

# 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 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]

n'est en fait qu'une longue litanie, dont il suffit de citer la fin : 'sicut platanus exaltata . . . iuxta aquam in plateis . . . tu fasciculus myrre . . . tu sicut therebintus extends ramos tuos . . . tibi laus, tibi gloria, o crux bona, crux sancta, crux benedicta, per infinita secula seculorum, amen.' — Ces deux fragments sont d'ailleurs, par le vocabulaire, le style, la prédilection pour certaines citations, en tout semblables aux sermons tenus pour authentiques, et méritent le jugement porté sur ces derniers au XVIII<sup>e</sup> s. par Claude Fleury<sup>1</sup> : 'Ces ouvrages, comme la plupart de ceux du même tems, sont pleins de lieux communs, de sens figurés de l'Écriture, de discours vagues et insipides, qui n'attirent le lecteur ni par l'utilité, ni par l'agrément.'

Il resterait à expliquer l'absence dans notre ms. des quatre sermons connus par ailleurs. — Le volume est relié aux armes de Jacques-Nicolas Colbert, abbé du Bec (1665-1707) ; or, du milieu du XI<sup>e</sup> au milieu du XII<sup>e</sup> siècle, trois illustres abbés du Bec sont devenus archevêques de Canterbury, Lanfranc, Anselme, Thibaut ; un quatrième, Roger, élu en 1174, refusa le périlleux honneur de succéder à Thomas Becket. Il est possible qu'un copiste du Bec ait noté les sermons archiepiscopaux au fur et à mesure de leur divulgation au-delà du détroit ; le manuscrit, dépourvu d'*explicit*, paraît d'ailleurs inachevé ; terminé, il présenterait sans doute les 33 sermons dont parle Henriquez. — De ces 33 sermons existait, en tout cas, dès le XIII<sup>e</sup> s., comme on a vu plus haut, une compilation abrégée, artificiellement divisée en seize parties, qui servit de base aux éditions modernes.

P. GUÉBIN.

## THE RULE OF TRUTH IN IRENAEUS.

A DANISH author, Mr S. A. Becker, has dedicated a very elaborated study to the problem, what *The Rule of Truth* is to Irenaeus. Through his thorough exegesis I think he has contributed a good deal to bringing to an end the dissension amongst scholars on that point, and readers of the JOURNAL may be glad to have his work brought to their notice. ('Ο κανὼν τῆς Ἀληθείας. *Regula veritatis* eller Sandhedens Regel. Et Bidrag til Belysning af dette Udtrykks Forekomst og Betydning hos Irenaeos. Copenhagen, G. E. C. Gad, 1910, 280 pages.)

I do not agree with Becker in all details. Although generally very careful, he has, I think, not been careful enough in interpreting a few passages, which affect the result itself. But instead of giving here

<sup>1</sup> *Histoire ecclésiastique* liv. LXXIV ch. 34 ; nouv. éd., x (1777) 622.

a review of the book, I prefer to point to the problem itself and how it is to be solved according to my opinion. We begin with an analysis of the passages in which the expression *Rule of Truth* is to be found, and a few others of importance for the question. I quote in *Adv. haer.* the chapters according to Massuet, the pages according to Harvey; for the *Epideixis* the edition of Harnack.

I ix 4; Harvey I p. 87 f. The argument of Irenaeus is as follows. Suppose a man to destroy a mosaic image of a king and arrange the stones so as to form the picture of a fox, declaring it to be the same picture (I viii 1; Harvey I p. 67), or to take some verses by Homer and out of them make a new poem (a so-called *Cento*). This is just what the Gnostics do: they take expressions from the Scriptures, especially from the Prologue to the Gospel of St John, and use them in quite another connexion and meaning. But he who knows the true picture of the king will not accept that of the fox; he who knows his Homer will detect the *Cento* to be false. Οὕτω δὲ καὶ ὁ τὸν κανόνα τῆς ἀληθείας ἀκλινῇ ἐν ἑαυτῷ κατέχων, ὃν διὰ τοῦ βαπτίσματος εἴληφε, τὰ μὲν ἐκ τῶν γραφῶν ὀνόματα, καὶ τὰς λέξεις, καὶ τὰς παραβολὰς ἐπιγνώσεται, τὴν δὲ βλάσφημον ὑπόθεσιν ταύτην [αὐτῶν] οὐκ ἐπιγνώσεται . . . ἐν ἑκάστον δὲ τῶν εἰρημένων ἀποδοὺς τῇ ἰδίᾳ τάξει, καὶ προσαρμόσας τῷ τῆς ἀληθείας σωματίῳ, γυμνῶσει καὶ ἀνυπόστατον ἐπιδείξει τὸ πλάσμα αὐτῶν.

