

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:



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



<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

PayPal

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for the *Journal of Theological Studies* (old series) can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_jts-os_01.php

pdfs are named: [Volume]_[1st page of article]

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

F. C. BURKITT.

NOTE ON VALENTINIAN TERMS IN IRENAEUS AND TERTULLIAN.

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

¹ leg. ἀποσταυρωθῆναι.

² ? read 'masculofeminum'.

³ MSS appear to have 'Monogenum'.

⁴ ? read *feminamarem*.

sign of its existence. Somehow the immeasurable Deep made its own Notion fecund, and so *Mind* (*Noûs*) came into being, and though it was called *Unique* (*Μονογενής*) it had a correlative side to it called *Truth* (*Ἀλήθεια*). It will be noticed that the Pairs are very much like the Hegelian Thesis and Antithesis that between them bring forth a Synthesis. After all, human beings only know of two kinds of fresh production: there is the notion or idea that seems to be self-produced from a man's inner consciousness, and there is the new individual that comes from generation in plants and animals. By the first process the ultimate Forefather of Valentinian theology conceived his original Notion, and by something analogous to the second the dumb Notion produced what could be called *Nous*, viz. an intelligent Understanding, the inevitable counterpart of which is Truth. For if there be nothing true to understand there can be no intelligent understanding. It may be pointed out that the original *Bythos*, which produced the first Notion out of itself, corresponds to the Subliminal Self of modern psychology.¹

Many more pairs according to Valentinus were formed in this way, the last of which was *Design* (*Θελητός*) and *Wisdom* (*Σοφία*), but a better modern equivalent is 'Philosophy'. Philosophy desired to know everything, especially 'ultimate problems', to 'get a grasp of reality', as we say, i. e. in Valentinian phrase to know the Forefather. This was beyond the unaided power of Philosophy to do, it was not in accordance with Design, so that the result of the disordered fancy (*Enthymesis*) of Philosophy was a sort of miscarriage or formless abortion, produced with pain and trouble (*Pathos, Passio*). To help Philosophy out of its trouble the ultimate Forefather sent another being called *Horos*, who cleansed and healed it by removing altogether its disordered Fancy and the pain and trouble that resulted from that Fancy, so that Philosophy was restored to its original Design.

Horos (*Ὅρος*) is *Definition*, it makes nothing new but puts things in their right places. The end or function of the other Aeons was to produce something fresh, consequently they are represented in pairs, or are regarded as in themselves bisexual (*ἀρρενόθηλυσ*). But *Horos* does not produce anything of itself, therefore it has the epithet *ἀθήλυτος*; it is, so to speak, not feminized.

Horos is also called by other names (*Lytrotes, Metagogeus, &c.*). Among them is *Cross* (*Σταυρος*). This has been supposed to have been used in the sense of 'stake', and when *Horos* is said to have 'crucified away' (*ἀποσταυρωθῆναι*) the *Enthymesis* of Philosophy it has been supposed to have merely fenced it off. But the 'Acts of John'

¹ What I mean is best explained by a reference to Sanday's *Christologies Ancient and Modern* pp. 146-148, 163, 166, 178.

§ 13 (*Apoc. Anecd.* ii 18) shew us that the Gnostic idea of the Cross is much more definitely Christian. Starting from the crucifixion of Christ, or perhaps it would be more accurate to say from the view of the significance of that crucifixion expressed in Gal. v 24, they regarded the True Cross, of which the wooden Gallows of Golgotha was only the symbol, as the dividing principle that marked out 'right' and 'left' (i.e. good and bad) in the lower world, the Higher Power or Aeon being altogether above it. The figure implied is no doubt not † but ‡, by which the lower space is divided into a right side and a left, but what is above is undivided.

It is useless to expect logical consistency in such imaginings: what is important is that the notions of Boundary (or Definition) and *σταῦρος* meet not in any classical use of *σταῦρος* as 'palisade' but in symbolism derived from the Crucifixion. When therefore the errors and fancies of philosophy are removed and fixed by true definition, or in Gnostic language when *Horos-Stauros* comes and cleanses *Sophia* from her *Enthymesis*, the *Enthymesis* is appropriately said *ἀποσταυρωθῆναι* and this is correctly rendered in Latin by *crucifixam*. The Latin translation of Irenaeus i 1, 3 and Tertullian *adv. Valentinianos* 10 both use this word, but it is the only correct rendering.

