ἦν ἀπ' ἀρχῆς καὶ ἐν ἀληθείᾳ οὐκ ἔσθηκεν*. The mistake in memory is evident. Irenæus puts together the *ὅτι ψεύστης ἐστίν* near the end of the verse in the N. T., and the *ἦν ἀπ' ἀρχῆς κ.τ.λ.* as above; cf. Epiphanius *ἐπειδὴ ἀπ' ἀρχῆς ψεύστης ἐστίν* (Tdf.).

Acts vii. 38: *praecepta dei vivi* (ii. p. 187, n. 4); N. T. *λόγια ζῶντα*. The peculiarities of the reading of Irenæus are, the genitive, cf. *d eloquia viventium*, vg. *verba vitae* (Tdf.), and *dei* interpolated, cf. 104. 106.

¹ Critici Sacri, Vol. vi. p. 617.

ii. pp. 103, 117, 118.

λόγια θεοῦ ζῶντα (Tdf.). I have found no parallel¹ for the combination of these two readings, but *deus vivus* is a favorite term with Irenæus.²

Acts xvii. 25: *tractatur* (ii. p. 63, n. 1.); N. T. *θεραπεύεται*. This, it should be noticed, is regarded by Mr. Harvey as "an undoubted proof." Even Grabe calls *tractatur* *mira sane versio verbi θεραπεύεται*, but without sufficient reason, for Erasmus comments: *θεραπεύεται* pro quo Irenæus legit *tractatur* nam et famuli et medici græcis dicuntur *θεραπεύειν*³; and Vatablus⁴ explains *colitur* (the usual translation of *θεραπεύεται* in the Latin versions) by the one word *tractatur*. We must not then regard this as an unnaturally bad translation from such a poor scholar as the interpreter of Irenæus.

Gal. iii. 19: *legem factorum positam* (i. p. 381, n. 4); N. T. *τὸν ὁ νόμος; τῶν παραβάσεων χάρις προσετέθη;* d e g m¹ (Tdf.) support the reading of Irenæus.

Gal. iv. 8: *ei enim* (ii. p. 24, n. 6); N. T. *ἀλλὰ τότε μὲν*. Grabe supposes *ei* written for *sed* by mistake; still Tert. has *si ergo* (Sab.); and in view of the variation of the Latin versions (e.g. Amb. *quia tunc* (Sab.) *g* and most *sed tunc*, Beza *immo tum*, etc.) it does not seem that *si enim* is a strange translation, the context and construction not being forgotten.

2 Thess. ii. 9: *portentis mendaciorum* (ii. p. 392, n. 6); N. T. *τέρασι ψεύδους*. I have found nothing nearer than *mendacii* in d Aug. Ambrst. Tert. (Sab.).

1 Tim. i. 4: *ματαιάς* (i. p. 1, n. 4); N. T. *ἀπεράντους*. The transition from *ἀπεράντους* to *ματαιάς* is not difficult.⁵ Gb. and Alford⁶ give "*ἀπείροις* const." But the reference seems to be a mistake. Still we may conjecture (since we are refuting a conjecture) that *ἀπείροις* was used in some mss. as the synonyme of *ἀπεράντους*. But *ἀπείροις*, meaning both *endless* and *foolish*, was naturally rendered

¹ Lest it should seem that a parallel has been neglected, it may be mentioned that Tischendorf's note on this passage,—"*teste Græbio codex actorum Collegii Novi Oxon. consentit, c. Ir.*"—is a mistake. Græbio's note refers only to *ἑμῶν* which is cited by Tischendorf in its place from the mss. to which Græbio refers (cat.¹¹⁹). Cf. Dr. Abbot's note in *Bib. Sac.* April 1876, p. 314.

² E.g. ii. pp. 44, 98, 103, 119, 155, 253.

³ *Critici Sacri*, Vol. vii. p. 2334.

⁴ *Ibid.* p. 2336.

⁵ Chrysostom, quoted by Alford (*Greek Test.*), ad loc.

⁶ *Greek Test.* (ed. of 1856, omitted in later editions).

μαραίως. If this conjecture be not regarded as "an undoubted proof" that Irenæus was a Greek, it must at least rank as an unusually good example of the style of argument here employed by Mr. Harvey. The Latin in this place (*infinitas*) makes it possible that we owe *μαραίως* to Epiphanius.

The list of conjectures is closed by six which the Codex Bezae explains.

Matt. xxii. 13 : *tollite* (ii. p. 281, n. 1) ; N. T. *θήσαντες* ; D *ἀπαρ.*

Matt. xxv. 41 : *quem preparavit* (i. p. 268, n. 2) ; N. T. *τὸ ἡτοιμασμένον* ; D *ὃ ἡτοίμασεν*.

Mark i. 3 : *semitas ante Deum nostrum* (ii. p. 39, n. 3). N. T. *τὰς τρίβους αὐτοῦ* ; D *τὰς τριβους τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν* (the last word an evident error for *ἡμῶν*, for d has *nostrum*).

Acts iii. 14 : *aggravistis* (ii. p. 55, n. 3) ; N. T. *ἠνρήσασθε* ; D *ἄβαρύνετε*.

Acts iii. 17 : *nequam* (ii. p. 55, n. 4) ; N. T. om. ; D *πονηρόν*.

Acts xv. 29 : *ambulantes in spiritu sancto* (ii. p. 70, n. 8) ; N. T. om. ; D *φερόμενοι ἐν τῷ ἁγίῳ πνεύματι*.

It has been shown that most of the conjectures are susceptible of natural explanations. Had more sources of information been accessible, the two or three left unaccounted for might perhaps have been elucidated. Mr. Harvey's conjectures, however, are of so little value that, had none of the readings been susceptible of other solutions, his discoveries would, as already shown, have been no proof that Irenæus was a Syrian.

We now come to parallels with the Syriac Scriptures ; and here the question of the nationality of Irenæus must be finally decided. It will be noticed that in many cases the so-called *variae lectiones* of Irenæus do not differ from the critical text of the N. T. But Mr. Harvey uses the *Textus Receptus* as the standard, and therefore these readings are justified on that basis wherever they appear. First, let us notice some alleged parallels which need only explanation in order to be set aside.

Fructus autem operis spiritus est carnis salus (ii. p. 353, n. 1).

