

# 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](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_jts-os_01.php)

pdfs are named: [Volume]\_[1<sup>st</sup> page of article]

## NOTES AND STUDIES

LOOFS' THEORY OF THEOPHILUS OF ANTIOCH  
AS A SOURCE OF IRENAEUS I

THE special object of the posthumous work of Friedrich Loofs—*Theophilus von Antiochien adversus Marcionem*<sup>1</sup>—was to shew that Irenaeus incorporated, 'mehr oder minder wörtlich', in his treatise *Adversus Haereses*, without acknowledgement, the lost work of Theophilus against Marcion, which Eusebius (*H. E.* iv 24) said was *οὐκ ἀγεννῶς πεπονημένον*, and to reconstruct it. He declares that he found traces of the missing work in the fourth book of the Treatise, iv 20, 1-6. Following two clues the 'trias' of God, Logos, and Sophia, and the 'Hands' of God he assembled twenty-nine passages in which he professed to find these clues and other ideas he imputes to Theophilus. As there is a reference in Theophilus's work *ad Autolyicum* iii 27 to the records of Chryseros the nomenclator of Marcus Aurelius, after the latter's death in 180 (June), the possibility of Irenaeus having borrowed from that work is precluded. Harnack thought of the earlier tract against Marcion which he dated between 170 and 180. This is the work Loofs set out to reconstruct. The twenty-nine passages (with power to add to their number) given (pp. 11-44) contain some 300 lines, and are among the finest in the Treatise. Of some of these passages, though not of all—he mentions 1, 2, 4, 10, 11-14, 16, 23, 28, 29—he suggests that they are more or less 'unbearbeitet' (p. 44). On p. 72 he says that Irenaeus in the passages in which he is dependent upon IQT adheres frequently 'mehr oder minder wörtlich' to his *Vorlage* and that was 'die Schrift IQT die dem Irenaeus vorlag' (p. 44). This he says of many other passages in addition to the twenty-nine (e.g. iii 20. 2 (p. 92)). The difficulty of pinning the theory down to a clear and definite issue is increased by the number of other sources, IQA, IQU, IQE, IQP, IQTU, and IQS, he has discovered in the treatise, which complicate the subject. But an effective answer can, nevertheless, be given from those passages he has passed over and from those he allows to be Irenaean, which contain the same phrases and ideas, sometimes in a less finished form, that appear in the IQT passages. For he has practically ignored the Gnostic controversy dealt with in his earlier books, which had a considerable influence upon the theological outlook of Irenaeus. The present writer accordingly agrees with Karl Müller of whom Loofs says, p. 45, 'ein so behutsamer Forscher wie Karl Müller' referred to Theophilus as an Apologist 'den Irenaeus nicht gekannt hat'. The tests also of scriptural

<sup>1</sup> *Texte und Untersuchungen* 46. 2, 1930. In this article Harvey's edition of Irenaeus is referred to and its pages given. An asterisk (\*) follows passages not given in Loofs, and a dagger (†) follows passages he allows to be the work of Irenaeus.

quotations and Irenaeus phrases in general in the twenty-nine passages help to disprove the theory. It is to be noted that Irenaeus iii 12. 12 promised a work against Marcion 'nos autem ex his (epistolis) quae adhuc apud eos custodiuntur, arguemus eos, donante Deo, in altera conscriptione', in which he would answer him out of the N.T. Epistles he accepted. As certain of Loofs's extracts, 25 (i 22. 1), 7 (ii 30. 9), 26 (ii 28. 2), and 28 (iii 8. 3), are before iii 12. 12, one might have considered them excluded from consideration owing to their position.