Further, there is no real agreement between Tertullian and Iren-lat in the rendering of *ἀθήλυτος*. Iren-lat has *masculofemina*, probably (as Dr Hort says) an error of the MSS for *masculofeminam*. This either represents a Greek corruption *ἀρρενόθηλον* (for *ἀθήλυτον*), or is an erroneous interpretation of the word in this sense. Tertullian has *feminamare(m)*, which is not the same thing. This hybrid word does not occur elsewhere and really corresponds to *ἀσύζυγον* and *ἀθήλυτον* together: it seems to me quite likely that he thought it a good enough equivalent. If Tertullian had the Latin words *sine coniuge masculo-femina* (or *-inam*) before him I do not see why he should have coined the word *feminamas*.

In I i 2, 4 (Harvey, p. 19) Irenaeus tells us how Horus separated the 'Enthymesis' (so Tert, Iren-lat has *intentio*) *σὺν τῷ ἐπιγυομένῳ πάθει* from *Sophia*. This is translated both in Tertullian and Iren-lat by 'appendix passio'. Tert has *et illam appendicem passionem*, Iren-lat *cum appendice passione* and the construction is different, but the 'appendix' (for *τὸ ἐπιγυόμενον*) appears in both. Dr Hort, however, shews on p. xlii that this reading, so far from being a mistake, is technically correct and that the only real puzzle is how the translator of Irenaeus came to use it. I should like to suggest that *appendix passio* is not, as Dr Sanday conjectures (p. lxiii, note), a technical term of 'the Gnostics', but that it is one of the medical phrases which Prof. Souter notes as characteristic of the translator (p. xcvi), for

Caelius Aurelianus the Numidian physician writes *de iis tussiculis quae aliarum fuerint appendices passionum* *Chronics* ii 8, 114), and elsewhere he enquires whether certain things *passionibus fuerint appendicia*. These passages should I think be added to illustrate Dr Hort's argument.

Caelius Aurelianus came from Sicca in Numidia and is thought to have flourished in the 5th century, which (so far as it goes) supports Prof. Souter's theory that the Latin translation of Irenaeus is African and not particularly early.

F. C. B.

ST LUKE'S PREFACE; ἀσφάλεια AND παρακολουθεῖν.

THE 'Notes on St Luke's Preface' by Mr F. H. Colson, in the April number of this JOURNAL, are an interesting and valuable contribution to the discussion of this important section of St Luke's Gospel. Especially happy is his apt use of the famous preface of Livy, which states as neatly as possible two of the general aims that must likewise have animated the evangelist—(1) to produce a more trustworthy account of the events narrated, and (2) to improve on the literary form of his predecessors. Whether, in the selection and arrangement of his material and in the emphasis with which he directs attention to one or another aspect of the facts, St Luke was guided by further purposes, must in his case, as in that of Livy himself, be discovered by study of the whole narrative which follows the Preface.

Two points occur in Mr Colson's article which seem to me to permit additional discussion, in one case partly because of his reference to an article of my own.¹

I

Of the last clause of the Preface (*ἵνα ἐπιγνῶς περὶ ὧν κατηχήθης λόγων τὴν ἀσφάλειαν*) two interpretations have been defended. (1) The view more current in the commentaries is clearly stated by Plummer: 'Theophilus shall know that the faith which he has embraced has an impregnable historical foundation.' Under this view *ἐπιγνῶναι τὴν ἀσφάλειαν* is taken to mean 'know the sureness and certainty' of the facts or doctrines in question. St Luke's aim, then, is not to state these facts or doctrines, but to prove them. (2) Under the opposing view *ἐπιγνῶναι τὴν ἀσφάλειαν* is interpreted by the aid of Acts xxi 34, xxii 30 (*γινῶναι τὸ ἀσφαλές*; cf. Acts xxv 26) as meaning 'gain sure and certain knowledge', and St Luke's announcement of his aim will then refer only to an adequate statement of the facts or doctrines, not to any purpose of proving, by argument or otherwise, how certain they are.

¹ That Mr Colson refers to me as 'Prof. A. R. Ropes' gives me pleasure, for it is an unexpected testimony to the versatility of 'Adrian Ross'.