disciples 'asking' in his name, using *αἰτέω*, and in verse 16 he says *κἀγὼ ἐρωτήσω τὸν πατέρα*. In xvi. 26 there is the same contrast between the disciples 'asking' (*αἰτέω*) and Jesus 'praying the Father' (*ἐρωτάω*). It seems as though the difference of subject determines the difference in verbs. The disciples *αἰτοῦσιν* the Father, Jesus *ἐρωτᾷ*. But in xvi. 23 we read *ἐμὲ οὐκ ἐρωτήσετε οὐδέν*, and immediately afterwards *αἰτέω* is again used, three times in succession, in reference to 'asking the Father' in Jesus' name. In six other cases *ἐρωτάω* is used in the same sense with a subject other than Jesus, but in three of them, as in xvi. 23, it is Jesus who is asked.

The widening of the sense of *ἐρωτάω* found in the N.T. has been explained as a Semitism. It is, however, very rare in the LXX, while several examples of it have been found in the papyri. This suggests that it was common in the *κοινή*, but, if it was, it is curious that it has not survived in Modern Greek. C. C. TARELLI

SIGLA FOR THE SYRIAC VERSIONS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT

JÜLICHER has referred[1] to the vexatious confusion caused by the diversity of the systems of symbols employed to represent the different Syriac versions of the New Testament. The same problem is briefly noticed in the section of Dobschütz–Nestle which lists the Syriac texts and which begins: 'Über die Siglen herrscht noch keine Einigkeit.'[2] How great is the diversity may be illustrated by the following table in which are set out the sigla used by a few scholars who cite the Syriac evidence.[3]

	Sinaitic	Curetonian	Peshitta	Harclean	Palestinian
Tischendorf		syr^{cu}	syr^{sch}	syr^{p}	syr^{hr}
Souter	𝔖 (vt.^{s})	𝔖 (vt.^{c})	𝔖 (vg.)	𝔖 (hl.)	𝔖 (pal.)
Legg	Sy.$^{s.}$	Sy.$^{c.}$	Sy.$^{pesh.}$	Sy.$^{hl.}$	Sy.$^{hier.}$
Allen	S^{1}	S^{2}	S^{3}	S^{4}	S^{5}
Gould			Pesh.	Harcl.	Hier.
Plummer	Sin.	Cur.	Pesh.	Harcl.	Hier.
M'Neile	𝔖sin	𝔖cur	𝔖pesh	𝔖hcl	𝔖pal
Swete	syr^{sin}	syr^{cu}	syr^{pesh}	syr^{hcl}	syr^{hier}
Creed	syr.sin	syr.cur	syr.vg	syr.hl	syr.pal

That there is no uniformity even within the same series of commentaries is evident from these lists. Of the confusion which can result one illustration may be given. For the addition at Matt. xx. 28

[1] *Introduction to the New Testament*, trans. by J. P. Ward (London, 1904), 614.

[2] *Einführung in das Griechische Neue Testament* (Göttingen, 1923), 109.

[3] The first three references are to editions of the Greek; the next three are to the commentaries in the I.C.C. series on the Synoptic Gospels; the last three are to the commentaries published by Macmillan on those Gospels.

Tischendorf cites, as part of the Syriac evidence, $syr^{p\ cod\ mg}$, the symbol syr^{p} representing, as he explains, 'syriaca posterior ex ed. Iosephi White'.[1] In his comment on this passage M'Neile adduces as a witness for the augmented text pesh cod. mg, an error only to be explained as a misinterpretation of syr^{p}.