We shall first consider the two clues, the 'Hands' of God and the Trias (not mentioned in this connexion by Irenaeus) of God, His Logos and His Wisdom. In ii 18 Theophilus said—'God having made all things by His word considered the creation of men the only work worthy of His own Hands. God is also found to need help by His saying—"Let us make man, &c." But to no one else but to His own *Word* and *Wisdom* did He say, "let us make man".' Irenaeus has a similar passage (with differences) in iv 20. 1. 'God did not need these (angels) for making what He had predetermined in Himself should be made, *as if He had not His own hands*, for the Word is always with Him, and Wisdom, Son and Spirit, through whom and in whom He made all things "libere et sponte", and to whom He spake "Let us make man".' 'Quasi ipse suas non haberet manus' is Irenaeus. See iv 35. 1 (\*), an argument with Valentinians. It is absurd, he says, to represent the Father of all in such a state of need, 'quasi non habuerit sua instrumenta', hands being understood *ὀργάνων τρόπον* (Philo *De M. Op.* 52). Theophilus calls the Logos and Wisdom the Hands of God, Irenaeus the Logos and Wisdom, whom he defines as Son and Spirit, e.g. 'verbum et sapientia, filius et Spiritus', 4. 20. 1 (no. 1); 'the hands of God, that is Son and Spirit' (5. 28. 4, no. 24), 4 Prol. 4, 'through His Hands, that is through Son and Holy Spirit' (no. 19); while Theophilus in the five passages, 1, 7, 2, 10 (twice), 15, 18 keeps to his pair 'word and wisdom' (wisdom and word in 1. 10 p. 80), without any addition or substitution of Son and Spirit. Now both writers could have found the term 'Hands of God' in many passages in the LXX and Philo with whom it can be shewn that both were familiar, e.g. Ps. 94. 4, 'Thy hands have fashioned me'; 4 Esdras iii 5 'Adam figmentum manuum tuarum' (cf. viii 7); Philo *De M. Op.* 52 (Adam) *χειρὶ θείας γενόμενος*; *De Nobil.* 3 (Adam) *χειρὶ θείας γενόμενος*; *De Plant.* 12, the world was prepared *ὑπὸ χειρῶν Θεοῦ, τῶν κοσμοποιῶν αὐτοῦ δυνάμεων*. The highest of these are *two*. See 1. 225. 18 (Cohn), where God is *δορυφορούμενος ὑπὸ δυεῖν τῶν ἀνωτάτω δυνάμεων*. The 'Hands' of God in Philo are these *two δυνάμεις*. See 1. 430 (Tauchnitz) where God is *διαλεγόμενός τισιν ὡς ἂν συνεργούς αὐτοῦ, ταῖς ὑπηκόοις δυνάμεσι . . . λέγων ποιήσωμεν κτλ.*; *De Fuga* 13 *διαλέγεται ὁ τῶν ὄλων πατὴρ ταῖς ἑαυτοῦ δυνάμεσι*, to whom

He entrusted the forming of the mortal part of the soul, when He fashioned τὸ λογικόν (cf. *Timaeus* 41). He defines these two δυνάμεις in *Leg. Alleg.* ii 21, 'the *Sophia of God* is the very first of His δυνάμεις which he separated from Himself, but God is the most universal (γενικώτατον) and second is ὁ Θεοῦ λόγος'. He said in *QRDH*, 41, that the world was made by the Divine Sophia, and in *De Op. M.* 5 by the Divine Logos (δύναμις ἢ κοσμοποιητικῆ); and in *De Cherubim* 35, the Logos is the ὄργανον through which the world was made. In Philo, therefore, the Sophia and Logos are the Hands of God. See also Wisdom (S) 9. 1 θεὸς . . . ὁ ποιήσας τὰ πάντα ἐν λόγῳ σου καὶ τῇ σοφίᾳ σου κατεσκεύασας ἄνθρωπον. Here also the Word and Wisdom co-operate in the creation. Ezekiel used 'hand' as an alternative for Spirit, e.g. 'the hand of the Lord God fell upon me' (8. 1); 'the Spirit of the Lord fell upon me' (11. 1) (Gk. and Heb.); 'the hand of the Lord led me' (40. 1); 'the Spirit led me' (11. 1) (Gk. and Heb.). In 3. 14, 'the Spirit . . . and the Hand of the Lord'; 37. 1 'the hand of the Lord was upon me, and the flood carried me away ἐν πνεύματι'. So when Theophilus 1. 7 said ὁ Θεὸς διὰ τοῦ λόγου αὐτοῦ καὶ τῆς σοφίας ἐποίησε τὰ πάντα and Iren. in iv 20. 4 wrote the original of 'Deus, qui verbo et sapientia fecit et adaptavit omnia', they both had common authorities and expressions to draw upon, quite independently of each other. The same applies to their use of 'Hands' and to their conversation of God with His powers (see Philo, 1. 430, 432, 556. T *et al.*). Cf. 4 Prol. 4; 5. 1. 3, *et al.* Again, Irenaeus in several passages claimed for IQT iv 20. 1; iv 20. 3; iv 7. 4; *Epidēixis* 10 *et al.* expressly equates Sapientia with Spirit, whereas Theophilus never calls Spirit wisdom or wisdom Spirit. Indeed, it appears that he identifies the Logos and Wisdom in some places. ii 10, the Logos of God says through Moses 'in the beginning . . . for the Divine Wisdom foresaw'. In the same chapter he defines ὁ λόγος . . . ὡς πνεῦμα θεοῦ καὶ ἀρχὴ καὶ σοφία καὶ δύναμις ὑψίστου (Luke 1. 35), confusing the Logos with Spirit and Wisdom and making Him the instrument of His own incarnation indirectly<sup>1</sup> [*Adv. Haer.* v 3. 1 \*, Pater qui operatus est incarnationem]. Loofs, p. 56, admits that the passage 1. 3 εἰ λόγον εἶπω ἀρχὴν αὐτοῦ λέγω is an echo of Prov. 8. 22, 'the Lord created me ἀρχὴν ὁδῶν αὐτοῦ' and that it referred to the *Sophia* of God. See also ii 22 ὁ λόγος αὐτοῦ δύναμις ὡς καὶ σοφία<sup>2</sup> αὐτοῦ ἀναλαμβάνων κτλ. In ii 10 it is uncertain whether Theophilus ascribes Prov. 8. 27 f to the Word or Wisdom. *Adv. Haer.* iv 20. 2 refers it to Sapientia, 'quae est Spiritus per Salomonem ait'. Theophilus says 'there were no prophets when the world was made but the Wisdom

