Introduction

Irenaeus and His Traditions

Sara Parvis and Paul Foster

Irenaeus is the star witness of the post-sub-apostolic period of early Christianity, the period of the late second century. By then, not only were the eyewitnesses, the generation that had known Jesus, dead, but so also were the generation that had known the apostles. Irenaeus himself, who became bishop of Lyons in Gaul in the late 170s or early 180s, was one of the last Christian writers who could plausibly claim to have learned directly from someone who had known the apostles, that someone being Polycarp of Smyrna.

Christianity was thriving but diverse. It continued to wrestle with its relationship to Judaism past and present, as it had done since the beginning. But increasingly it was also attracting converts who situated their knowledge within the Greek and Roman cultural worlds of rhetoric and philosophy. In place of the apostles who had founded the oldest churches were the writings they had left, the long-term memories of the individual communities they had left, and a succession of more recent teachers, preachers, and charismatic individuals. These latter had preached or taught or prophesied in different places, made a mark, and in some cases left writings, new communities, or strong memories of an exemplary death for the faith. Among these was to be found some considerable theological divergence. Irenaeus, the most comprehensive writer that Christianity had yet produced (at least in terms of surviving work), who on the one hand celebrated diversity of tradition, education, geography, and charismatic gifts, but on the other fiercely opposed divergence of doctrine, allows us to take stock of all this, and much else.

This book, based on a conference that took place at the University of Edinburgh in 2009 under the auspices of the Centre for the Study of Christian Origins, seeks to bring together a number of aspects of Irenaeus's witness and a number of current strands in Irenaeus scholarship. To bring together all would be impossible in a book of this size. In planning the conference, we had intended to give equal room to both lovers and critics of Irenaeus, but it was mainly Irenaeus's lovers who accepted our invitation. These included, as well as some of the foremost writers in English on Irenaeus today, scholars expert in other areas of biblical studies and patristic thought who were conscious of

Irenaeus's strong influence on their own areas of work. One of the features of current Irenaeus scholarship is a shift away from studying him for what he says about Gnosticism (which was itself a shift away from studying what he says about church order) toward studying him for what he says about scripture and about early Christian theology. These last are the two areas on which we have concentrated in this volume, though we include also three essays on Irenaeus's historical context. Amidst the lovers, who for the most part and in varying degrees accept Irenaeus as a credible witness to the make-up of the church of his day and its handling of its own traditions, Allen Brent and Paul Foster do duty for the sceptics and read Irenaeus to some extent as a witness against himself.

New trends in Irenaeus scholarship are also reflected by something that would have been far less likely only fifty years ago: the diversity of church affiliation among the contributors. We include among ourselves scholars from the Eastern Orthodox, Roman Catholic, Anglican, Lutheran, and various Reformed and other Protestant traditions. How far this colors our different perspectives, we leave to the reader to judge. To say we believe Irenaeus would have approved is perhaps all the comment that is needed on how our portraits of him differ from those of some of his early editors.

Irenaeus and His Context

We begin with an examination by Paul Parvis of the first major portrait of Irenaeus, that of Eusebius of Caesarea around 300: hearer of the martyr Polycarp of Smyrna in Asia Minor, immigrant bishop of the largely immigrant community in Lyons in Gaul, writer of a number of works, witness to the formation of the New Testament, chiliast, and man of peace. Parvis largely accepts Eusebius's picture but tweaks and colors it, showing some of the ways in which Irenaeus's writings and life also differ from common modern perceptions of them.

Jared Secord, in an illuminating study, looks at the cultural geography displayed in Irenaeus's work. He demonstrates in the process just how Greek Irenaeus actually was and just how much of a foreigner he felt himself to be in Lyons, not because it was full of Celts but because it was so much more Latin than the Rome in which he had previously been living.