Ὁ κανὼν τῆς ἀληθείας must be something which includes the terms abused by the Gnostics (such as Pater, Charis, Monogenes, Aletheia, Logos, Zoë, Anthropos, Ecclesia). Then it must be either *the Scriptures* or *the main content of the Scriptures*. That it is said to have been received at Baptism cannot overthrow this explanation and lead us to think of a short formulated Creed. But in some way or other there must have been given at the Baptism or at the baptismal instruction some knowledge of the principal content and expressions of Scripture. And then the Christian, who knows these expressions, will again make them harmonize with the *The Body of Truth*, i.e. the principal Christian doctrine, especially contained in Scripture. For shewing that the diminutive form *σωμάτιον* is not to be urged I must refer to Becker, p. 19 ff.

I xxii; Harvey I p. 188 f. 'Cum teneamus autem nos regulam veritatis, id est quia sit unus Deus omnipotens, qui omnia condidit per Verbum suum . . . quemadmodum Scriptura dicit . . . Hanc ergo tenentes regulam . . . facile eos deviasse a veritate arguimus'.

The content of *The Rule of Truth* is here: the belief in one God the Creator proclaimed in Scripture.

II xxv 1; Harvey I p. 343. We ought to interpret details in Scripture from its main content. 'Non enim regula ex numeris, sed numeri ex regula.' In a musical composition we ought to catch the

principal theme. So in Scripture we must glorify its compositor (i.e. God) 'nusquam transferentes regulam, neque errantes ab artifice, neque abiicientes fidem quae est in unum Deum qui fecit omnia'.

II xxvii 1; Harvey I p. 347 f. In interpretation of the Scriptures we ought to begin with the clear passages, then we shall be safe, 'et veritatis corpus (the correction of Kunze and Becker instead of the meaningless *a veritate corpus*) integrum . . . perseverat'. If on the other hand we combine uncertain passages with others just as uncertain, 'sic enim apud nullum erit regula veritatis'.

II xxviii 1; Harvey I p. 349 'Habentes itaque regulam ipsam veritatem'.

In these last three passages there can be no doubt of the explanation: *The Rule of Truth* is the main, unambiguous content of the Scriptures. And the last quoted passage shews that at least here the *κανών* is the *ἀλήθεια*, so that the genitive may be explained as gen. appos.

The first chapters of lib. III are generally taken as a proof that Irenaeus fights against the Gnostics, taking his stand rather on tradition or on the Baptismal Creed than on Scripture. But rightly understood they say just the opposite.

III i 1; Harvey II p. 2 'Non enim per alios dispositionem salutis nostrae cognovimus, quam per eos per quos Evangelium pervenit ad nos: quod quidem tunc praeconaverunt, postea vero per Dei voluntatem in Scripturis nobis tradiderunt, fundamentum et columnam fidei nostrae futurum'.

The proclamation of the first witnesses of Christ is according to the will of God continued and perpetuated in Scripture; *fundamentum . . . futurum* relates not simply to *Evangelium*, but to *Evangelium in Scripturis*.

III ii 1; Harvey II p. 7. The assertion here, that the true tradition is not to be found in the Scriptures themselves, but transmitted *per vivam vocem*—this assertion is not that of Irenaeus himself, but of the Gnostics. And they by means of their secret traditions spoil *The Rule of Truth* (*regulam veritatis depravans*), which also here seems to indicate the true, genuine Christianity.

But then Irenaeus follows the Gnostics on the battle-ground they prefer: tradition outside Scripture. He is sure he shall be able to refute them on that ground. For there is a true Catholic tradition handed down through the Bishops; as examples he quotes Rome and Asia Minor. This tradition, he says III iv 1; Harvey II p. 15 f, is so full and valid that it would be sufficient even if we had no apostolic writings. But this is only an imaginary situation. Very few really depend upon tradition alone, only (a) The Churches outside the Greek-Latin world, who have no translations of the Bible in their tongue;

(b) all Christians in smaller questions (*de aliqua modica quaestione*), probably such as to which Scripture gives no certain evidence.

Now let us see the surroundings of the chapters in question.

II xxxv 3; Harvey I p. 387 'Sed ne putemur fugere illam quae ex Scripturis Dominicis est probationem, ipsis Scripturis multo manifestius et clarius hoc ipsam praedicantibus . . . ex Scripturis divinis probationes apponemus in medio omnibus amantibus veritatem'.

So ends lib. II, i. e. in lib. III Irenaeus will give the evidence from the Scriptures.

III v 1; Harvey II p. 18 'Traditione igitur quae est ab Apostolis sic se habente in Ecclesia et permanente apud nos, revertamur ad eam quae est ex Scripturis ostensionem . . .'