This is not a direct quotation of Scripture ; but Mr. Harvey affirms

it is inexplicable except from the Syriac version of Phil. i. 22. If this be true, it is strange that Irenaeus here twice quotes the text in general conformity to the Greek, and very differently from the Syriac. Further, the passage is clear enough as a case of mistaken exegesis. Irenaeus is arguing for the *resurrectio carnis*, and of course many Pauline texts require elucidation. In trying to show that it was *sin*, and not *flesh*, which was to be cast off, Irenaeus uses the text, *exspoliantes vos veterem hominem cum operibus ejus* (Col. iii. 9). This, however, needs explanation; so he adds: *Hoc autem dicebat (apostolus) non veterem amovens plasmationem: alioquin oportet nosmet ipsos interficientes separari ab ea quae est istic conversatione.* He goes on to add another proof, by citing a text from Paul which could not be harmonized with Col. iii. 9, if that were interpreted as *veterem amovens plasmationem: Sed et ipse apostolus, ille existens qui in vulva plasmatus erat, et de utero exierat, scribebat nobis, et vivere in carne fructus operis* epistola confessus est, in ea quae est ad Philippenses, dicens. This text probably comes from memory; and Irenaeus, missing the force of its context,¹ proceeds to apply it here in the above misunderstood and abbreviated form. Life, the fruit of labor, — this can be only eternal life — salvation; so *vivere in carne* = *carnis salus*. But then the *operis* cannot be referred to the apostle, — no amount of man's work brings salvation, — it must be the work of the Spirit. So from *vivere in carne fructus operis*, Irenaeus deduces *fructus autem spiritus est carnis salus*, which contains the truth of the salvation (resurrection) of the body, though it is not proved by Phil. i. 22. Then he goes on to defend this exegesis: *quis enim alius apparens fructus ejus est qui non apparet Spiritus, quam maturam efficere carnem et capacem incorruptelae.* And now he applies the hard-won argument, *Si igitur vivere in carne, hic mihi fructus operis est* (N. T. εἰδὲ τὸ ζῆν ἐν σαρκί, τοῦτό μοι καρπὸς ἔργου) non utique substantiam contemnebat carnis, in eo quod diceret, *Spoliantes,*" etc. We have followed it far enough to show the train of thought, and to give a more probable explanation than Mr. Harvey's, who makes the Syriac of Phil. i. 22 refer to Phil. i. 11, and thus say that "the fruits of righteousness (Phil. i. 11) are the life of the flesh" (Phil. i. 22).

1 Cor. xiii. 13: *Sicut et apostolus dixit, reliquis partibus destructis haec tunc preseverare, quae sunt fides, spes, et caritas* (i. p. 351, n. 4).

¹ Cf. Lightfoot, Commentary on Philippians, ad loc.

Irenæus then adds that these three will endure forever. Mr. Harvey claims that Irenæus mistook the apostle's meaning; "for the Greek has *νυνὶ δὲ μένει πίστις, ἐλπίς, ἀγάπη*; the particle *νυνὶ*, 'for the present,' marks the transitory nature of the two first, . . . but love abideth forever. Now this is lost sight of in the Syriac, which ignores the *νυνὶ*. It simply says, 'for these are the three that abide'; and Irenæus follows the statement."

It is not worth while to go into the exegesis of the passage. "*Haec tunc perseverare*" shows conclusively that Irenæus does *not* ignore the *νυνὶ*, and consequently differs from the Syriac. *Νυνὶ* is logical (as Irenæus understands it¹), and Mr. Harvey separates *ἀγάπη* from *πίστις* and *ἐλπίς*, with which it is shut in between *νυνὶ δὲ μένει* and *τά τρία ταῦτα* by a *tour de force* which can hardly be called exegesis.

Three more cases of difference between Irenæus and the Syriac are adduced by Mr. Harvey as arguments.

Matt. xii. 20: *in contentionem* (ii. p. 45, n. 2); N. T. *eis νίκος* "the reading *νίκος* being followed instead of *νίκος*, victoria. The Syriac has *victory* in a forensic sense, acquittal, innocence." Auct. l. cont. Jud. ap. Cyp. p. 501 has *in contentione* (Sab.); but probably the translator of Irenæus is here at fault.

1 Cor. vi. 11: *Et haec quidam fuistis* (ii. p. 288, n. 5); N. T. *καὶ ταῦτά τινες ἦτε*; "the Syriac has *every man of you*."

John i. 18: *Unigenitus deus, Υἱὸν μονογενῆ καὶ θεόν, unigenitum domini* (ii. p. 221, n. 4; i. p. 76, n. 4); N. T. *ὁ μονογενὴς υἱός*. Mr. Harvey tries to support both these readings from the Syriac, saying, with truth, that it has *μονογενὴς θεός*, but making a mistake in the quotation of the same text as *μονογενὴς θεοῦ*. The citation of this text in Irenæus is so fluctuating that it is impossible to fix on any reading as the original one. We have Vol. i. p. 76, Greek, *υἱὸν μονογενῆ καὶ θεόν*; Latin, *unigenitum domini*; Vol. ii. pp. 44, 399, *unigenitus filius dei* (with q); p. 218, *unigenitus filius* (with AC^sXΓΔΔΠ, abc eff^s, etc.); p. 221, *unigenitus deus* (with ABC^sL 88. etc.). *Unigenitus filius* occurs four times (once in Greek), and is perhaps the most probable. From its combinations with *unigenitus deus*, a reading strongly supported by New Testament mss., all these combinations might arise. So, though nothing is decisive, the argument is rather against the Syriac.

¹ Here and ii. p. 178; cf. Meyer's Commentary, *ad loc.*, Ante-Nic. Lib., Iren. Vol. i. p. 221, n. 3.

We now come to those readings of Irenaeus which are explained by the concurrence of Latin versions.

Matt. iii. 9 : *potens est* (ii. p. 163, n. 6) with am a b c (Ln.); N. T. *δύναται*.

Matt. iii. 17 : (*bene*) *complacui* (ii. p. 32, n. 3); N. T. *ἠιδόκησα* *bene* is omitted in Clerm. and Voss. mss. and the Syriac, also by ff² am Amb. Aug. (Sab.). *Bene* is retained in Arundel ms. and in a b f.

Matt. v. 45 : *bonos et malos* (i. p. 327, n. 2) with a c f ff¹ h (Tdf.); N. T., *πονηροὺς καὶ ἀγαθοὺς*.

Matt. xii. 18 (cf. iii. 9) : *Ecce filius meus dilectissimus in quo bene sensi : ponam spiritum meum, etc.* (ii. p. 45, n. 1); N. T. *ἰδοὺ ὁ παῖς μου ὃν ἠρέτισα, ὁ ἀγαπητός μου εἰς ὃν ἠιδόκησεν ἡ ψυχὴ μου · θήσω τὸ πνεῦμά μου κ.τ.λ.* Tertullian cites this text just as Irenaeus does (Sab.). The Syriac is not to be thought of as a parallel, for it has *Ecce servus meus* (though, of course, *servus* is a possible translation of *παῖς*) *in quo mihi complacitum est ; dilectus meus in quo delectatur anima mea, spiritum meum ponam, etc.* The Syriac is close to the Greek. But from the way in which Irenaeus introduces this quotation : "et Petrus (cf. John i. 49) cognovit Christum Filium dei vivi, dicentis : *Ecce,*" etc., shows that he meant to quote from Matt. iii. 19 what was said by the voice from heaven at Christ's baptism; but the similarity of this to Matt. xii. 18 makes him go on with the quotation as there found. This piecing of texts may be the result of a mistake of memory,¹ or because Irenaeus took the citation of the first verse (Matt. iii. 9 and parallels) as standing for the quotation of the whole prophecy.²

Matt. xxi. 37 : *forte* (ii. p. 276, n. 8) with b c e ff² h (Tdf.); N. T. om.