In the last chapter in this section, Allen Brent looks at length at the development of the early episcopacy in Rome and argues that Irenaeus's Roman succession-list cannot be considered a reliable witness to a tradition of monarchical episcopacy there. Building on previous scholarship, Brent takes the problem as far as 235, in several stages. Either Hegesippus or Irenaeus himself has compiled the Roman list on the basis of names attached to letters in the Roman archives, including the letter of Clement to the Corinthians and others of the same sort. (Irenaeus, Brent argues, misunderstood or else misrepresented the role of these officers, whose role would be better understood as that of Foreign Secretary to the Roman presbyterate, rather than president in any sense.) For Irenaeus, these names represented the same sort of succession list that would be implied in Diogenes Laertius's *Lives of the Philosophers*, guaranteeing that the teaching of the current head of the school was in clear and approved continuity with the teaching of its original founder. Their office was a teaching office rather than a ruling one. It is only with the building of the "papal mausoleum" in the Catacomb of

Callistus in 235, Brent argues, that we see the real ideology of a monarchical episcopate emerge in Rome.

Irenaeus and His Scriptural Traditions

Throughout his writings, Irenaeus reveals knowledge of various types of tradition, both oral and written. In that last category, the writings that formed the Jewish scriptures and those that were in the process of becoming the New Testament appear as a key resource in Irenaeus's thinking and theology. He is well known for being our earliest surviving witness to a fourfold gospel collection comprising the accounts written by Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John. However, his contribution to scriptural tradition is much greater than simply displaying awareness of what are now the four canonical Gospels. He bears more subtle witness to the contemporary status of the scriptures on the edge of the eventual New Testament canon, which only later fell definitively inside or outside of it: Hebrews, the *Shepherd of Hermas*, and 1 Clement. He witnesses to the dates and breadth of circulation of the scriptures of the Christian groups he designates as heresies, a study in their own right. He shows how both the Jewish scriptures and the emerging New Testament were read in his day and by the older generation whose teaching he remembered. He is an important witness both to the text of the New Testament, and to scribal practice in copying it. And in his love of and widespread use of imagery drawn from scripture, he began new traditions of interpretation that fed into later exegesis in sometimes quite surprising ways.

In the first essay in this section, Denis Minns discusses the form of the parable of the Two Sons (Matt. 21:28-32) known to Irenaeus. The textual tradition of the parable of the Two Sons is a famous textual conundrum, with three major divergent forms that disagree in the details of whether the first or second son agreed to go to the father's vineyard, coupled with differing assessments of which son actually carried out the will of the father. Two of the forms initially have the first son refusing to go to the vineyard but later repenting and deciding to go. This is the structure of the parable known to Irenaeus; however, Irenaeus does not explicitly state which of the sons is adjudged to have done the will of the father. As a result, most text critics assume he is more likely to have followed the form of the text that has Jesus' interlocutors answer sensibly that the first son did the father's will. The alternative is that Irenaeus is a witness to the form of text in Codex Bezae. This preserves the assessment that despite inaction and failure to go to the vineyard, it is the second son who actually does the will of the father. Such a form is seen typically either as a nonsensical form resulting from a textual corruption or as one that intentionally wished to characterize Jesus' opponents as perverse since they purposefully give the incorrect answer. However, discussing the last major section of book IV of *Adversus haereses* (IV.36.1—41.3), Minns notes that its aim is to prove the unity of the two testaments from the parables of Christ. Therefore, he observes, Irenaeus, in line with the interpretation of the parable of the Wicked Husbandman (Matt. 21:33-45) that immediately follows on from the Two Sons, argues that it, too, tells a story where the younger or more recent character supplants the former. Hence, Irenaeus must have had the parable in the form where the second son does the will of the father. Minns then delves into Irenaeus's exegesis of the parable and notes that he comments

in relation to the contrition of the first son, "afterwards, when repentance availed him nothing." This suggests to Minns that Irenaeus's view was that the repentance of the first son either came too late or was defective in some way. Moreover, Minns argues that this view is entirely compatible with Irenaeus's wider understanding of the nature of human response to the call of God. The conclusions that are drawn from this study are, first, that Irenaeus is a witness to the form of the parable that is contained in Codex Bezae. Secondly, this form of the parable, which is seen as a corruption of one of the other two forms, must have occurred between the redaction of the Gospel and not much later than the middle of the second century. Thirdly, this reading of the form of the parable known to Irenaeus is consonant with the assessment that Codex Bezae displays an attitude of liberty toward the text and its revision. Minns's discussion highlights the valuable insights that can be derived through consideration of textual details combined with exegetical tendencies in the writings of Irenaeus.