From those lists may be illustrated also certain defects which must be avoided by any system of sigla proposed for universal adoption. Some, for example, have sacrificed brevity to clarity. Swete's syr^{pesh} is in length only one letter less than the whole word Peshitta. Such fullness is permissible in a commentary, but in a modern critical edition of the Greek text brevity must be considered almost of prime importance.[2] Yet a system which commends itself because of the compactness of its sigla may still be open to objection. Thus although brevity is achieved in the scheme adopted by Allen, this use of mathematical symbols has certain defects. First, his numerals convey a suggestion of chronological order which may be regarded as question-begging. Few perhaps would deny that the Sinaitic text is earlier than the Curetonian or that the Peshitta is later than both, but it is doubtful whether those relationships should be indicated by their sigla. Secondly, they are not adaptable to new discoveries. If, for example, a third Old Syriac manuscript were found, its inclusion in the series would involve the modification of the numbers for all the later texts. Thirdly, the aid to memory afforded by the initial letter or letters of the name of a text is lost when numbers are used.

It will be observed that most of the sigla in the table consist of two parts, the first giving a general reference to the version by its language, the second indicating a particular translation of that version. It is desirable that in a printed apparatus those two components should be readily distinguishable. This is usually achieved by devices such as the use of a capital letter for the general reference and supralinear type for the particular. But, ignoring the complication that S is used to represent a Greek manuscript, the capital letter alone is not sufficiently prominent for a modern apparatus, and any larger abbreviation involves extra print. Those difficulties Dr. Souter has met by the use of Gothic symbols, a method of indicating the versions which was suggested to him by Sanday and for which he claims general approval.[3] His Gothic capitals meet the requirements of conspicuity and brevity—𝔖 stands out from Roman type yet it involves the printing of only one character—and this feature of Dr. Souter's apparatus might well be commended for adoption by future editors of the Greek New Testament.

In representing the particular texts with the brevity afforded by the

[1] *N.T.G.* I. xv.

[2] Cf. T. W. Manson, *J.T.S.* xliii (1942), 90 f.

[3] *Expositor*, 8th Series, xx (1920), 347.

use of single letters after the Gothic symbols the difficulty is to avoid the confusion caused by the fact that initial p may indicate the Peshitta, the Philoxenian, or the Palestinian, and h the Harclean or the Palestinian (*hier.*). One solution would be to adopt in the ambiguous references a two-letter system, using, for example, either ha or hl for the Harclean. But if possible this ought to be avoided, and in its stead the following scheme is suggested. The recognized symbols for the Sinaitic and the Curetonian are s and c. For the names, Philoxenian and Harclean, there are no alternatives, and p and h may be reserved for those texts. The Peshitta is often referred to as the Syriac Vulgate, and, for the vg of Souter and Creed, v may be adopted. For the Palestinian text, which five editors in our table refer to Jerusalem, the letter j may be employed. Then 𝔖 would represent the consensus of 𝔖s, 𝔖c, 𝔖v, 𝔖p, 𝔖h, and 𝔖j. And the supralinear type, no longer required for the different texts, might well be kept to indicate modifications such as the presence of corrections and marginal readings, e.g. 𝔖h^{m}.

This system, developed for the version in which the representation of the evidence is most complicated, may be applied also to the other versions of the New Testament. Confining ourselves to those cited in the 'New Tischendorf', we would suggest 𝔠s and 𝔠b for the Coptic and 𝔊, 𝔈, and 𝔄 for the Georgian, Ethiopic, and Armenian, in place of Mr. Legg's Cop.$^{sa.}$, Cop.$^{bo.}$, Geo., Aeth., and Arm. The Latin would be represented by 𝔏, but for some purposes Mr. Legg's use of italics to indicate the evidence of this version might be retained. The system would of course have to be reviewed afresh if it were desired to take into consideration the whole field of textual criticism.

The economy of print achieved by the use of the sigla suggested in this note may best be judged by reprinting with revised sigla the apparatus to a single verse from Mr. Legg's edition. The section chosen, the apparatus to Matt. i. 18, consists of only 15½ lines, yet the typescript saved totals 56 letters, 32 full stops, and a pair of brackets.