Matt. xxiii. 4 : *sarcinas graves* (ii. p. 179, n. 1), ⁵ adds *δυσβάστακτα*; N. T., *φορτία βαρέα*, also a b e ff² h (Tdf.).

Matt. xxiii. 38 : *relinquetur* (ii. p. 284, n. 5); N. T., *ἀφίεται*. Mr. Harvey adopts *relinquetur* on the authority of Grabe, the Syriac, and a similar quotation (ii. p. 289), but Arund. Voss. and Clerm. (correction a prima manu) have *remittitur*. *Remittitur* has no resemblance to the Syriac. But as *relinquetur* occurs (ii. p.

¹ For examples of this confusion, cf. ii. p. 333 (1 Cor. xiii. 9, 12); p. 170, n. 2; (Phil. iii. 2; 1 Cor. iv. 4; xiii. 9, 10).

² Isa. xlii. 1 sq.; Matt. xii. 18 sq.

289) we may give as parallels f ff² vg. *Remittetur* is found in Zeno Veron. ; d Aug. have *dimittetur* (Sab.).

Luke i. 17 : *plebem perfectam* (ii. p. 34, n. 1), with a b f ; N. T., λαὸν κατεσκευασμένον.

Luke i. 35 : *quod nascetur ex te* (ii. p. 116, n. 1), with a vg. ; N.T. τὸ γεννώμενον ; Syr. ex te natum.

Luke ix. 61 : *ire et* (i. p. 71. n. 2), with a g¹ (g¹ om. et) (Tdf.) ; N. T. om.

Luke xvi. 31 : *credent ei* (ii. p. 148, n. 2), with c i l m (Tdf.) ; N. T. πεισθήσονται.

John i. 30 : *quoniam prior me* (ii. p. 36, n. 1) ; N. T. ὅτι πρῶτός μου. The reading of Irenæus has nothing against it but the A. V. l we may cite a f ff² vg. (*quia*) b (*ante me*) as parallels.

John ii. 25 : *ei* (ii. p. 33, n. 2), with c l vg. (Tdf.) ; N. T. om.

John v. 39 : *in quibus* (ii. p. 172, n. 5), with a ff² ; N. T. ὅτι ἐν αἰταις.

John xx. 31 : *Jesus est Christus filius dei* (ii. p. 86, n. 5), with g q vg. (Tdf.) ; N. T. Ἰησοῦς ἐστὶν ὁ Χριστὸς ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ. The reading of Irenæus has the weight of authority, and as Mr. Harvey's note turns on the insertion of *Christus*, we may add D b c e f (Tdf.) to g q vg.

Acts ii. 30 : *ventris* (ii. p. 53, n. 6), with am Victorin. (Tdf.) ; N. T. ὄσφύος.

Acts ii. 30 : Irenæus omits τὸ κατὰ σάρκα ἀναστήσειν τὸν Χριστὸν (ii. p. 53, n. 6), with N. T. D² h am (Tdf.).

Acts ii. 33 : *donationem hanc* (ii. p. 54, n. 3), with e demid tol (Tdf.) ; N. T. τοῦτο.

Rom. iii. 23 : *egent* (ii. p. 241, n. 6), with am f vg. ; N. T. ἵστεροῦνται.

Rom. v. 6 : *ut quid enim* (ii. p. 91, n. 2) with d e f g vg. (Tdf.) ; N. T. ἔτι γάρ ; Syr. si autem.

Rom. viii. 11 : *corpora vestra* (ii. p. 337, n. 7), with f g vg. (Ln.) ; N. T. σώματα ὑμῶν.

Rom. viii. 34 : *immo (qui) et resurrexit* (ii. p. 91, n. 4) ; N. T. μᾶλλον δὲ ἐγερθεῖς ; *qui* is not found in any ms. of Irenæus ; Syr. omits *qui*, and has simply *et resurrexit* ; f g have *immo autem et resurrexit*.

Rom. xi. 32 : *omnia* (i. p. 96, n. 1 ; ii. p. 106, n. 8), with d e f g vg. (Tdf.) ; N. T. τοὺς πάντας ; Syr. unumquemque.

Rom. xii. 3: *prudentiam* (ii. p. 380, n. 2), with *gue* (Tdf.) *g*; Syr., *puḍicitiam*; N. T., τὸ σωφρονεῖν.

Rom. xiv. 9: (vol. ii. p. 96, n. 2, probably a misprint for n. 3) *et vixit et mortuus est et resurrexit* with *d e*; N. T., ἀπέθανεν καὶ ἔζησεν, but Syr., *mortuus est, et vixit, et resurrexit*.

1 Cor. vi. 11: *Domini nostri* (ii. p. 288, n. 5), with *c f vg.* (Tdf.); N. T. τοῦ κυρίου.

1 Cor. vi. 14: *nos* (ii. p. 336, n. 1), with *d c f vg.* (Tdf.); N. T. ἡμᾶς, 5^o has ὑμᾶς, which seems to be the point of Mr. Harvey's note.

1 Cor. xiii. 12: *faciem ad faciem* (ii. p. 338, n. 7, cf. p. 339); N. T. πρόσωπον πρὸς πρόσωπον. "Clerm. ms., cum Vulg. It. *faciem ad faciem*"¹; also Syr. Other mss. of Irenaeus read *facie ad faciem*; we may read *faciem* with *d g vers. antiq. apud Sab., etc.*, or *facie* with Tert. Cyp. Aug. (five times) Hil. Amb. (three times) Ambst. Gaud. Brix. (twice) (Sab.) *f am fu*.

1 Cor. xv. 15: (vol. ii. p. 359, n. 5, misprint for n. 6); Irenaeus omits; N. T. εἴπερ ἄρα νεκροὶ οὐκ ἐγείρονται, with Syr. *d e harl ** (Tdf.).

1 Cor. xv. 42: *surgit* (ii. p. 338, n. 1); N. T. ἐγείρεται. Mr. Harvey asserts Syr. (*resurgunt*) is nearer the reading of Irenaeus than ἐγείρεται, but *surgit* is found in *vers. ant. (Sab.) Go. fu. g*; *surgit* is in Clerm. and Voss. mss. Arund. has *surget* with *am vg. etc.*

2 Cor. iv. 10: *Jesu* (omitting *Domini*); v. 11, *si* (ii. p. 358, n. 1); N. T. Ἰησοῦ . . . αἰ. Irenaeus omits *Domini* with *d e f g r vg.* and almost all except 5 (Tdf.). *Si* (probably a mistake of the translator reading *et* for *αἰ*, according to his Latin Bible) is found in *k^{xx} f g Tert. Ambrst. etc.* (Tdf.).

Eph. ii. 7: *saeculis supervenientibus* (ii. p. 154, n. 3); N. T. ἐν τοῖς αἰῶσιν τοῖς ἐπερχομένοις. Mr. Harvey says the Syriac (*saeculis venturis*) is indicated rather than the recepta lectio *ἐν τοῖς αἰῶσι τοῖς ἐρχομένοις*. I have failed to discover any where this reading *ἐρχομένοις*, but if it does exist it is certainly a nearer parallel to the Syriac than the reading of Irenaeus or N. T.; *d f g fu am* have *in saeculis supervenientibus*.