<sup>1</sup> Theophilus in this work never mentions Christ, deriving 'Christian' from χρίσμα (χρισμέθα ἔλαιον θεοῦ), or the Atonement or Incarnation.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Justin *Dial.* 61 ὁ λόγος τῆς σοφίας ὡς . . . λόγος καὶ σοφία καὶ δύναμις.

of God which was in Him and His holy Logos, ὁ ἀεὶ συμπαρὼν αὐτῷ, wherefore through Solomon, the prophet, οὕτως λέγει (no subject), when He prepared the heaven συμπαρήμην αὐτῷ. This seems to refer to the Logos. In ii 9 Theophilus speaks of men who were filled with (πνευματοφόροι) *the Holy Spirit*, taught of God, having become 'organs of God' and χωρήσαντες σοφίαν τῆν παρ' αὐτοῦ, through which wisdom they spake: but he never calls the Spirit Wisdom or Wisdom Spirit. It is clear then that these precise passages: 'Sapientia quae est Spiritus' in iv 20. 3 (no. 3); 'verbum et Sapientia, filius et Spiritus' iv 20. 1 (no. 1); 'der heilige Geist der die Weisheit des Vaters ist' (*Epid.* 10), no. 9; and similar passages could never have been written by Theophilus, whose 'triad' is 'God, Word, and Wisdom' (ii 20), not Father, Son, and Spirit. This is Irenaeus's formula, e.g. iv 38. 3 (no. 16, c) iv 20. 5 (no. 15), although he uses the other, 'Word and Wisdom'. On the other hand, Irenaeus found the identification of Wisdom and Spirit in the Valentinian writings, e.g. 1. 4. 1 \* 'Sophia is also named Holy Spirit', 1. 6. 4 \*, 'there is a syzygy of the Saviour and Wisdom'; 1. 5. 3 \* 'Achamoth is called Wisdom and Holy Spirit'. Philo *De Gigant.* 11, *et al.* speaks of the divine *Spirit* of Wisdom (τὸ σοφίας πνεῦμα θεῶν). Wisdom (S) 7. 6 has σοφία πνεῦμα νοερόν.

Theophilus got his *τριάς* from Philo who used it frequently, e.g. *De Abr.* x περίσεμνος τριάς ἐνὸς εἶδους (also *De S. Abel.* 15, *De Abrah.* 24); *Quaest. in Gen.* iv 2, 'pro uno triadis apparitionem faceret'. In *De Op. M.* 20 Philo uses *τριάς* of the first three days of Creation and proceeds to speak of the tetras. So does Theophilus in ii 15, finding the three days types of God, His Word, and His Wisdom, and in the fourth a type of man. Philo also wrote a treatise on the *Monarchia* of God. Theophilus has several references to the mystery of the Divine Monarchia, e.g. ii 4, 8 *et al.* Irenaeus has the word *trinitas* in ii 15. 1 \* among other numbers, e.g. quinio, octonatio, when discussing the thirty aeons, and therefore did not use it of God. In the same way he rejected the use of *προφορικός* with λόγος because of a Gnostic connexion. Theophilus used it (ii 10, 22). But he has the doctrine independently of Theophilus, e.g. in 1. 21. 3 \* we have a Gnostic Baptism 'into the name of the Unknown Father, into Truth, into Him who descended upon Jesus'. In 1. 8. 5 \* he says Valentinus discovered the doctrine in John 1, 1. 2 διαστείλας τὰ τρία, θεὸν καὶ Ἀρχὴν καὶ Λόγον πάλιν καὶ ἐνοῖ; in 1. 23. 1 \* Simon declared that he himself came 'as Son among the Jews, descended as Father in Samaria, and came as the Holy Spirit to the Gentiles'; and in 1. 2. 6 \* he gives the Valentinian phrase *συνευδοκούντος τοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ τοῦ πνεύματος, τοῦ δὲ πατρὸς αὐτῶν συνεπισφραγιζομένου*, afterwards developed in iv 38. 3 (IQT 16c) *τοῦ πατρὸς εὐδοκούντος, . . . τοῦ υἱοῦ πρᾶσσοντος . . . τοῦ πνεύματος τρέφοντος*, a passage