Matthew i. 18

δε: = *om.* 𝔠b$^{alliq.}$; = et 𝔈𝔄 | ιησου χριστου Uncs. pler. Minusc. pler. 𝔖vhj 𝔠𝔈𝔄𝔊 Iren.^{semel}: > *Χριστου Ιησου* B; *nil nisi Ιησου* W 74; *nil nisi Χριστου* 71 *it. vg.* 𝔖 cs Iren.^{bis} | γενεσις ℵBCPSWZΔΘΣ 1. 1582. 259. 372. 399. 482. 1604 al., *similiter* 𝔠b Eus.: *γεννησις* LΠל (*exc.* S) 209. 124. 346. 543. 28. 33. 157. 700. 892. 1241 al., *item* generatio *it. vg.*, *similiter* 𝔖𝔠s 𝔈𝔄𝔊 Iren. Epiph. Aug. | μνηστευθεισης *sine add.* ℵBC*ZP^{1} 1. 209*. 372. 700. 1241. *it.* (*exc. d*) *vg.* VSS rell. Epiph. Aug.: + *γαρ* C^{2}LPWΔΘΠΣל 209^{2}. 124. 346. 543. 28. 33. 157. 565. 892 al. pler. *d* Eus. | *om.* της μητρος αυτου *l*44 | μαριας: = mariam 𝔖 csvj 𝔊 | ευρεθη: *ηυρεθη* 1. 1582 Epiph.$^{pan.2.87}$.

WILLIAM DUFF MCHARDY

IRENAEUS, *ADV. HAER.* 3. 3. 2

IT may seem more than a little optimistic to suppose that in the present year of grace it is possible to say anything that has not been repeated *ad nauseam* on the subject of the famous utterance of Irenaeus with regard to the position of the Roman Church in *adv. Haer.* 3. 3. 2. Unfortunately the passage has usually been interpreted, not in the light of the literature of the age, but in the light of the theological presuppositions of the writer or of the communion whose system he is concerned to defend.

Irenaeus is defending the truth of the historical tradition of Christianity against the alleged secret traditions produced in Gnostic writings by appealing to the apostolic Churches; and since it would be tedious to quote them all, it is enough to appeal to the tradition of Rome, founded by SS. Peter and Paul. 'Ad hanc enim ecclesiam propter potentiorem[1] principalitatem necesse est omnem convenire ecclesiam, hoc est, eos qui sunt undique fideles, in qua semper ab his, qui sunt undique, conservata est ea quae est ab apostolis traditio.' The well-known questions are: (1) does the *potior* or *potentior principalitas* refer to the primacy of the Roman Church (in whatever precise sense) or to the imperial pre-eminence of the city of Rome? (2) do the words *convenire ad* mean that every Church must come together to, i.e. resort to, the Church of Rome, because business of one kind or another is always bringing them to the Imperial City, or does it mean that every Church must agree with the Roman Church because of its supremacy; and (3) do the words 'in qua semper ab his qui sunt undique' &c. mean that the faithful everywhere must resort to the Church of Rome 'in which the tradition which comes from the Apostles is always preserved by the faithful who are everywhere' or 'inasmuch as the Apostolic tradition is always preserved by the faithful who are everywhere'.[2] A lengthy exposition of the anti-Roman interpretation of the passage is to be found in many writers, e.g. in Denny's *Papalism*, the correct Roman Catholic view in any Roman Catholic dogmatic theology.[3] On the first view, which goes back to Grabe, the sentence means that all Churches, that is the faithful everywhere, must resort to Rome as the centre of the Empire, in which, as a result, the Apostolic tradition is preserved by the

[1] The Clermont MS. reads *pontiorem*, presumably an error for *potiorem*.

[2] So Kidd, *Documents*, no. 74, p. 124, following Harvey; but whether *in qua* (ἐν ᾗ) can mean 'inasmuch as', especially so soon after a feminine noun, is doubtful. Kidd, however, in his *History of the Church*, i. 276 rightly, as we shall see, takes Irenaeus to mean that the Roman Church is Christendom in miniature.