Phil. iii. 11: *quae est a mortuis* (ii. p. 359, n. 2); N. T., τὴν ἐκ νεκρῶν. Mr. Harvey adduces the 5 *ἐκ νεκρῶν* to show that Syr., which has the relative, is the source of the reading of Irenaeus. But *d e f g vg.* (Tdf.) have *quae est*.

1 Thess. v. 3: *munitio* (ii. p. 418, n. 3), with *d g*; N. T. ἀσφάλεια.

¹ Massuet, in Stieren's Irenaeus, i. p. 734, n. 2.

2 Thess. ii. 4: *super omne quod* (ii. p. 391, n. 2), with f g vg. (Ln.); N. T., ἐπὶ πάντα (f g vg. read ἐπὶ πάντων τό; cf. ii. p. 24, n. 7).

2 Thess. ii. 11: *mittet* (ii. p. 392, n. 7), with d e f g vg. demid tol (Tdf.); N. T., πέμψει. Tdf. decides for πέμψει, but adds that Irenæus has present and future each three times; so no conclusion can be drawn.

Other readings may be classed as explained by Codex Bezae.

Matt. i. 22: *Hoc autem totum factum est* (ii. p. 280, n. 5); D and N. T. τοῦτο δὲ ὅλον γέγονεν.

Matt. x. 10: *esca* (ii. p. 168, n. 2); D and N. T. τῆς τροφῆς.

Matt. xxii. 32: *Deus* once (ii. p. 155, n. 1); D and N. T. θεός once.

Mark i. 2: ἐν Ἡσαΐα τῷ προφήτῃ—*in Esaiâ propheta* (ii. p. 49, n. 2); N. T. ἐν τῷ Ἡσαΐα τῷ προφήτῃ; D ἐν Ἡσαΐα τῷ προφήτῃ. (Irenæus twice (ii. pp. 39, 84) cites this text *in prophetis* with 5. etc.)

Luke i. 75: *dies nostros* (ii. p. 35, n. 2); D and N. T. τὰς ἡμέρας ἡμῶν.

Luke xiv. 27: ὃς οὐ βαστάζει τὸν σταυρὸν αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀκολουθεῖ μοι μαθητῆς ἐμὸς οὐ δύναται γενέσθαι—*qui non tollit crucem suam et sequitur me discipulus meus esse non potest* (i. p. 29, n. 3); N. T. ὅστις οὐ βαστάζει τὸν σταυρὸν ἑαυτοῦ καὶ ἔρχεται ὀπίσω μου οὐ δύναται εἶναι μου μαθητῆς; D ὃς οὐ βαστάζει τὸν σταυρὸν αὐτοῦ καὶ ἔρχεται ὀπίσω μου οὐ δύναται μου μαθητῆς εἶναι; Syr. *is qui non tollet crucem suam et venit post me discipulus non potest esse mihi*. It will be noticed that the reading of Irenæus coincides with none of the adduced parallels, but that it is a little nearer to D (ὃς, αὐτοῦ and the order of the last clause) than to the other two. The Syriac also shares with D and N. T. the differences from Irenæus in ἀκολουθεῖ, ἐμὸς, γενέσθαι. So that Syr. is no better parallel to Irenæus than N. T., and not so good as D. ΚΠ etc. have ἀκολουθεῖ ὀπίσω (Tdf.).

Luke xxiv. 46, 47: All mss. of Irenæus omit *sic oportebat* (vs. 46) and *poenitentiam in* (vs. 47) (ii. p. 86, n. 4). The first omission is in N. T., and may be ascribed to D; for the second I have found only the authority of two versions—a Syriac (not Mr. Harvey's, which is the Peschito) and a Persian (Mill). As the Peschito has filled up both these lacunae, no parallel can be alleged.

John xii. 32: *omnia* (ii. p. 150, n. 4); D πάντα; N. T. πάντας; Syr. *υπυμνηστικῶς*.

John x. 31 : *vitam aeternam* (ii. p. 86, n. 6) ; D ζωήν αἰώνιον ; N. T. ζωήν.

Acts ii. 24 : *inferorum* (ii. p. 53, n. 4) ; D τοῦ ᾄδου ; N. T. τοῦ θανάτου ; Syr. *vincula sepulchri* (Tdf. and Michaelis Cur. Syr. p. 2)

Acts ii. 31 : D, N. T., and Irenaeus (ii. p. 54, n. 1) all omit ἡ ψυχὴ μου, which 5 adds.

Acts iii. 18 : *ore omnium prophetarum pati Christum suum* (ii p. 56, n. 1) ; D and N. T. διὰ στόματος πάντων τῶν προφητῶν, πάθει τὸν Χριστὸν αὐτοῦ ; but 5 adds αὐτοῦ after προφητῶν.

Acts iv. 25 : *per Spiritum Sanctum ore David patris nostri pueri tui dixisti* (ii. p. 58, n. 1) ; Syr. has all except *patris nostri* ; so D διὰ πνεύματος ἁγίου διὰ τοῦ στόματος λαλήσας Δαυεὶδ παιδὸς σου, and N. T. adds τοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν, but before διὰ πνεύματος ; vg may be given as perhaps the best parallel to Irenaeus : *qui spiritu sancto per os patris nostri David, pueri tui, dixisti*.

Acts iv. 27 : *in hac civitate* (ii. p. 58, n. 2) ; D and N. T. ἐν τῇ πόλει ταύτῃ ; 5 om.

Acts vii. 43 : *stellam dei Rempham* (ii. p. 188, n. 1) ; D τὸ ἄστρον τοῦ θεοῦ Ῥεμφάμ ; N. T. τὸ ἄστρον τοῦ θεοῦ Ῥομφάν ; 5 adds ἡμῶν ; Syr. *stellam dei Rephon* or *Radphon* (Schaaf Nov. Test. Syr. *Rephon* ; Michaelis Cur. Syr. p. 57, *Radphon*).

Acts xvii. 27 : *illud quod est divinum* (ii. p. 64, n. 2) ; D τὸ θεῖον ἐστιν ; N. T. τὸν θεόν ; Syr. *deum*.

Three readings may now be noticed which find their explanation outside of the circle of MSS. to which we have hitherto limited ourselves.

Mark x. 21 : ἄρας τὸν σταυρὸν αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀκολουθεῖ μοι, *tollens crucem sequere me* (i. p. 29 n. 2) ; N. T. καὶ δεῦρο ἀκολουθεῖ μοι ; Syr. *accipe crucem tuam et veni post me*. Nearer than Syr. to the Latin of Irenaeus is a, *sublata cruce veni, sequere me*. The Greek reading of Irenaeus is found in ANXPII5 q etc. (Tdf.) ; but the order of the clauses is transposed. The order and reading of Irenaeus are found in G 1. 13. 28. 69. al^s Arm. Aeth. (Tdf.) Therefore this reading need not come from the Syriac, which is different from it.