which abounds in genitive absolutes, a peculiarity of Irenaeus, but very sparingly used by Theophilus (see below). Again in I. 4. 1\* we have Father, Sophia, Logos, and Christ in a Valentinian passage: '(Enthymesis) is called Sophia after her Father, for her Father is called Sophia, and Holy Spirit from the Spirit τὸ περὶ Χριστόν and is emptied of the invisible Logos who is with her, who is Christ.' This may be regarded as the origin of such passages in the later books of the *Adv. Haer.* as 'verbum id est filius . . . et sapientia quae est Spiritus (iv 20. 3): 'filius et Spiritus Sanctus, verbum et sapientia' (iv 7. 4) in which the Son is emphatically identified with the Word, and Wisdom with the Spirit. Other passages are *Epideixis* 8 and 10 and iv 20. 1, all being assigned to IQT. But there are no parallel passages in Theophilus. Irenaeus has such variations as Father, Spirit of God, Word, iv 14. 2\*; Father, Word of God, Spirit of God, iv 33. 9\*; Father, Spirit of God, Son, iv 33. 7\*; God, Son, Spirit, 4 Prol. 4 IQT (19); and v 28. 4 IQT 24. Theophilus adheres to 'God, His Word, and His Wisdom'. We are entitled, therefore, to claim 'Father, Son, Spirit' in iv 38. 3 IQT 16 as an Irenaeian phrase. In Philo we have Father, Logos, and Sophia in some passages, e.g. *De Fuga* 20, 'The Logos of God had God as Father and Sophia as mother.' He frequently connects Logos and Sophia, e.g. *De Somn.* ii 37 and iii 131. 1 (C) πηγή σοφίας λόγος θεῖος. He has also God, the Spirit, and the Logos together, e.g. iii 44. 5 (C), 'the soul of man is the coinage of τὸ θεῖον πνεῦμα, stamped by the seal of God, whose impress is the everlasting Logos.' He called the Logos 'Son', πρωτόγονος υἱός (ii 106. 1 C), and identified the Spirit with Wisdom 1. 265 (Tauch.). So we may regard the phrase 'God, His Logos, and His Wisdom' as Philonian. In some places Theophilus used πνεῦμα θεοῦ in the materialistic sense of breath. 'If I say He is πνεῦμα, I speak of His breath' (ἀναπνοή) (1. 3). 'The whole creation is contained by the πνεῦμα θεοῦ—(a sort of anima mundi)—and τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ περιέχον along with the creation is contained (περιέχεται) by the Hand of God' (1. 5).<sup>1</sup> In 1. 7: 'You draw in His breath (τούτου τὸ πνεῦμα ἀναπνεῖς) and you ignore Him.' Celsus took the Spirit in this sense. It was soiled, he says, by the Incarnation. In 1. 3 Theophilus distinguished Spirit from Wisdom, for he proceeds: 'If I say He is *Wisdom*, I speak of his progeny' (γέννημα). On the other hand the 'Spiritus Dei' in *Adv. Haer.* is 'Sapientia Dei'. As a theologian, Irenaeus is, therefore, under no debt to Theophilus. The so-called 'clues' of IQT fail in this examination.

*The test of scriptural quotations.*

This test applied to the twenty-nine passages that are said to form

<sup>1</sup> The *pneuma* of God is thus inferior to His *Hand*, in Theophilus, and distinguished from it.

the nucleus of Theophilus's lost work reveals many differences between Irenaeus and Theophilus.