[3] Tanquerey, i. 370.

faithful everywhere. The meaning is the perfectly good one that the faithful everywhere resort to Rome and so are prevented by and in turn prevent the Roman Church from erring from the Apostolic tradition. According to the latter it is necessary for every Church to agree with the Roman Church on account of its pre-eminence, inasmuch as the Apostolic tradition is always preserved by Christians throughout the world. The last clause is lamentably weak, and suggestions have been made that we ought to read *praesunt*, i.e. inasmuch as the bishops everywhere always preserve the Apostolic tradition and agree with it. This view is taken by Dr. Jalland in his Bampton Lectures[1] on the ground that the idea that visitors to Rome keep the local Church up to the mark is at variance with the general line of Irenaeus' argument; on the other hand, to amend a reading may be legitimate when it makes no sense at all, but to amend a reading merely because it does not suit the sense you think it ought to bear savours of temerity. It may be added that Dr. Jalland notes that *principalitas* is used to translate ἐξουσία or αὐθεντία, and takes the latter word to mean not 'absolute power' but 'self-moved source'. From this he proceeds to equate *principalitas* simply with 'source', so that the *potior principalitas* of the Roman Church means its superior origin as founded by the Apostles. But even if his rather dubious interpretation of the word αὐθεντία as 'self-moved source' could be admitted, which I doubt, that does not mean that it can simply mean 'source' in the ordinary sense; and he ignores the fact that in 3. 11. 11 the adjectival form occurs twice, once to translate καθολικά (of the four main winds) and once to translate ἡγεμονικόν; as we shall see, it is probable that the *principalitas* here translates the Greek ἡγεμονία.

For of course Grabe was right. But the curious thing is that even he did not notice the strongest argument in favour of his rendering. Irenaeus is writing, we must remember, as an historian. And if we look at the historians of the hellenistic age we shall find that the argument from the position of the city of Rome is a commonplace with them. The most interesting instance is Diodorus, *Sic.* 1. 4. 2f., who explains that his main qualification for writing his history was the abundance of information available to him at Rome. ἡ γὰρ ταύτης τῆς πόλεως ὑπεροχὴ διατείνουσα τῇ δυνάμει πρὸς τὰ πέρατα τῆς οἰκουμένης, ἑτοιμοτάτας καὶ πλείστας ἡμῖν ἀφυρμὰς παρέσχετο, παρεπιδημήσασιν ἐν αὐτῇ πλεῖστον χρόνον. In other words the *potior principalitas* of the city of Rome, extending *ad eos qui sunt undique*, gave Diodorus the opportunity of acquiring the fullest information, in view of the length of time he spent there. He omits to mention that in fact most of his information was derived by the simple method of cutting up Ephorus, Thucydides, Posidonius and the other standard historians of the

[1] *The Church and the Papacy*, 113.

hellenistic age, who would have been available in almost any good library.