Acts xv. 11 : *Domini nostri* (ii. p. 69, n. 2) ; N. T. τὸν κυρίον. The reading of Irenaeus is found in 13. Hier. (Gb. Wetst.) "one ms." (Sab.) Cop. Sahid. Aeth. (Scholz).

Col. i. 22 : *per mortem ejus* (ii. p. 362, n. 4) ; N. T. διὰ τοῦ θανάτου ; Syr. *et per mortem suam* — so Syr. adds *et*. For the reading of Irenaeus we have \aleph AP al^{ss} m^{ss} etc. (Tdf.)

There are a good many texts which seem to be sufficiently natural as translations from the Greek.

Luke i. 2 : *speculatores* (ii. p. 145, n. 2) ; N. T. ἀντόπται. *Speculatores* needs no justification, for it and *contemplatores* (ii. p. 76 and e) are nearer than the translation of almost all the Latin versions : *qui ipsi viderunt* (d vg etc.).

Luke ii. 31 : *in facie* (ii. p. 163, n. 1) ; N.T. κατὰ πρόσωπον ; Syr. *ante faciem* ; d f have *in conspectu* ; b vg. *ante faciem*. Irenæus cites the text twice *ante faciem* (ii. pp. 38, 85) ; Hil. has *in facie* (Ln. 7).

Acts ii. 33 : *qui dextera* (ii. p. 54, n. 2) ; N. T. τῇ δεξιᾷ οὖν ; but the Syr. has *et ipse est qui per dexteram*. The only exact parallel seems to be Cop. But it is common enough to find the relative and finite verb in Latin for the participle in Greek.

Acts iii. 19 : *et veniant* (ii. p. 56, n. 2, misprint for n. 3) ; N. T. ὅπως ἂν ἔλθωσιν. Syr. has literally *et evenient* ; but, as in Hebrew, here *et* has the consecutive force, and so *et evenient* is equivalent to *ut eveniant*. But in Irenæus *et* connects *veniant* with *ut* in the previous clause ; otherwise of course we should have *et venient*.¹

Acts v. 42 : *in domo* (ii. p. 59, n. 4) ; N. T. κατ' οἶκον ; d Lucif. Cal. (Ln.) have *domi*, from which this *in domo* cannot be sharply distinguished in such a translator as the interpreter of Irenæus, especially as he had just written *in templo*. The Syriac has *domi*, that is, strictly, a preposition and a noun (the Hebrew רִצְוֹן), but to be translated *domi* in Latin (e.g. Schaaf, N. T. Syr. ad loc.).

Acts vii. 43 ; *accepistis* (ii. p. 187, n. 4) ; N. T. ἀνελάβετε ; Syr. *bajulastis* sive *accepistis* ; vg. *suscepistis* ; d *adsumpsistis*. The Vulgate has the best translation ; but the translator of Irenæus is as near the Greek as d is.

1 Cor. xv. 49 : *qui de terra (limo) est* (ii. pp. 343, n. 2, 348, n. 6) ; N. T. τοῦ χοϊκοῦ. The relative construction is too common to need justification, and Syr. has *qui erat ex pulvere*. Irenæus probably wrote τοῦ χοϊκοῦ, for the translation varying (*terra, limo*) indicates some word which could be thus differently rendered.² So Tertullian (de resurr. carnis, cap. 49) *primus homo de terra choicus, id est limaceus*.³ Ambrst. has *qui de terra est* ; Cyprian, Zeno Veronensis, *qui de limo est* (Sab.).

Col. ii. 19 : *compaginatum* (ii. p. 363, n. 4) ; N. T. ἐπιχορηγού-

¹ Cf. Erasmus, ad loc., Critici Sacri, Vol. vii. p. 2156.

² ii. p. 220 we find χοῦν θανάτου (Ps. xxii. (xxi.) 15) translated *linum mortis*.

³ Quoted by Drusius, Critici Sacri, Vol. vii. p. 3926.

μενον. Mr. Harvey pronounces the reading of Irenaeus to be closer to Syr. (which has *compositum*) than the Greek *ἐπιχορήγων*. This is true; but where does Mr. Harvey find *ἐπιχορήγων*? *Comraginatum* is about as near to *ἐπιχορηγούμενον* as the Syr. *compositum*. Ambrst. has *comraginatum* (Sab.).

Two texts follow which are quoted from heretics, and for which Irenaeus is not responsible.

Rom. xi. 36: *πάντα εἰς αὐτὸν καὶ ἐξ αὐτοῦ τὰ πάντα; omnia in ipsum et ex ipso omnia* (i. p. 28, n. 5.); N. T. *ἐξ αὐτοῦ καὶ δι' αὐτοῦ καὶ εἰς αὐτὸν τὰ πάντα*: Syr. *omnia ab eo et omnia in eo, et omnia per eum*. This quotation of the Valentinians is careless or intentionally defective in omitting *καὶ δι' αὐτοῦ*. Being used as a proof text in showing *Σωτήρ* to be *πάντα* what would be more natural than to repeat the *πάντα*?¹ Further, the Valentinians may have quoted with the Syriac in mind.

Col. iii. 11: *καὶ αὐτός ἐστι τὰ πάντα, et ipse est omnia* (i. p. 28, n. 5); N. T. *ἀλλὰ πάντα καὶ ἐν πᾶσιν Χριστός*; Syr. *sed omnia et in omnibus (est) Christus*. The same remarks apply to this quotation as to the last, except that the Syriac parallel is evidently much weaker than before, in fact, no closer than the N. T.

The rest of the texts must be left to the Syriac explanation; for I have not been able to discover adequate parallels.

1 Cor. i. 26: *non multi sapientes apud vos nec nobiles neque fortes* (i. p. 320, n. 5); N. T. *οὐ πολλοὶ σοφοὶ κατὰ σάρκα, οὐ πολλοὶ δυνατοί, οὐ πολλοὶ ἐνγενεῖς*; Syr. *non multi inter vos (sunt) sapientes secundum carnem, neque multi inter vos potentes, neque multi inter vos genere illustri*. The parallel between Irenaeus and the Syriac is only in the first *apud (inter) vos*. Irenaeus omits *secundum carnem* and the second and third *inter vos* and Irenaeus reads *nobiles*, not *genere illustri*.

Acts vii. 41: *sacrificia* (ii. p. 187, n. 4); N. T. *θυσίαν*; Syr. *victimae*; the plural I have found only in Go. (Bianchini) and 46. (Scholz).

Acts vii. 42: *exercitibus* (ii. p. 187, n. 4); N. T. *τῆ στρατιᾷ*; Syr. (*ut colerent*) *exercitus*.

Acts ix. 15: *in gentibus* (ii. p. 79, n. 3); N. T. *ἐνώπιον ἰθῶν*; Syr. *in gentibus*.

Acts xvii. 26: *super faciem totius terrae* (ii. p. 63, n. 4), with Syr. Cop.; N. T. *ἐπὶ πάντος προσώπου τῆς γῆς*.