Next, Jeffrey Bingham investigates the possibility that Irenaeus was a witness to the Letter to the Hebrews. His discussion opens with later patristic testimony that claims both that Irenaeus denied the Pauline authorship of Hebrews and that in a now no-longer extant work he composed a series of addresses drawing upon this same epistle. However, as Bingham documents, scholars have usually been less willing to see evidence for the use of Hebrews in his *Adversus haereses*. Bingham's purpose is to argue against and to overturn that understanding, which has emerged as something of a scholarly consensus. In place of such a view, Bingham does not suggest that Hebrews must therefore be understood as a fundamental scriptural text for Irenaeus. Instead, his claim is more subtle. Rather than arguing that Irenaeus revered Hebrews in the same way that he did the fourfold gospel collection and the letters of Paul, it is suggested that Irenaeus was dependent upon the language and teachings of Hebrews in various observable ways. After presenting a series of examples where this phenomenon might occur, a wider thesis is suggested to account for Irenaeus's somewhat ambivalent relationship with the Letter to the Hebrews. Bingham suggests that because Hebrews did not have the apostolic pedigree that Irenaeus viewed as so important for writings regarded as authoritative, he was hesitant to cite the epistle explicitly. Instead, the influence of Hebrews is to be detected at a deeper level, as it shapes his theology and ideology.

Karl Shuve considers Irenaeus's contribution to the later interpretative tradition of a rather different sort of scriptural text, the Song of Songs. He argues that despite the apparent neglect of the Song of Songs in the first two centuries of the Common Era, Irenaeus was fundamental in establishing the interpretative context that enabled later Christian exegetes to engage with this text. In the process of this argument, Shuve also wishes to challenge the scholarly assumption that the Song of Songs only became an artifact of interest in the third century, when Christian asceticism felt the need to develop metaphorical or allegorical interpretations of this most *un-ascetic* of texts. Shuve seeks to turn such an understanding of the rise in interest in the Song of Songs on its head. In opposition to the prevailing scholarly consensus, he argues that "the Song is best understood as emerging, quite organically, from a nuptial theological trajectory that affirms, rather than denies, the value of the body and sexuality." It is further

suggested that Irenaeus is the first to affirm the Old Testament nuptial texts as being a typological patterning of Christ's redemptive activity. Thus, analogically, texts that speak of human marital union play a significant role in Irenaeus's discourse on ecclesiology and soteriology. Although Irenaeus does not himself make reference to the Song of Songs, Shuve argues that Irenaeus's "nuptial theology is developed primarily through the exposition of certain key Old Testament texts (Num. 12:10-14; Hos. 1; Isa. 54:1, 63:9)" that will be central to later exegesis of the Song. While nuptial theology does not appear with great frequency in Irenaeus's writings, partly because similar imagery is used by his Gnostic opponents, nonetheless the approach is seen as a methodological watershed that would provide a conceptual space in which the Song of Songs could be read by later Christian exegetes, beginning with Origen. For Shuve, therefore, it is right to see Irenaeus as laying the methodological foundation upon which all subsequent patristic exegesis of Song of Songs would stand.

Our next two papers debate the interesting question of the identity of the Elder of *Adversus haereses* IV.27-32, whose teaching, as outlined by Irenaeus, defends the believers of the Old Testament (the "former dispensation"), as well as God's dealings with them, from several sorts of attack, arguing that they too were saved by Christ. Irenaeus gives him no name but considerable status, calling him "a disciple of the Apostles," and describing his teaching at length. Sebastian Moll, from the perspective of his work on Marcion, questions Charles Hill's claim that this Elder must have been Polycarp. He argues, on the basis of Irenaeus's *Letter to Florinus*, from which an extract is given in Eusebius of Caesarea's *Church History*, that Irenaeus, being a "boy" (παῖς) at the time when he met Polycarp, could not have remembered his teaching as extensively as he remembers the Elder's. Moll argues that "boy" implies a "childlike age" (in Luke 2:42-43, for example, the twelve-year-old Jesus is called a παῖς). Moll further argues that the Elder's teaching as outlined by Irenaeus is as much anti-Valentinian as anti-Marcionite; that, given Irenaeus's age, the Elder, whose teaching he recalls so clearly that he must have heard him as an adult, must be a third-generation witness rather than someone who had seen the Apostles; and that it is hard to imagine why Irenaeus would not have given the Elder's name as Polycarp if he really were Polycarp, given that Polycarp is mentioned by name earlier in the work.