I call this the most interesting, since it would be quite reasonable to suppose that Irenaeus is simply modelling himself on Diodorus. For Diodorus' artless Euhemerism in describing the main religions of the pagan world made him a happy hunting-ground for Christian apologists.[1] On the other hand, it would be rash to make the assumption that Irenaeus is using Diodorus in particular, since an examination of other writers of the period shows that it is a regular commonplace for an author to allege his residence at Rome as evidence of his reliability as an historian. Thus Dionysius of Halicarnassus[2] claims to have lived at Rome for twenty-two years and learnt Latin and met the eminent men of his time. Appian makes the point at the end rather than at the beginning of his preface: 'as for who I am that wrote this book... (I am) Appian of Alexandria, one of the leading men of the city; I pleaded in law-suits before the Emperors until they asked me to act as their procurator.' It must of course be remembered that most of the historians of the time have perished, except in so far as they have been incorporated by other writers. But it is perhaps significant that Suidas' notices of three of the leading ones, as well as of one obscure one, mention that they visited or resided in Rome. Thus he tells us that Posidonius visited Rome in the consulship of M. Marcellus[3] (51 B.C.). This is nearly all that Suidas has to say about him; similarly almost all he has to tell us about Timagenes, Arrian, and the obscure Caecilius of Kale Acte is that they resided at Rome for the greater part of their lives.[4] Now it is not to be supposed for a moment that Suidas had read the works of these historians, which seem to have lapsed into oblivion long before his time. It looks as though he had reproduced some notices about them which had been compiled by an excerptor who did not trouble to go beyond a preface in which they mentioned their qualification to write history as having resided in, or at least visited, Rome. It may perhaps be conjectured that the reason why Josephus introduces his visit to Rome and his meeting with Poppaea in his autobiography at an early point (*Vita*, 6) is not mere vanity but a desire to comply with convention; he leaves to the end his friendly relations with the Flavian emperors and his permanent residence at Rome (422 ff.).

[1] Tert. *Apol.* 10, *De Cor.* 7, *Ad Nat.* 2. 12, Ps.-Just. *Coh. ad Gent.* 9; Minucius Felix, *Oct.* 21. 4, repeats or is repeated by Tert. *Apol.* 10, or both use the same Jewish or Christian source; he is one of Eusebius' main sources for Gentile religion in the *Praeparatio Evangelica*.

[2] *Antt. Rom.* 1. 7.

[3] *F.G.H.* 87, T. 1; there is some obscurity about this, since he seems to have met Marius at Rome in 87–86 (Plutarch, *Marius*, 45) but this need not concern us.

[4] *F.G.H.* 88, T. 1; 156, T. 1; and 183, T. 1.

So far the writers quoted mainly illustrate the thought of Rome as the city (or Church) which on account of the *potior principalitas*, i.e. the fact that it is the centre of the Empire, is bound to be visited by people from all parts of the world, and is best able to acquire accurate information. But we have still to consider what Irenaeus means by 'in qua semper ab his, qui sunt undique, conservata est ea quae ab apostolis traditio'. The words mean that 'in it the tradition which is from the apostles is preserved by those who come from all parts of the world' and correspond in some way to the words of the previous clause to the effect that every Church, that is the Christians from all parts of the world, must come together to this Church. The solution would appear to lie in another version of the rhetorical commonplace, which appears in Galen's commentary on Hippocrates *περὶ ἄρθρων* 1.[1] Here Galen explains that he has seen more cases of a rare type than Hippocrates had because *μετὰ τὸ τριακοστὸν ἔτος ἐν Ῥώμῃ διέτριψα, πόλει τοσοῦτον ἀνθρώπων ἐχούσῃ ὥστε πένεσθαι*[2] *Πολεμῶνα τὸν ῥήτορα τῆς οἰκουμένης ἐπιτόμην αὐτὴν εἴποντα*. The commonplace is also to be found in Athenaeus, *Deipnosophistae* 1. 20 of the Loeb edition, where 'Athenaeus speaks of Rome as the "populace of the world" and says that one would not shoot wide of the mark if he called the city of Rome an epitome of the civilized world; so true it is that one may see at a glance all the cities of the world settled there . . . more than one day would fail me, if I tried to enumerate all the cities he counts within the heavenly city (*οὐρανοπόλις*) of Rome . . . even entire nations are settled there *en masse*'. If we bear this commonplace in mind, we get an excellent sense. To Rome, as the centre of the Empire, all Churches, that is the faithful everywhere, must come together, and in it, by the faithful who are everywhere (i.e. the faithful from every city of the *οἰκουμένη* settled in Rome, its *ἐπιτόμη*), preserve the apostolic tradition. The point is that not only does Rome preserve the tradition of SS. Peter and Paul, but that this tradition is reinforced by the tradition of every Church in the world, since every Church in the world is represented there.

