in *Klio* xxiv Heft 1), the following third-century epitaph was copied: Σεργιανὸς καὶ | Σέργιος μητρὶ Λικι|νία καὶ Μενάνδρω | πατροφοιήτω μ|νήμης χάριν. This is a family tombstone, and since the father φύσει of Sergianus and Sergius is not mentioned it seems likely that he was already dead and buried elsewhere, and that Menandros was the second husband of Licinia as well as the adoptive father of her two sons. This double relationship is in any case certainly attested in another third-century epitaph found at Kunderaz, on the territory of Laodicea Combusta, at the same season: Ξενικὸς κὲ | Μακεδὼν πρ|όγον(ο)ι ἔστησα[ν | Μάνη πατροπο|ήτω μνῆς χάριν. Here Xenikos and Makedon describe themselves as the stepsons of their adoptive father.

Epitaphs, as Professor de Zulueta reminds me, are unsatisfactory witnesses to a point of law; they record facts of relationship, but are generally silent on the legal implications of the facts. But it seems to be a reasonable hypothesis that this South-Galatian custom whereby a stepfather was also the adoptive father of his stepsons finds its explanation in some principle or provision of the local law of inheritance. I have been unable, even with the kind help of Professor de Zulueta and of Mr A. Cameron, to find any analogy to this custom, or to explain it in terms of any known system of law.[1] I suggest provisionally that it is Phrygian or Anatolian. Its interest for the present must be that it helps us to paint in the background of St Paul's metaphor: ἵνα τὴν υἱοθεσίαν ἀπολάβωμεν . . . εἰ δὲ υἱός, καὶ κληρονόμος διὰ θεοῦ.

Mr R. McKenzie informs me that the form πατροποίητος is unknown to the editors of Liddell and Scott. In view of υἱοποίητος it was bound to turn up soon or late; it is odd that the first two examples should occur in the course of a single journey in the Phrygian and Galatian region.

W. M. CALDER.

ON A QUOTATION FROM JUSTIN MARTYR IN IRENAEUS

FROM a lost work of Justin Martyr against Marcion St Irenaeus has made a quotation in his *Adversus Haereses* iv 11, 2 (Harvey ii p. 159). Eusebius has in turn quoted Irenaeus, supplying us with the Greek text at this point (*H. E.* iv 18, 9):

Καὶ καλῶς Ἰουστῖνος ἐν τῷ πρὸς Μαρκίωνα συντάγματί φησιν ὅτι Αὐτῷ τῷ κυρίῳ οὐκ ἂν ἐπείσθην ἄλλον θεὸν καταγγέλλοντι παρὰ τὸν δημιουργόν.

[1] The adoption by Augustus of Tiberius was a dynastic improvisation, and has no relevance here.

The question arises whether the words of Justin as quoted by Irenaeus extend beyond this brief sentence, and if so how far. The editors, from Grabe (1702) and Massuet (1710) to Harvey (1857) have, at first with cautions, indicated their view by the use of italics. The passage with its context runs as follows :—

> Nullam enim oportet quaestionem talem esse et tantum invalescere, ut et deum quidem mutet et eam quae est erga fabricatorem, qui nos alit per suam conditionem, fidem nostram evacuet. sicut enim in filium fidem nostram dirigimus, sic et in patrem dilectionem firmam et immobilem habere debemus.
>
> Et bene Iustinus, in eo libro qui est ad Marcionem ait quoniam *Ipsi quoque domino non credidissem alterum deum annuntianti praeter fabricatorem et factorem et nutritorem nostrum. sed quoniam ab uno deo, qui et hunc mundum fecit et nos plasmavit et omnia continet et administrat, unigenitus filius venit ad nos suum plasma in semetipsum recapitulans, firma est mea ad eum fides, et immobilis erga patrem dilectio, utraque deo nobis praebente.* neque enim patrem cognoscere quis potest, nisi verbo dei, id est, nisi filio revelante; neque filium nisi patris beneplacito . . . utraque autem haec sic habere manifestavit dominus.