Extract I. iv 20. 1 (Harvey ii 213) has Gen. 2. 7: 'plasmavit Deus hominem limum terrae accipiens'. This text occurs in *Adv. Haer.* four times and always with a verb governing 'limum' probably after Philo i 32 T. *χοῦν λαβών*. Theophilus (ii 19) with Heb. and LXX has no verb. Gen. 1. 26; 'faciamus hominem, &c.' This occurs seven times in *Adv. Haer.* In only one, 1. 24. 1, has he the second *κατά* (a Gnostic passage). Theophilus quotes it twice (ii 18) with second *κατά*.

II. iv 20. 2 (ii 214) has many quotations: (1) 'Verbum caro factum', John 1. 14 (eight times in *Adv. Haer.*, not once in Theophilus). (2) 'Agnus qui occisus est', Apoc. 5. 6; also iv 20. 11 \*, 'Agnum stantem quasi occisum', not in Theoph. (3) 1 Pet. 2. 22, 'Qui peccatum non fecit nec inventus est dolus in ore ejus'; iii 16. 9 † has the continuation: 'Qui cum pateretur non est minatus.' Theophilus does not refer to this and has only four clichés from the Petrines, two incorrect. Irenaeus has eleven quotations in passages not in Loofs. (4) 'primogenitus mortuorum', Col. 1. 18, not in Theoph. (In iii 22. 4 †; v. 31. 2 †; iv 2. 3 \*; ii 22. 4 (IQS).) The words here—'ut quemadmodum in caelis principatum habuit Verbum Dei sic et in terra haberet principatum'—are an echo of iii 16. 6 † 'uti sicut in supercaelestibus . . . princeps est Verbum Dei, sic in visibilibus, principatum habeat.' Theophilus has nothing to correspond. (5) 'ut videant omnia, quemadmodum praediximus, suum regem'. This refers back to iv 11. 1 \*, which comments upon Matt. 21. 8 sq.: 'audiebant venturum regem, praesentem viderunt'. Theophilus has no reference to Matt. 21.

No. II, one of the passages mentioned as 'mehr oder minder wörtlich' from IQT (p. 44), is a string of scriptural passages and echoes to which Theophilus has nothing to correspond, but Irenaeus in passages not in Loofs or allowed by him to be Irenaeus has much.

III. iv 20. 3 (ii 214 f) has quotations from Proverbs. (1) iii 19 f, with *δρόσον* (LXX *ἄσπερον δρόσῳ*) and *αἰσθήσει αὐτοῦ* (LXX *ἄσπερον* and Heb.). Theoph. 1. 7 has *δρόσους* and *αἰσθήσει* with LXX B. (2) viii 27-31, Iren. 'pararet', LXX *ἠροίμαζεν*, Theoph. *ἠροίμασεν* (2. 10), v. 28<sup>b</sup>, 'tum firmos faceret fontes abyssi' (omitted by Theoph.). Cf. Justin *Dial.* 61.

VII.<sup>1</sup> ii 30. 9 (1. 367)—a Valentinian context discussing 'Mater'. Bythus, 'Pleroma xxx aeonum' assigned to IQT because the extract contains 'per verbum et sapientiam suam'. (1) The one quotation 'verbo virtutis suae', Heb. 1. 3, proves the passage is not anti-Marcionite. In ii 12. 12 \* Irenaeus promised to confute Marcion 'ex his (epistulis) quae adhuc apud eos custodiuntur'. He did not accept Hebrews, but Valentinus did (iii 12. 12). (2) The phrase 'pater . . . omnia capiens,

<sup>1</sup> No quotations in iv, v, vi.

solus autem a nemine capi potest' is a repetition of I. 15. 5 \* πάντα χωροῦντα πατέρα ἀχώρητον δὲ ὑπάρχοντα. iv 20. 2 cites Hermas *Mand.* i 1 as γραφή. 'Father' does not occur in Hermas *Mand.* i 1 but is emphasized in ii 30. 9.

X. iv 20. 1 (ii 212) 'haec (dilectio) est quae nos per verbum ejus perducit ad Deum'. An echo of John 14. 6 'nemo venit ad Patrem nisi per me' in iv 7. 3 \* explained as 'per Filium, id est per Verbum cognoscitur'. Theophilus has no reference to John 14.

XI. iv 20. 5 (ii 216). (1) Matt. 5. 8 'Beati mundo corde quoniam ipsi Deum videbunt'. Also in iv 9. 2 \* Theophilus (I. 2) has a loose paraphrase, 'wherever there is sin in a man, such cannot see (θεωρεῖν) God'. (2) Exod. 33. 20 'nemo videbit Deum et vivet'. Also in I. 19. 1 \*, iv 20. 11 \*, iv 20. 9 †. (3) Luke 18. 27 'quae impossibilia apud homines possibilia apud Deum' (correct order); also in ii 10. 2 \* and v 5. 2, *Epideixis* 97. Theoph. ii 13 refers to this text once, changing the order, τὰ παρὰ ἀνθρώποις ἀδύνατα, δυνατὰ ἐστὶ παρὰ θεῶ. These quotations are against Loofs's theory. This is confirmed by the abl. absolutes, a constant feature in *Adv. Haer.* 'Spiritu praeparante . . . filio adducente . . . patre donante.'