If I may make a conjecture as to the original Greek of Irenaeus, I would suggest that the *potior principalitas* of the translator represents an original *ὑπερέχουσα ἡγεμονία*. The translator, as we have seen, uses *principalis* as the equivalent of *ἡγεμονικόν* in 3. 11. 11. For this sense of the word cf. *Mon. Anc. Gr.* 15. 1, where Augustus claims to have added Egypt to the *ἡγεμονία* (Lat. *Imperium*) of the Roman people; Plutarch, *Lucullus*, 30, where Lucullus by attacking Mithridates, Tigranes, and the Parthians hopes to pass undefeated and

[1] Kühn's Leipzig text 18 (i). 347; Basel edition v. 585. 51.

[2] Kühn *ὡς ἐπαινεῖσθαι*, the middle form being used in the active sense 'so that P. praised it'; this seems very dubious.

victorious through the three greatest ἡγεμονίαι beneath the sun; Jos. *B.J.* 2. 362, where Agrippa contrasts the ἡγεμονία of the Romans with the weakness of the Jews; Aelius Aristides, εἰς Ῥώμην, 10 (Keil 2. 94), Philo, *in Flacc.* 158. In any case, it seems clear that Irenaeus is simply reproducing a well-worn rhetorical commonplace, which may be introduced almost in parenthesis to make a particular point, as it is by Irenaeus[1] Or it may be worked up into a full dress panegyric as in Aelius Aristides[2] and presumably in the original of Athenaeus[3] which only survives in an epitome.

It would seem, then, that Irenaeus has in mind the rhetorical commonplace of contemporary historians, and introduces it into theology as Galen does into medicine. He had before him an original which explained that all the cities of the world, that is, the whole of mankind, are forced by the imperial position of the city to meet at Rome, which is itself a miniature of the whole world; at any rate he was familiar with the commonplace. It is possible that he also had in mind another version of the commonplace in which the welfare or freedom of all the cities of the world was preserved by the empire of Rome.[4] The Greek form would run εἰς ταύτην γάρ τὴν πόλιν διὰ τὴν ὑπερέχουσαν ἡγεμονίαν δεῖ συνέρχεσθαι πάσας τὰς πόλεις, ἐν ᾗ συνιδεῖν ἐστι πάσας τὰς πόλεις, the last clause in the second form running ἐν ᾗ σώζεται ἡ πασῶν τῶν πολέων ἐλευθερία (εὐταξία). The conflation produces the obscurity we have already noticed: if Irenaeus had simply said that all the Churches were present in miniature in the Roman Church he would have given a plainer meaning, but he could not resist the temptation to bring in the apostolic tradition again. In any case, the appeal to the prestige of Rome gave him a convenient short method of dealing with Gnosticism. Moreover it gave him a well-turned rhetorical phrase; and to a Hellenistic writer a well-turned rhetorical phrase was always more valuable than a well-reasoned argument.

WILFRED L. KNOX

[1] For a curious parallel cf. Dion. Halic. *De Orat. Antt.*, Proem. 3, where the return from the exaggerated Asiatic to a simpler style of rhetoric is ascribed to ἡ πάντων ἐπικρατοῦσα Ῥώμη, πρὸς ἑαυτὴν ἀναγκάζουσα τὰς ὅλας πόλεις ἀποβλέπειν.

[2] Loc. cit.

[3] From Aelius Aristides we may note in passing φαίης ἂν περιοίκους ἅπαντας ἢ κατὰ δῆμον οἰκοῦντας ἄλλους ἄλλον χῶρον εἰς μίαν ταύτην τὴν πόλιν συνέρχεσθαι (61, Keil 2. 108: note the *convenire ad* implied in συνέρχεσθαι εἰς).

[4] Cf. Philo, *Leg. ad G.* 157, of Augustus, and Ael. Arist. op. cit. 103 (Keil 2. 121).