Hill agrees that the Elder's teaching is not simply anti-Marcionite, but aimed at other heresies as well, but argues that this does not exclude Polycarp as its author. He sets out the similarities between the *Letter to Florinus* and *Haer.* IV.27-32 in parallel columns. He dismisses the argument that the Elder must be third generation on the grounds that it assumes in advance that the Elder cannot be Polycarp, despite the fact that (as Moll had noted) the textual evidence presents him as a disciple of the Apostles. He then proceeds to discuss the ancient evidence as to what Irenaeus is likely to have meant by παῖς and by the parallel phrase "in my first age," as well as some modern studies on the pervasiveness of memories laid down between ages ten and twenty-five, and some ancient evidence on disciples memorizing the stories of their teacher. Hill posits that Irenaeus might have been seventeen or eighteen when he saw Florinus in company with Polycarp, and points out that Irenaeus could have carried on listening to Polycarp's teaching for a number of years afterwards. Finally, he argues that Irenaeus

does not mention Polycarp's name because this is often his practice with post-apostolic teachers; he expected his readers to pick up the earlier allusion; and he did not want for modesty's sake to insist too frequently on his connection with the great martyr.

The next chapter in this section moves from looking at traditions that were a positive influence on Irenaeus—even if in a somewhat veiled manner—and instead looks at his reaction against "anti-traditions." Irenaeus was able to advocate holding fast to the apostolic writing, but the "flipside" of that assertion was the rejection of writings that did not meet his criterion for accepting such traditions as authoritative. Irenaeus devotes considerable space in his *Adversus haereses* to justifying the privileged standing of the fourfold gospel collection. In the process he rejects those who argue for a different collection of gospel writings, as well as those writings that are read in addition to the four gospels that he authorized. Irenaeus states that the heretics fall into one of two errors: either reading too many, or too few gospels (*Haer.* III.11.9). Foster surveys the *Adversus haereses* to determine which of the noncanonical gospel writings were likely to have been known by Irenaeus during the last quarter of the second century. While Irenaeus actually refutes that the competitor writings are truly gospels, the very fact that he has to mount such arguments suggests that others of his contemporaries did not share his view, and in fact had a very different understanding of what made a gospel a gospel. Irenaeus names some of those writings that he rejects. As Foster discusses, those include the *Gospel of Judas* and the Valentinian *Gospel of Truth*. In addition to these explicitly named texts, Irenaeus also cites a well-known tradition that occurs in a noncanonical gospel. This is the so-called alpha—beta logion that is now embedded in the *Infancy Gospel of Thomas*. Here, Foster suggests that it is more likely that Irenaeus came across this as a free-floating logion and not as part of that wider narrative. Also problematic are Irenaeus's references to the so-called Jewish-Christian gospels. Since these texts are only known from citations in early Christian writings, the accuracy of such quotations cannot be assessed. However, they are invaluable for providing access to otherwise unattested traditions. Lastly, this chapter looks at Irenaeus's knowledge of some of the writings that are found in the Nag Hammadi corpus. Foster concludes that Irenaeus was surprisingly well informed about the gospel texts and traditions being used by his opponents, and may have known more of these texts than it is now possible to detect. Thus, if Irenaeus's aim was to cast into oblivion such works regarded by his opponents as gospels, then he must be commended since for the most part he has succeeded!