XII. iv 20. 6 (ii 216 f). An echo of Rom. 11. 33 in τὸ μέγεθος αὐτοῦ ἀνεξιχνίαστον καὶ ἡ ἀγαθότης αὐτοῦ ἀνεξήγητος (Theoph. i 2 has μεγέθει ἀκατάληπτος . . . ἀγαθοσύνη ἀμίμητος. He does not use ἀγαθότης, often in *Adv. Haer.*). See also *Adv. Haer.* i 15. 6 \* τὸν ἄρρητον ἐξηγεῖται καὶ ἀνεξιχνίαστον ἐξιστορεῖ; i. 2. 2 \* τὸ μέγεθος τοῦ βάθους καὶ τὸ ἀνεξιχνίαστον τοῦ Πατρὸς. i. 10. 3 \* has the whole passage, \*Ὁ βάθος πλοῦτον καὶ σοφίας . . . αἱ ὁδοὶ αὐτοῦ, correctly. Theoph. ii 12 has it incorrectly: τὸν πλοῦτον τῆς σοφίας τοῦ θεοῦ. He often quotes inaccurately.

XIII. iv 20. 6 (ii 218) has no quotation but a string of abl. absolutes—'Spiritu operante, filio ministrante, patre comprobante'—which shew the hand of Irenaeus.

XIV. iv 20. 7 (ii 219) has an echo of Rom. 2. 19 f, not in Theoph.—'quae est per conditionem ostensio dei'. The same natural revelation is found in ii 9. 2 \*, 'ethnicis ab ipsa conditione discentibus . . . ipsa conditio ostendit eum qui condidit eam'.

XV. iv 33. 15 (ii 269) (Acts ii 17, Joel ii 28) 'Spiritus Dei in novissimis temporibus nove effusus est in nos'. Not in Theoph., but often in *Adv. Haer.*, e.g. iii 11. 9 †, iii 17. 1 \*, iii 12. 1 \*, 'hunc promisit effundere in novissimis temporibus'. This phrase to which Irenaeus was partial stamps the extract as his.

XVI. iv 38. 3 (ii 295) a long Greek extract in the style of Wisdom (S) concludes with Wisdom vi 20 ἀφθαρσία δὲ ἐγγὺς εἶναι ποιεῖ τον θεον. He borrowed his preceding phrase περιποιητικὴ ἀφθαρσίας also from *Βεβαίωσις ἀφθαρσίας* (Wisdom l. c.). Cf. iv 13. 4 † 'Amicitia Dei con-



donatrix est immortalitatis'. Theoph. does not quote from the Apocrypha but Ir. does often. In this extract ἀγαθότης (Wisdom i 1. 7, 26. Sir. 45. 23 *et al.*) three times, not in Theophilus.

XVIII. iii 18. 7 (II. 100 f). τὸν μεσίτην θεοῦ τε καὶ ἀνθρώπων, 1 Tim. 2. 5 (not in Theophilus who has no reference to Incarnation or the Atonement). It goes on: διὰ τῆς ἰδίας πρὸς ἑκατέρους οἰκειότητος εἰς φιλίαν τοὺς ἀμφοτέρους συναγαγεῖν. Compare 'in amicitiam restituit nos Dominus per suam incarnationem, mediator Dei et hominum factus', v 17. 1 (not IQT). There would be no point in quoting the Pastorals against Marcion who did not accept them. Theoph. has a few clichés from the Pastorals. In ii. 16 he has διὰ ὕδατος καὶ λουτροῦ παλιγγενεσίας, Tit. iii 5 making an addition as usual, correct in v 15. 3. He adds iii 13, ἀλλοτριάν after γυναῖκα (Mt. 5. 28), correct in iv 16. 4 \*; ἡ χεῖρ in Mt. 6. 3, iii 14, correct in iv 30. 3.