So Irenaeus says having finished the evidence from tradition. *Ergo*, this passage about tradition is a parenthesis. Before going on to develop his proper subject in lib. III, the evidence from Scriptures, Irenaeus will strengthen his position against an eventual appeal from Scripture to tradition. This parenthesis is surely interesting, but it can by no means be allowed to dominate the understanding of Irenaeus's principal views and methods.

III xi 1; Harvey II p. 40 f 'Omnia igitur talia (i. e. the statements of the Gnostics) circumscribere (exclude) volens discipulus Domini et regulam veritatis constituere in Ecclesia, quia est unus Deus omnipotens, qui per Verbum suum omnia fecit . . . sic inchoavit in ea quae est secundum Evangelium doctrina: In principio erat Verbum', &c.

*The Rule of Truth* here is the belief in God's creation and salvation, and this is proclaimed in the Gospel of St John.

A little later (III xi 7; Harvey II p. 46 f; the Greek text is here to be corrected by the Latin) Irenaeus gives his proof, that there can only be four Gospels as there are four corners of the earth. The pillar of the Church, he says, is (1) the Gospel (i. e. the four Gospels), (2) the Spirit of Life, always breathing eternal life out from the four Gospels. This is a very strong instance that to Irenaeus Scripture is the principal objective basis of the Church.

III xii 6; Harvey II p. 59. The Gnostics try to evade the demonstration from the Acts of the Apostles by assuming an accommodation by the Apostles. 'Secundum hunc igitur sermonem apud neminem erit regula veritatis, sed omnes discipuli omnibus imputabunt . . . Superfluous autem et inutilis adventus Domini parebit . . .'

*The Rule of Truth* is also here the genuine Christianity. A more special meaning (the content of the Acts or of the writings of St Luke) is to be found in III xv 6; Harvey II p. 79. The Gnostics reject the statement of the Acts about St Paul; but God has just arranged it so

that in the Gospel written by the same author there are to be found many necessary details 'ut sequenti testificationi eius, quam habet de actibus et doctrina Apostolorum, omnes sequentes, et regulam veritatis inadulteratam habentes salvari possint'.

IV xxxv 5; Harvey II p. 276 'Nos autem unum et solum verum Deum doctorem sequentes et regulam veritatis habentes eius sermones ...'

In this clearest of all passages *The Rule of Truth* is the Words of God contained in Scripture (A.T. and N.T.).

In the *Epideixis* we find in c. 1 the expression *Body of Truth*, as in the above-mentioned *Adv. haer.* I ix 4. Twice (c. 3 and 6) we find *The Rule of Faith*. If we may trust the Armenian translator it is not correct then to assume that Irenaeus always uses the expression *Rule of Truth*. *The Rule of Faith* in both places is the main content of Christianity (as an exposition of the belief in Father, Son, and Holy Ghost).

Our result is :—

I. *The Rule of Truth primarily* is not an institution, a formula, or a book ; it is Christianity itself, the genuine, apostolic Christianity.

II. That *κανών* or *regula* may be used for not a formal rule, but a body of doctrine, we may prove from the Latin translation. For there very often (compare Dr Kunze: *Glaubensregel, Heilige Schrift und Taufbekenntniss*, 1899, p. 322, and Becker, p. 212 f) *regula* (or *regulae*) is used of the doctrine or the main principles of the Gnostics. Only in one passage (I xx 3; Harvey I p. 180) the Greek text is preserved ; there *regula* stands for *ὑπόθεσις*.

III. *The Rule is the Truth* itself. The genitive is generally to be taken as gen. appos. as indicated in the above-quoted passage, II xxviii 1 'Habentes itaque regulam ipsam veritatem'. Still we shall perhaps not press such a dilemma too strongly. *Rule of Truth* may perhaps also mean the Rule, which decides what is to be regarded as Truth. In the connexion *Rule of Faith* the gen. may also be taken as gen. appos. (Faith = *fides quae creditur*), but here more probable as gen. obj. = *regula credendi* (this expression is used by Novatian *De trin.* c. xvi).

IV. *The Truth*—which is the Rule—has a central place in the theology of Irenaeus. It comprehends the whole revelation, nay even nature, which also gives testimony to the Creator. Its main points are : the creation—the dispensation and prophecies in the Old Testament—Christ as the second Adam, His supernatural birth, His words, His death, His resurrection and ascension—the Holy Ghost—the Church—the Christian Ethics—the Eschatology. *The Rule of Truth* is something

positive, leading to salvation. It is not—as generally assumed—formed as against the heretics; but of course it excludes heresy just as truth excludes error.