The view thus indicated is accepted by Otto (*Justin M.* ii 250), and by Harnack (*Altchristliche Litteratur* 1898 i p. 100). The question has assumed a new importance since the late Professor Loofs in his posthumous work on the sources of the theology of Irenaeus has found in the words thus assigned to Justin the starting-point for the use of ἀνακεφαλαίωσις, *recapitulatio*, which is so familiar a characteristic of the writings of Irenaeus.[1] He had indicated this view in his *Leitfaden* some forty years ago[2]; but it is now put forward as the climax of a long argumentation, the purpose of which is to dissect the great work of Irenaeus, and so to distribute its leading ideas among supposed predecessors as to leave but little to the initiative of the author himself, who accordingly appears in the issue as 'a smaller man' than we had hitherto thought him.[3] This immense and laborious dissertation is, as we should expect from so distinguished a theologian, a treasure-house of information to the student of Irenaeus; but it throws down a challenge which can hardly fail to be taken up by some of those who have little sympathy with the method here adopted and are profoundly dissatisfied with its result.

Our present concern is with the purely literary question as to the

[1] Theophilus von Antiochien und die anderen theologischen Quellen bei Irenaeus (*Texte u. Unters.* xlvi 2 : 1930) pp. 225 f, 358 f.

[2] § 18, 5 *b* (ed. 4 p. 128), § 21, 2 (pp. 140 ff).

[3] Theoph. v. Antioch. p. 432 : 'Irenaeus ist als theologischer Schriftsteller viel kleiner als man bisher annahm'.

point at which the quotation from Justin stops. It may well be that the extension indicated by the editorial italics was due to the supposed correspondence of the first person singular in 'mea ad eum fides' with that of the opening sentence 'non credidissem' (οὐκ ἂν ἐπείσθην); the sequence of thought being: 'Not even the Lord Himself could I have believed, if He had been announcing another God beside the Creator; but—since indeed it was far otherwise—my faith in Him remains firm, and my love for the Father immoveably sure'.

But an examination of the context as cited above makes it difficult to accept this argument. Irenaeus has just said that no consideration of a particular difficulty ought to lead to such a result as a change of God, and the loss of faith in the Creator who sustains us by His creation: 'sicut enim in filium fidem nostram dirigimus, sic et in patrem dilectionem firmam et immobilem habere debemus'. These are the words which immediately precede the quotation from Justin. Is it not most reasonable to think that it is the same hand which writes half a dozen lines lower down: 'firma est mea ad eum (*sc.* filium) fides, et immobilis erga patrem dilectio'?

If it be thought strange that Irenaeus should thus introduce his personal conviction—'mea fides', in contrast with the 'fidem nostram' of the earlier sentence—we may point to the notable passage (iii 6, 31: Harv. ii 24) in which after quoting Elijah's prayer at Carmel—'et ego invocabo in nomine domini dei mei'—he breaks out: 'Et ego igitur invoco te, domine deus Abraham', &c. Need we be surprised that the first person singular of Justin's startling saying should evoke from Irenaeus a personal confession of his own faith as confirmed by the intervening argument?

It is to these intervening sentences that we must direct our attention. Is there any verbal parallel to them in the works of Justin that we know? To his own words of which Eusebius has preserved the Greek we have indeed a striking parallel in the statement about Marcion's teaching in *Apol.* i 58: ἄλλον δέ τινα καταγγέλλει παρὰ τὸν δημιουργὸν τῶν πάντων θεόν, καὶ ὁμοίως ἕτερον υἱόν. But as soon as we pass on, we shall find that it is Irenaeus himself of whom we are reminded at every point.

1. For παρὰ τὸν δημιουργόν the Latin gives us: 'praeter fabricatorem *et factorem et nutritorem nostrum*'. We might perhaps leave these additional words to Justin himself, but for the close parallel in *Iren.* i 4, 1 (Harv. i 94): 'et alius deus excogitetur praeter fabricatorem et factorem et nutritorem huius universitatis', where the Greek (preserved by Epiphanius) is: καὶ ἄλλον θεὸν παρεπινοεῖν παρὰ τὸν δημιουργὸν καὶ ποιητὴν καὶ τροφέα τοῦδε τοῦ παντός. Here there can be no question of borrowing phraseology from Justin or any one else, and the correspondence

with our passage finds its easiest explanation if the hand of Irenaeus is responsible for both. We may further note his own words in the preceding context, 'fabricatorem qui nos alit per suam conditionem'. Is it not indeed most probable that the startling statement of Justin was cited by Irenaeus from memory, and expanded at the end in terms of his own?