XX. iv 39. 2 f (ii 399). (1) Exod. 25. 11 'liniet te ab intus et a foris auro puro' (καταχρυσώσεις αὐτήν (κιβωτὸν) χρυσίῳ καθαρῷ ἔσωθεν καὶ ἔξωθεν). Theoph. has no reference to Exod. 25. *Adv. Haer.* has many, e.g. 25. 10 in ii 24. 3 \*, the measurements of the ark. (2) Ps. 44. 12 'et ipse Rex concupiscat speciem tuam', iv 33. 10 \* quotes a long passage from Ps. 44. 3-8 emphasizing *species*, 'speciosus forma', 'specie tua', 'speciem ejus'. Theoph. has one echo of the first verse τὸν λόγον ἐξερευξάμενος (ii 10). (3) 'fugeris manus ejus' (see xxi).

XXI. v 1. 3 (ii 317). (1) 'non effugit Adam manus Dei'; cf. 2 Macc. 7. 31 οὐ μὴ διαφυγῆς τὰς χεῖρας τοῦ θεοῦ (not in Theoph.), Wisdom (S) 16. 15 τὴν σὴν χεῖρα φυγεῖν ἀδύνατόν ἐστι (not in Theoph.). Cf. iii 23. 5 \* 'non quasi possit Adam effugere Deum'. (2) 'non ex voluntate carnis neque ex voluntate viri'. John 1. 13, not in Theoph. but in iii 16. 2 † and iii 19. 2 †. (3) 'fiet secundum imaginem et similitudinem Dei.' Gen. 1. 26, as usual, without the second κατὰ which Theoph. has twice in ii 18.

XXII. v 5. 1 (ii 330): a reference to the μετάθεσις of Enoch and the ἀνάληψις of Elias. Theophilus says nothing of either. But Irenaeus does, e.g. iv 16. 1 \*, 'Enoch placens Deo homo translatus est' (repeated), a parallel to the phrase preceding this extract—'Ἐνώχ ἐναρσετήσας τῷ θεῷ ἐν σώματι μετετέθη after Ecclus. 44. 16 and Heb. 11. 5. There are references to the Assumption of Elias here and in v. 5. 2 (IQS), 'the fiery chariot' is after Ecclus. 48. 9. Theophilus does not quote the Apocrypha.

XXIV. v 28. 4 (ii 403). (1) Mt. 13. 30 τοῦ ἀχύρου (Mt. 3. 12) ἀποσκευαζομένον, ὅπερ ἐστὶν ἡ ἀποστασία, τοῦ δὲ σίτου εἰς τὴν ἀποθήκην ἀναλαμβάνομένου (Greek in T. u. U. 38. 3, S. 431 Holl.). The latter are πρὸς θεὸν πίστει καρποφοροῦντες. Cf. v 27. 1 \* 'colligere primum zizania . . . triticum autem colligere in horreum'. iv 40. 2 \* gives an

explanation of the parable of the zizania (Mt. 13. 25 f). ii 27. 3 \* 'triticum condit in horreum'. Theophilus has no reference to Mt. 3 or 13. Here the chaff is explained as ἡ ἀποστασία, to which Theophilus makes no reference, but it is often in *Adv. Haer.*, e.g. ii 7. 1 \*. It is explained in v 25. 1 (not IQT but IQE). In iv 40. 2 \* supra, the tares are sown by ὁ ἀποστάτης ἄγγελος described in iv 40. 1 \* as ὁ ἀρχηγὸς τῆς ἀποστασίας. (2) πρὸς θεὸν πίστει καρποφοροῦντες. Rom. 7. 4 (not in Theoph.) καρποφορήσωμεν τῷ θεῷ. v 14. 4 † explains the context Romans 7. 5 as 'fructificemus vitae'. (3) Gen. 1. 26 is cited without second κατὰ (in Theoph. twice).

XXV. 1. 22. 1 (1. 188 f). (1) Ps. 33. 6 'verbo enim domini caeli firmati sunt et spiritu oris ejus omnis virtus eorum'. So LXX after Heb. and iii 8. 2 \*, i 21. 5 \*. Theoph. (1. 7) omits τοῦ στόματος. (2) John 1. 3 'omnia per ipsum facta, etc.' nine times in *Adv. Haer.*, e.g. ii 2. 4 \*, once in Theoph. (ii 22). Here and in ii 2. 4 \* Irenaeus stresses the *omnia*; here 'ex omnibus nihil subtractum est', there 'in omnibus est hic . . . mundus . . .'. Theophilus makes no comment on 'omnia'.

XXVI. ii 28. 2 (1. 349). (1) An echo of 1 Cor. 13. 2 (not in Theoph.), 'scientia mysteriorum ejus'; cf. iv 12. 2 †, 'mysteriorum comprehensio'.