¹ Valla (Critici Sacri, Vol. vii. p. 828) paraphrases the verse thus: *unde omnia, et per quem omnia, et in quem omnia*.

To sum up, — we have reviewed thirty conjectures, five cases where Irenæus and the Syriac evidently differ, thirty-six explained by the Latin versions, sixteen by D, three by other MSS., eight by inaccurate translation into Latin, two quotations by heretics, and five instances for which we are unable to give a better reason than the Syriac; in all one hundred and five readings. There are, then, just five instances in which the influence of the Syriac cannot be disproved from the accessible materials. It is possible, if not probable, from the large number of readings explained, that had we been able to refer to a larger number of MSS., these five also might have been traced. But five parallels will be deemed wholly insufficient ground on which to rest the nationality of Irenæus, especially, since all but one occur in Acts, of which book, as we shall see, it is probable that Irenæus used a different version. But, in case it should still appear to some that real, though slight, traces of Syriac influence can be detected in the writings of Irenæus, these traces may be easily accounted for.

The striking agreement of the Peschito — Mr. Harvey's "Syriac Version" — with Codex Bezae¹ and the old Latin versions,² makes it probable that they coincided in other readings now lost (except in the Peschito and Irenæus) from the mutilations and changes which the Greek³ and the Latin have undergone. Again, the present condition of the Peschito indicates a probable revision in the fourth century by collation with Greek MSS.,⁴ and thus readings may have come into the Peschito and Irenæus from some common source. When we remember that the Peschito is cited by many

¹ Marsh's *Michaelis*, Vol. ii. pp. 25, 231; Cureton, *Syriac Gospels*, Introd. p. lxxviii and note; Scrivener, *Codex Bezae*, Introd. pp. lvi, lviii, lix, lxxv; *Michaelis, Curæ Syriacæ*, p. 82.

² Marsh's *Michaelis*, Vol. ii. pp. 24, 112, 116; Horne's Introd. Vol. iv. (1863), pp. 235, 265; Cureton, l. c. p. lxxvii.; Scrivener, l. c. p. lvi; Etheridge, *Horæ Aramaicæ*, p. 68; *Michaelis, Curæ Syriacæ*, p. 163 s.

³ Cf. Horne's Introd. Vol. iv. pp. 170, 172.

⁴ Tregelles, in *Smith's Bible Dict.* (s.v. *Version, Syriac*), and Horne's Introd. Vol. iv. p. 265 s.; Marsh's *Michaelis*, Vol. ii. p. 46 s.

of the Fathers,¹ that it was possibly used in Alcuin's revision of the Vulgate,² and, especially, that there was from an early date a Syriac translation of Irenaeus,³ we see that the avenues were not few at which Syriac influence could enter. Proof, to be sure, is wanting, and must be ; but, at all events, if Syriac influence is insisted on, it is more probable that it was felt in any or all of these ways than through the Syriac nationality of Irenaeus.

2. From the New Testament citations of Irenaeus a much stronger argument may be deduced for the use by him of Codex Bezae, than that advanced by Mr. Harvey for his familiarity with the Peschito. It is beyond the scope of this discussion, and impossible in the mutilated state of some mss., to prove this exhaustively from the examination of every New Testament text cited by Irenaeus ; but it may be briefly illustrated in so striking a manner as to carry almost equal weight. For the purpose of comparison with Irenaeus we select a Codex whose history associates it with that Father ; one, too, not like the Peschito, the result of a much later recension by comparison with other mss., but which has probably kept, to a great extent, its own readings from an early date. Codex Bezae is, moreover, a manuscript whose readings are individual and peculiar, so that wherever found they leave little doubt as to their source. The most peculiar book of this most peculiar Codex is Acts ; let us then compare some readings of Irenaeus in the book of Acts with Acts in Codex Bezae. Fortunately Irenaeus quotes almost all the passages he adduces from Acts within a very short space ;⁴ and these often in long citations, where a writer cannot trust to his memory, and where, therefore, traces of the ms. he used will probably appear.

¹ Origen, Basil, Ambrose, Procopius, Theodoret, Chrysostom, Augustine, Ephrem the Syrian (and perhaps Melito) ; Etheridge, l. c. p. 23 ; Epiphanius also, cf. Mill, Proleg., in Nov. Test., § 790.

² Theganus is the authority ; but cf. Lee, Proleg. in Bib. Polyglot, p. 63, notes ; Marsh's Michaelis, Vol. ii. p. 125, iii. p. 630 ; Etheridge, l. c. pp. 36, 37.

³ i. p. clxiv s. ; Massuet, Diss. ii. § 55.

⁴ ii. pp. 52-76.

As to the form of coincidences to be noticed, they must be limited to words and order of words (since this last is used by Mr. Harvey). Conjectures, however simple, are not admissable. Nor would it be fair to cite all variations from the Textus Receptus, but only the differences from the critical text which has hitherto been our standard. Such a test is just to Irenæus, and not unjust to Mr. Harvey; for, in the twenty-five pages of Irenæus now to be examined, Mr. Harvey has collected eighteen Syriac analogies; more than in any other twenty-five pages of either volume. But these eighteen are reduced to nine by the rules laid down, for we find four conjectures,¹ four variations from only the Textus Receptus,² and one case where the Syriac and N. T. exactly agree, but Irenæus differs from both.³ Let us now compare Codex Bezae and Irenæus with the critical text.

Acts i. 16 (p. 52): D Ir. add *ταύτην*, hanc.

Acts ii. 24: N. T. *τοῦ θανάτου*; D *τοῦ ᾄδου*; Ir. inferorum.

Acts ii. 37: D Ir. add *οὖν*, ergo.

Acts ii. 38: D Ir. om. *ὑμῶν*.

Acts iii. 7: N. T. *παραχρῆμα δέ*; D *καὶ παραχρῆμα*; Ir. et statim.

Acts iii. 12: N. T. *πρὸς τὸν λαόν*; D *πρὸς αὐτούς*; Ir. (dixit) *eis*.

Acts iii. 12: D Ir. add *ἡμῶν*, nostrâ.

Acts iii. 13: D Ir. add *εἰς κρίσιν*, in iudicium.

Acts iii. 13: N. T. *ἀπολύειν*; D *ἀπολύειν αὐτὸν θέλοντος*; Ir. cum remittere eum vellet.

Acts iii. 14: N. T. *ἠρνήσασθε*; D *ἐβαρύνετε*; Ir. aggravastis.

Acts iii. 17: D Ir. add *πονηρόν*, nequam.

Acts iii. 21: D Ir. om. *ἀπ' αἰῶνος*.

Acts iii. 22: D Ir. add *πρὸς τοὺς πατέρας ὑμῶν*, ad patres nostros.

Acts iii. 22: N. T. *ὡς ἐμέ· αὐτοῦ ἀκούσεσθε*; D *ὡς ἐμοῦ αὐτοῦ ἀκούσεσθε*; Ir. quemadmodum me ipsum audietis.