The fondness of Irenaeus for these reiterated epithets may be further illustrated by such passages as—

iii 39 (H. ii 133) 'fabricatorem huius universitatis, patrem omnium, providentem et disponentem secundum nos mundum'.

iii 41 (H. ii 136) 'factorem et fabricatorem huius universitatis'.

iii 42, 2 (H. ii 137) 'fabricatorem et factorem huius universitatis, solum verum deum et dominum omnium'.

2. The passage continues: 'Sed quoniam ab uno deo, qui et hunc mundum fecit et nos plasmavit et omnia continet et administrat'.

Parallel phrases are the following:

iii 11, 4 (H. ii 37) 'eum qui plasmavit nos, qui et solus est deus . . . in eum qui fecerit et constituerit et enutriat'.

iv 49, 1 (H. ii 254) 'nec enim esse alterum deum praeter eum qui fecit et plasmavit nos'.

ii 1, 1 (H. i 251) 'et solus continens omnia et omnibus ut sint praestans'.

ii 1, 4 (H. i 253) 'unum esse qui omnia continet'.

iv 34, 1 (H. ii 213) 'qui per semetipsum constituit . . . et continet omnia'.

iv 34, 6 (H. ii 218) 'unus deus pater, qui continet omnia et omnibus esse praestat'.

iv 58, 7 (H. ii 252) 'cuius providentia constant omnia et iussu administrantur omnia'. Contrast what is said in iii 38, 2 (H. ii 133) of the 'invented' God: 'nec terrena administrantem'.

3. 'Unigenitus filius venit ad nos, suum plasma in semetipsum recapitulans.'

'Unigenitus filius' is frequent in Irenaeus, and for the rest of the sentence it would be superfluous to quote more than the almost identical passage, iii 31, 1 (H. ii 121) 'Hoc itaque factum est verbum dei, suum plasma in semetipsum recapitulans'.

4. 'Firma est mea ad eum fides, et immobilis erga patrem dilectio, utraque deo (*leg. cum Arm.* domino) nobis praebente.'

We have seen how these words echo the immediately preceding context, and we may quote one passage to illustrate further the frequent combination of faith and love:

iv 42, 1 (H. ii 238) 'Hi enim et eam quae est in unum deum qui omnia fecit fidem nostram custodiunt, et eam quae est in filium dei dilectionem adaugent'.

In the final clause 'utraque' (faith in the Son and love for the Father) may be compared with the 'utraque', which comes a little lower down, of the knowledge of the Father and of the Son. The correspondence is the closer when with the Armenian version we read (as indicated above) 'domino' for 'deo'—a correction already proposed independently by Loofs.

What on the other hand can be said in favour of attributing these words to Justin? Undoubtedly the debt of Irenaeus to Justin is very great, much greater than a reader of Dr Loofs's book might be led to think. I have dealt with it at some length elsewhere.[1] But here the question is primarily one of phraseology. Can we find in Justin's accredited works any such parallels as we have drawn from Irenaeus?

In his frequent references to the One God, whether addressing himself to heathen or to Jewish opponents, he rings the changes on a series of phrases of a much more limited type. Thus in *Apol.* i 46 we have ὁ πατὴρ πάντων καὶ δεσπότης θεός: as again twice in c. 61 (of baptism) and once in c. 65 (of the eucharist). In *Apol.* ii 10 we read: τὸν δὲ πατέρα καὶ δημιουργὸν πάντων, which is drawn from Plato's *Timaeus*. And in the *Dialogue with Trypho the Jew* we get such phrases as ποιήσας καὶ διατάξας τόδε τὸ πᾶν (c. 11), παντοκράτορα καὶ ποιητὴν τῶν ὅλων θεόν (c. 16), ποιητὴν τῶν ὅλων καὶ πατέρα (cc. 56, 60).

But we miss the variety and superabundance of Irenaeus, and in particular we find no parallel to his τροφεύς (*nutritor*). The Biblical terms πλάσσειν and πλάσμα occur, though but sparingly; and we look in vain for the ἀνακεφαλαιοῦσθαι and ἀνακεφαλαίωσις which belong so distinctively to the theology and diction of Irenaeus.

The conclusion appears inevitable. Eusebius was right in citing as Justin's words no more than he did: in what follows we have the amplification and the comment of Irenaeus himself.

J. ARMITAGE ROBINSON.

[1] *Apostolic Teaching of Irenaeus* (from the Armenian), Introd. pp. 6–34.