XXVII. *Epidexis* 5. (1) Eph. 4. 6, not in Theoph. but often in *Adv. Haer.*, e.g. iv 32. 1 †, ii. 2. 6 \*, iv 22. 2 \*. In four places as here Iren. has the reading of D, 'in omnibus nobis'. (2) Here it is followed by Gal. 4. 6 (not in Theoph.) 'der Geist der ausruft "Abba Vater"', see v 9. 2 \* 'Spiritus . . . qui clamat "Abba Pater"'. Cf. also Rom. 8. 15, in iv 9. 2 \* 'Spiritus sanctum . . . qui clamat *Abba Pater*'.

XXVIII. iii 8. 3 (ii 29). (1) Ps. 32. 9 (not in Theoph.), order of clauses purposely changed to emphasize ἐνετείλατο, 'cui ergo praecepit? Verbo scilicet.' ii 2. 4 \* correct order. In both places explanatory of John 1. 3, which immediately precedes in both, 'omnia per ipsum facta, etc.' There is no reason then why Loofs should here divide these texts between different sources.

XXIX. 4. 38. 1 (ii 292). A discussion on the different foods suitable to νήπιος and τέλειος, on pages 292, 293, 294 Harvey.<sup>1</sup> Loofs assigns p. 292 (omitting the opening sentence) and a line and a half of p. 293 to IQT. The rest of pp. 293 and 294, omitting the last line and a half, he says is Irenaeus (p. 421). This division cuts into the explanation of Heb. v 12-14, which is supported by 1 Cor. 3. 2 (γάλα ὑμᾶς ἐπότισα οὐ βρῶμα) which is in the latter portion of the passage. The former portion (IQT) has 'the mother is able to give the babe τὸ ἔμβρωμα but it is not able to receive it. So God was able to give τὸ

<sup>1</sup> A subject discussed by Philo 1. 62, 301; 2. 332 (T); also in 1 Cor. 14. 20, 2. 6, 3. 2; Eph. 4. 13.

τέλειον to man from the beginning, but he was not able to receive it, *νήπιος γὰρ ἦν* (Heb. v 13). The latter portion (†) has *ἀγύμναστα ἔχειν τὰ τῆς ψυχῆς αἰσθητήρια τῆς πρὸς θεὸν γυμνασίας* after Heb. v 14 *τῶν τὰ αἰσθητήρια γεγυμνασμένα ἔχοντων πρὸς*. This latter portion has references to a mother, e.g. *μασθός, γαλακτουργία*. The division of this passage between different sources is therefore illogical, the latter portion being incomprehensible without the former. Irenaeus, also, could not quote Hebrews against Marcion who did not accept it. Theophilus (ii 25) also refers to the *στερεὰ τροφή* of Heb. 5. 12. He says Adam was *νήπιος* and could not hold (*χωρεῖν*) knowledge; Irenaeus, that man could not receive (*λαβεῖν*) perfection (*τὸ τέλειον*). They elaborated their different subjects differently. *τέλειος* is the key-note of both portions of this passage. If Irenaeus wrote the latter part, as is allowed, he also wrote the former part. The quotation test as applied to the passages which have quotations proves that they are Irenaeus, and might be largely extended. It shews that there is no parallel as alleged (p. 69. 8th parallel) between Theoph. ii 25 'not envying, *ὡς οἰονταί τινες*, did God forbid him *ἐσθίειν ἀπὸ τῆς γνώσεως* (sc. *τοῦ ξύλου*)', and iii 23. 6 (IQT), 'non invidens ei lignum *vitae quemadmodum audent quidam dicere*.' *Adv. Haer.* used a controversial expression, also in iv 17. 1 \* and refers to a different tree. Loofs claims passages containing *ornamenta* and *adornare* for IQT, and yet in iii 6. 5 \* Irenaeus has 'omne *ornamentum caeli*' (LXX. Deut. iv 19 *κόσμος*), and Theophilus has *σπατία*. Many of the twenty-nine passages examined consist largely of quotations. And as Loofs (p. 72) asserts that Irenaeus 'da, wo er von IQT abhängig ist, vielfach mehr oder weniger wörtlich an seine Vorlage sich angeschlossen hat', we must consider the quotations included, unless we are to believe that a man like Irenaeus, who gives his authorities so openly and so frequently, in order to conceal his borrowings of IQT, deliberately altered the quotations as they stood in the tract of Theophilus! The latter's method of quotation was very different from the former's, being inexact, as we see in the tract *ad Autolycum*.

F. R. MONTGOMERY HITCHCOCK.

(To be continued.)