In the second of his two chapters in this collection, Charles Hill illuminates the handling of gospel texts in the late second century through the lens of the earliest surviving manuscript of any part of Irenaeus's writings. The papyrus fragment under examination in this discussion, P.Oxy. 405, is of particular interest because it contains a citation of Matthew 3:16-17. There are a number of fascinating features and aspects of this scrap of text that results in its value far outstripping its size. First, the form of the text preserved in the citation is closer to that preserved in Codex Bezae. Secondly, Hill draws attention to the wedge-shaped marks, or *diplai*, that are used in the left margin to mark certain lines of the text, "where they are clearly being used to mark a quotation." However, after surveying other usages of the *diplai* in early Christian

manuscripts, Hill notes that ordinarily they were not employed to indicate quotations. Interestingly, he states that he knows of no NT papyrus manuscript that uses *diplai* is this fashion, although the fourth-century parchment manuscript Codex Vaticanus does so. In this latter manuscript there is a systematic attempt to use these markers comprehensively throughout to mark OT quotations. Having cited Irenaeus's statements about his high regard for scripture and his exacting standards for scribal copyists, Hill suggests that "[i]t seems a natural outgrowth of such a doctrine of Scripture that certain measures should develop, even scribally, to signify it, to make it visible." Thus the earliest manuscript of Irenaeus's writings reveals in a physical way an insight into the very issues Irenaeus was keenly debating in his *Adversus haereses* at a more conceptual and theological level.

Irenaeus and His Theological Traditions

Michael Slusser begins the section on Irenaeus's theology with a challenge: What is the heart of Irenaeus's theology, the key that unlocks the whole of his thought? Sweeping aside other suggestions, such as recapitulation, Slusser argues that it is the interaction between God's greatness and God's love, *magnitudo* and *dilectio* in the surviving Latin translation. Irenaeus is in fact largely in agreement with his Gnostic opponents, Slusser argues, over the question of God's greatness, even though the Gnostics themselves are unable to admit the fact. But the reason why they are unable to admit the fact is precisely because they do not understand that greatness is not incompatible with love, and that the acts of love evident in creation and in the incarnation in the thought of what they call the "psychic Christians" do not compromise God's greatness, but show how unbounded God's power actually is.

Peter Widdicombe takes further the exploration of God's love in Irenaeus, by considering the ways in which Irenaeus speaks of the fatherhood of God. Widdicombe situates Irenaeus's theology of God's fatherhood in the wider patristic tradition, from Justin and Theophilus of Antioch before him through Origen to Athanasius. He argues that, although Irenaeus is not entirely consistent on the matter, and is prepared to use the term in slightly different ways in different arguments, on the whole his usage is quite distinctive and connected, above all, to the revelation by the Son that God is our Father, and we are God's adoptive children. Though he accepts the classical, philosophical tradition of God as "Father of all" as Justin and Theophilus had, and also to some extent the Jewish tradition of God as the Father of Israel (particularly in arguing against Marcion), these are not the traditions of divine fatherhood that interest him. Nor does he use the term, as Origen and Athanasius do, to discuss the immanent Trinity, the relationship between the Father and the Son in themselves. Instead, he is most interested in the new knowledge about God that the revelation of God's fatherhood transmits to us. He has a strongly Pauline sense of the good news as the revealing by the Son that God is not simply Creator and Lawgiver, Almighty and Lord, but loving Father. In this, Widdicombe argues, he is close to Origen, though Origen was to develop further the implications for the individual Christian's relationship with God.

Alistair Stewart examines Irenaeus's Rule of Truth as given in *Haer.* I.10.1, together with the context of his claim in *Haer.* I.9.4 that "whoever holds the Rule of

Truth immutable in himself, which he received through baptism, will acknowledge those names and sayings and parables which are indeed in Scripture, but will not acknowledge the blasphemous narrative" (which his opponents make out of them). Stewart argues that the traditional reading of this passage as evidence for a three-fold trinitarian questioning of baptismal candidates in Irenaeus's church is misplaced. Instead, he argues that the trinitarian section of the Rule would reflect catechetical instruction before baptism and a trinitarian formula of baptism in the name of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, while the narrative christological confession at the end ("and the coming and the birth from the virgin and the passion and the resurrection from the dead and the bodily reception into the heavens of the beloved, our Lord Jesus Christ, and his coming again") reflects a christological confession that was to be made by the candidate herself immediately before baptism. Stewart concludes by suggesting that the confession of Christ specifically links back to the anti-Valentinian context: it is Christ who is the true meaning of scripture.