V. This *Truth* is first to be found in Scripture, so that Scripture or some part of it occasionally may be called *The Rule of Truth*. The idea of separating Scripture from the Church never occurs to Irenaeus. But how strongly he insists on Scripture as the basis may be proved from nearly every page he wrote. Characteristic is the passage:—

V xx 1; Harvey II p. 379 'Fugere igitur oportet sententias ipsorum (the heretics) . . . confugere autem ad Ecclesiam, et in eius sinu educari, et dominicis Scripturis enutriri. Plantata est enim Ecclesia Paradisus in hoc mundo. Ab omni ergo ligno Paradisi escas manducabitis, ait Spiritus Dei, id est, ab omni Scriptura dominico manducate . . .'

VI. The same *Truth* can be found outside the Scriptures in the tradition of the Church, for materially tradition coincides with the Scripture. But never does Irenaeus call the tradition *Rule of Truth*, although we should not have been astonished if he had done so.

VII. The question of a formulated Creed by Irenaeus seems to be quite doubtful. In several passages scholars generally have found a creed. Those from *Adv. haer.* have often been collected (comp. Harnack in *Patrum apostolicorum opera*, ed. major. I p. 122 f; Hahn *Bibliothek der Symbole* 3 Aufl. p. 6 f; C. A. Swainson *The Nicene and Apostles' Creeds*, 1875, p. 28 ff; A. C. McGiffert *The Apostles' Creed*, 1902, p. 48 ff); to be added are Epid. c. 3, 6, 7, 97, 100. It may be that sometimes Irenaeus hints at a Creed, but I do not see that it has been proved, and still less do I see how a reconstruction is possible.

On the question of *The Rule of Faith (Truth)* Caspari called Irenaeus the classical author. It would be interesting to see if the explanation we have found in his case could be justified also in the case of other authors.

I think it is the case with Polykrates of Ephesus. He says (Euseb. *hist. eccl.* V xxiv 6) that the great Christian leaders of Asia Minor kept Easter *according to the Gospel*, and the following *according to the Rule of Faith* probably means the same. I also think it is the case with Novatian (*De cib. jud.* c. VII; *De trinitate*, c. I, IX, XVI, XVII (Moses has put the *regula veritatis* in Gen. I), XXI, XXVI, XXIX). Only it is here more evident that Novatian uses a formulated Creed—not as identical with, but as a means of arranging the description of, *The Rule of Truth*. Cyprian also (Ep. LXVIII 7; Hartel II p. 756) supposes him to use a formulated Creed; and he certainly is right in that, although he may be mistaken in assuming Novatian to use just the African formula (*per sanctam ecclesiam*).

In regard to Hippolytus and Tertullian I have at present formed no judgement. But if originally *The Rule of Truth* is a thing so elastic as we have found, it would be no wonder if later its meaning may have been modified.

In the Danish *Theologisk Tidskrift* I have tried to prove more in detail the opinion stated shortly here, and I have examined some points of the history of the interpretation of Irenaeus from Erasmus to the present time. As this Danish periodical will be found in few public libraries, I shall be glad to send this article to scholars on application.

VALDEMAR AMMUNDSEN.

### THE BOOK OF LIFE.

THE publication in 1903 of Dionysius Bār Ṣalībī's commentary on the Jacobite liturgy<sup>1</sup> brought to light the fact that besides the diptychs of living and dead, recited after the Epiclesis in connexion with the Intercession, certain other diptychs were formerly read in that rite at an earlier point of the service, in connexion with the kiss of peace, and that this document was known in Syriac as the *Book of Life*.

This discovery has, perhaps not unnaturally, raised a question as to the original position of the diptychs in the Liturgy of St James. Thus Mr Brightman writes in the *Journal of Theological Studies* (Jan. 1911, p. 321): 'As to the Greek S. James, it is true that its diptychs are now within the anaphora; but no doubt this is only a Byzantinism, for in the Jacobite rite the *Liber vitae*, when it was in use, was recited before the kiss of peace (Barsalibi *Expositio* 8).'

What follows here is an attempt to account for this feature in the service of the Syrian Jacobites by the aid of fuller evidence. And I must begin by explaining how it is that I come to be in possession of this additional evidence.

Before leaving England in the summer of 1911, to resume his post in the Ceylon Civil Service, Mr H. W. Codrington left in my keeping several manuscript books containing copies made by him of a number of Syriac liturgical documents. These documents relate for the most part to the rites of the Syrian Jacobites, and most of them are contained in MSS of the British Museum. But one or two were copied in the East and are, to say the least, not generally known in Europe. Being unable himself to undertake an edition of any part of them, owing to enforced and prolonged absence from England, Mr Codrington most

<sup>1</sup> H. Labourt *Dionysius Bar Ṣalībī: Expositio Liturgiae*. In *Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium* (Scriptores Syri, series secunda, tomus xciii).