Acts iii. 23: N. T. *ψυχὴ ἧτις ἐάν*; D *ψυχὴ ἧτις ἄν*; Ir. omnis anima quaecunque.

Acts iii. 24: D Ir. om. *δέ*.

Acts iii. 26: D Ir. om. *αὐτόν*.

Acts iv. 8: D Ir. add *τοῦ Ἰσραήλ*, Israelitæ.

¹ ii. pp. 55, n. 3, 4; 63, n. 1; 70, n. 8. ² ii. pp. 54, n. 1; 56, n. 1; 58, n. 1, 2.

³ ii. p. 64, n. 2.

- Acts iv. 9: D Ir. add ἀφ' ὑμῶν, a vobis.
 Acts iv. 12: D Ir. om. ἡ σωτηρία.
 Acts iv. 20: N. T. ἐν ἀνθρώποις; D ἀνθρώποις; Ir. hominibus.
 Acts iv. 22: D Ir. om. τοῦτο.
 Acts iv. 24: D Ir. add ὁ θεός, deus.
 Acts v. 31: N. T. τοῦ δοῦναι (vg. ad dandum); D δοῦναι; Irv. dare.
 Acts x. 5: d Ir. om. τινα (wanting in D).
 Acts x. 37: D Ir. add γάρ.
 Acts x. 41: D Ir. om. αὐτόν.
 Acts xiv. 15: D Ir. om. καί.
 Acts xiv. 15: D Ir. add τὸν θεόν, deum.
 Acts xiv. 15: D Ir. add ὅπως, uti.
 Acts xiv. 17: N. T. αὐτόν; D ἐαυτόν; Ir. semetipsum.
 Acts xv. 8: D Ir. add ἐπ' αὐτούς, eis.
 Acts xv. 10: D Ir. add Χριστοῦ, Christi.
 Acts xv. 13: N. T. Ἰάκωβος λέγων; D Ἰάκωβος εἶπεν; Ir. Jacobus dixit.
 Acts xv. 15: N. T. τούτῳ; D οὕτως; Ir. sic.
 Acts xv. 18: D Ir. add ἔστιν (τῷ κυρίῳ) τὸ ἔργον αὐτοῦ, est (deo) opus ejus.
 Acts xv. 20: D Ir. om. καὶ τοῦ πνικτοῦ.
 Acts xv. 20: D Ir. add καὶ ὅσα μὴ θέλουσιν ἑαυτοῖς γίνεσθαι ἑτέροις μὴ ποιῆτε, et quaecunque nolunt sibi fieri aliis ne faciant.
 Acts xv. 26: N. T. τὰς ψυχὰς; D τὴν ψυχὴν; Ir. animam.
 Acts xv. 29: D Ir. om. καὶ πνικτῶν.
 Acts xv. 29: D Ir. add καὶ ὅσα μὴ θέλετε ἑαυτοῖς γίνεσθαι ἑτέροις μὴ ποιῶν, et quaecunque nolunt sibi fieri aliis ne faciant.
 Acts xv. 29: N. T. ἐξ ὧν; D ἀφ' ὧν; Ir. a quibus.
 Acts xv. 29: D Ir. add φερόμενοι ἐν τῷ ἁγίῳ πνεύματι, ambulantes in spiritu sancto.
 Acts xvi. 10: N. T. συμβιβάζοντες; D ἐνοήσαμεν; Ir. intelligentes.
 Acts xvi. 10: N. T. ὁ θεός; D ὁ κύριος; Ir. dominus.
 Acts xvii. 25: N. T. αὐτὸς διδούς; D ὅτι οὗτος ὁ δούς (where οὗτος is probably an error for αὐτός, cf. d ipse); Ir. cum ipse dederit.
 Acts xvii. 26: N. T. καὶ τὰ πάντα ἐποίησέν τε; D καὶ τὰ πάντα ἐποίησεν; Ir. et omnia qui fecit.
 Acts xvii. 26: N. T. καὶ τὰς ὁροθεσίας; D κατὰ ὁροθεσίαν; Ir. secundum determinaciones.

Acts xvii. 27 : N. T. τὸν θεόν ; D τὸ θεῖόν ἐστιν ; Ir. illud quod est divinum.

Acts xvii. 27 : N. T. αὐτόν ; D αὐτό ; Ir. illud.

Acts xvii. 27 : N. T. καί ; D ἡ ; Ir. aut.

Acts xvii. 27 : N. T. ὑπάρχοντα ; D ὄν ; Ir. sit (cf. v. 24, Ir. renders, ὑπάρχων, existens).

Acts xvii. 28 : D Ir. om. ποιητῶν.

Acts xvii. 28 : N. T. τοῦ ; D τούτου ; Ir. hujus.

Acts xvii. 29 : N. T. καί ; D ἡ ; Ir. aut.

Acts xvii. 31 : N. T. ἐν ᾗ μέλλει κρίναι ; D κρίναι ; Ir. judicari.

Acts xvii. 31 : D Ir. add Ἰησοῦ, Jesu.

Acts xx. 28 : D Ir. add ἑαυτῶ.

Acts xx. 30 : N. T. ἀποσπᾶν ; D ἀποστρέφειν ; Ir. convertant.

Acts xx. 30 : N. T. ἑαυτῶν ; D αὐτῶν ; Ir. se.

We have here sixty instances of *variae lectiones* common to D and Irenæus. It may be worth while to call particular attention to some of these instances of the remarkable agreement of Codex Bezae and Irenæus, over against the critical text—in peculiar changes of words, Acts ii. 24 ; iii. 14 ; xvii. 26, 27 ; xx. 30 ; in marked omissions, iv. 12 ; xv. 20, 29 ; xvii. 28, and in curious interpolations—the chief characteristic of Codex Bezae—iii. 13, 17, 22 ; xv. 18, 20, 29.

These parallels are of such strength as to prove a common source, and the weakness of the Syriac analogies we have considered is salient in contrast with them. Let us notice, further, a few cases of similarity in the order of words.

Acts ii. 26 : N. T. μου ἡ καρδιά ; D ἡ καρδιά μου ; Ir. cor meum.

Acts ii. 33 : N. T. τοῦ πνεύματος τοῦ ἁγίου ; D τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος ; Ir. sancti spiritus.

Acts ii. 36 : N. T. ἐποίησεν ὁ θεός ; D ὁ θεὸς ἐποίησεν ; Ir. deus fecit.

Acts ii. 38 : N. T. μετανοήσατέ φησιν ; D φησὶν μετανοήσατε ; Ir. ait poenitentiam agite.

Acts iii. 7 : N. T. αἱ βάσεις αὐτοῦ ; D αὐτοῦ αἱ βάσεις ; Ir. ejus . . . gressus.

Acts iii. 19 : N. T. ὑμῶν τὰς ἁμαρτίας ; D τὰς ἁμαρτίας ὑμῶν ; Ir. peccata vestra.

Acts iii. 25 : N. T. διάθετο ὁ θεός ; D ὁ θεὸς διάθετο ; Ir. deus disposuit.

Acts iii. 26: ἀναστήσας ὁ θεός; D ὁ θεὸς ἀναστήσας; Ir. deus excitans.

Acts iv. 33: N. T. Ἰησοῦ ... τοῦ κυρίου; D τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ; Ir. domini Jesu.

Acts vii. 60: N. T. τὴν ἁμαρτίαν ταύτην; D ταύτην τὴν ἁμαρτίαν; Ir. hoc peccatum.

Acts x. 28: N. T. ἔδειξεν ὁ θεός; D ὁ θεὸς ἔδειξεν; Ir. deus ostendit.

Acts x. 47: N. T. δύναται κωλύσαι τις; D κολῦσαι τις δύναται; Ir. quis ... vetare potest.

Acts xv. 7: N. T. ἐξελέξατο ὁ θεός; D ὁ θεὸς ἐξελέξατο; Ir. deus elegit.

Acts xv. 28: N. T. τῷ πνεύματι τῷ ἁγίῳ; D τῷ ἁγίῳ πνεύματι; Ir. sancto spiritu.

Acts xvii. 24: N. T. ὑπάρχων κύριος; D κύριος ὑπάρχων; Ir. dominus existens.

Acts xvii. 27: N. T. μακρὰν ἀπὸ ἐνὸς ἐκάστου ἡμῶν ὑπάρχονται; D μακρὰν ὄν κ. τ. λ.; Ir. non longe sit, etc.

These sixteen parallels of order would not otherwise merit so much attention as they now deserve, being supported by sixty verbal parallels and a strong historical probability. Of course the argument from Codex Bezae does not exactly overthrow Mr. Harvey's supposition of Syriac readings retained in the memory. Yet, in conjunction with the foregoing examination of those Syriac readings, it shows that the traces of the Peschito in Irenaeus are infinitesimal compared with those of Codex Bezae, and so, that the argument from the Scripture citations in the *Adversus Haereses*, is in favor of that manuscript of the New Testament which was procured by Beza from the monastery of S. Irenaeus.

But the case for Codex Bezae may be made still stronger. It will have been observed that almost all of Mr. Harvey's Syriac analogies were from the Latin text, so that they (if from Irenaeus) had survived embodiment in Greek and translation into Latin, while there is really no evidence that they might not have emanated from the last transcriber, or any other, as probably as from Irenaeus or his immediate translator. But with these seventy-six parallels the case is different;

they are taken directly from the Greek of Codex Bezae, and, from their style, seem to have been translated from it by the translator of the whole of Irenæus. It is evident at a single glance that they have nothing to do with the Latin of Codex Bezae. Not only do they differ from *d* wherever synonymes will permit,¹ but the translator of Irenæus often remains faithful to the Greek when *d* varies from it, and follows some Latin version.² Their habits of translation are entirely different, and the interpreter of Irenæus is generally the better scholar.³

The translator of Irenæus was probably almost (if not quite⁴) contemporaneous with that Father, so that few, if any, Greek scribes intervened. Hence it seems most natural that the quotations evidently made directly from the Greek of Codex Bezae were cited by Irenæus himself, and as incorporated with the context were translated by his interpreter. Thus we reach the probability that the older form of Codex Bezae, including the Epistles,⁵ was the New Testament of Irenæus.⁶

This foundation-text was probably far more visible even in the first translator than now, because of the mutilation of Codex Bezae and the loss of its Epistles. Add to these causes the alterations of the Latin scribes, who from different Latin versions remodelled the ancient readings, and we reach the present state of the Bible text in Irenæus. But while this theory for the formation of our Latin text of this Father is suggested, not proved,⁷ yet we trust it will hardly be dis-

¹ E.g. Acts i. 20, *d accipiet alter, Ir. sumat alius*; ii. 24, *d suscitavit, Ir. excitavit*; *d amitibus, Ir. doloribus*; *d deteneri, Ir. teneri*; ii. 26, *d inhabitabit in spem, Ir. requiescat in spe*; ii. 30, *d collocare super thronum, Ir. sedere in throno* — and so on, ad lib.

² E.g. Acts iv. 22, *d hoc signum, Ir. om. hoc*; xvii. 26, *d et, Ir. secundum*; xvii. 28, *d et, Ir. aut*; xvii. 30, *d abstrahant, Ir. convertant, d se ipsos, Ir. se*.

³ E.g. always *d quia* (or *quod*), *Ir. quoniam* (Gr. *ὅτι*); often *d suscito, Ir. excito*; *d puts enim* and *autem* in the third place, e.g. Acts vii. 37, ii. 38; x. 28, *d's use of aliquis*; ii. 30, *d inhabitabit in spem*; xv. 8, *d super eos* (*Ir. eis*); xv. 16, *ipsius* (*Ir. ejus*); x. 29, *d ferentes, Ir. ambulantes*.

⁴ Horne's *Introd.* Vol. iv. p. 333.

⁵ *Ibid.* p. 170.

⁶ Cf. Scrivener, *Codex Bezae, Introd.* p. xlv.

⁷ If Dodwell was right in supposing (*Diss. in Iren. (Oxon. 1689) Diss. v. §§ vi. vii. x.*), that Tertullian did not have the Latin translation of Irenæus before

puted by one who has followed the course of this essay that Irenaeus was an Asiatic Greek by birth, by name, by education, in style, in the absence of Hebrew and Syriac attainments, and in the New Testament he read from his childhood.

ARTICLE V.

STRICTURES ON REVIVALS OF RELIGION.

BY REV. W. H. H. MARSH, PASTOR OF THE CENTRAL BAPTIST CHURCH,
SALEM, MASS.

ONE of the prominent evangelical agencies of our time for the promotion of vital piety and the salvation of men is best defined by the current phrase which the agency has coined as descriptive of itself, "revival effort." Such effort is now nearly universally accepted as indispensable to the growth of existing churches and the planting of new ones. So general is this recognition that to submit any criticisms on the theory or method of such efforts is to invoke on ourselves the severe censure of those who set themselves up as the special champions and promoters of religious awakenings. To do so often incurs the charge of frigid conservatism, or a want of zeal for the Lord, or a want of interest in the salvation of sinners. If pastors or churches raise any question as to the scripturalness, or even the expediency, of measures employed, they are assumed to have no sympathy with the thing itself. If they institute an earnest, scriptural inquiry into the theory and objects proposed by the special advocates of revivals and revival measures, they are assumed to be influenced more by excessive caution than by love for souls; more by indifference to the end sought than by sincere rev-

him, and that we have no trace of it before Augustine (§ viii), this lessens the improbability of alterations in the *Greek* text of biblical passages made subsequent to Irenaeus and incorporating readings of the Codex Bezae. Even then, the boldness of such interpolations, unless from the hand of Irenaeus himself, is only surpassed by that exhibited in Codex Bezae itself. So if Dodwell be right, our theory is weakened, but not rendered improbable. Cf. Massuet, *Diss.* ii. § 53, Harvey's *Irenaeus*, i. p. clxiv, Sanday, *Gospels* in 2d. Cont. pp. 330, 332.