Sara Parvis looks at Irenaeus's implicit engagement with Gnosticism's appeal to educated women. The Gnostic myths and assemblies discussed by Irenaeus, on the face of it, had far more to offer women than the late second-century church: female divine principles, a creator Mother to the creator Father, a re-reading of the story of Eve by which eating the forbidden fruit was a wise action rather than a disaster, and, under Mark at least, some kind of liturgical role for women in the assembly. Parvis argues that Irenaeus is aware of the appeal of all of these, and carefully and sensitively counters them all in his work, maximizing room for women as far as possible within the tradition he understands himself to have received. He avoids the obvious move of criticizing women gods and female divine principles on the grounds of female inferiority, instead arguing that the roles of Sophia and Achamoth are logically impossible for other reasons. At the risk of creating serious theological difficulties for the tradition, he extends Paul's Adam/Christ paradigm to Eve and Mary. And he insists that women prophets are chosen by God and sanctioned by both scripture and tradition, going so far (Parvis argues) as to claim that those who reject them are committing the unforgivable sin against the Holy Spirit.

Stephen Presley's essay builds upon Michael Slusser's programmatic article "The Exegetical Roots of Trinitarian Theology" (1988), discussing Irenaeus's contribution to embryonic analytical trinitarian thought. Behind such analytical discussions, he notes, there is a prior exegetical discussion. In particular the focus on the concept of *prosōpon* in the interpretation of passages such as Gen. 1:26 and Psa. 110:1 is a cornerstone of this exegetical debate. While the prosopological method permeates the writings of many Christian authors of the second century, Presley asks why Irenaeus does "not more explicitly detail and utilize this method?" The answer Presley supplies is that Irenaeus's hesitancy to employ this method stems from his own polemical context. Specifically, Presley argues that Irenaeus recognized the potential this method had to play into the hands of his Gnostic opponents, for by discerning different voices in a given passage, they could validate suppositions about a multiplicity of heavenly characters speaking in scriptural passages. Irenaeus's response is not to dispense with the method in its entirety, but to step back from the method and to discuss the theological

framework in which such a method could be applied, when there is a prior theological affirmation of belief in the only true God. Thus, Presley notes that Irenaeus limits the potentiality of the method so that "the only possible divine referent found in scripture is the one true God, and likewise any divine allusion must refer to either Father or the Son." Hence it is suggested that Irenaeus subordinates prosopological exegesis under his overarching theological framework, or *regula fidei*, that acknowledges the necessity of the prior commitment to the Father and Son as divine beings, to the exclusion of the Gnostic plethora of divine intermediaries. Consequently, for Presley, Irenaeus occupies a key place in the development of early trinitarian thought, particularly in regard to the concept of person.

Sophie Cartwright explores another distinctive aspect of Irenaeus's thought, his theology of the image of God, throwing it into relief by comparing it to the same doctrine in two fourth-century theologians whom he much influenced, Eustathius of Antioch and Marcellus of Ancyra. Like most patristic theologians, all of these writers understood scripture to teach both that Adam (and hence humanity in general) was created in the image of God, and that Christ is the image of the invisible God. Eustathius and Marcellus both followed Irenaeus's distinctive teaching that it is Adam's body specifically that is in the image of God and that Christ renews and perfects the image in Adam. Beyond this, however, the theological anthropology of the three differs in significant and mutually illuminating ways. For Irenaeus, Cartwright argues, Christ makes visible both what God is and what Adam is meant to be. This is because Adam already resembles God, even before the incarnation; humanity, indeed, "has an ontological affinity with God," being connected with God by both pattern and substance from its creation. On receiving the Holy Spirit, restored humanity becomes even more intimately connected to God, to the extent, she claims, of "entirely relinquishing the power of self-direction." For Marcellus, meanwhile, humanity is radically unlike the eternal God, and is in the image not of the eternal God but of God incarnate: Adam is modelled on perfect Adam. But the incarnation itself is temporary: although humanity can only be saved by being united to God, once the eschatological restoration has been achieved, humanity is left as the perfect creature, beloved of and saved by God, who yet, being a creature, continues to be radically unlike God. For Eustathius, meanwhile, it is the eternal Son who is the true image of God; Christ is image of God in a more attenuated sense, because of Eustathius' strongly divisive Christology. The Word is made visible through the "human being of God," and the Word, as true image, then makes known the whole Godhead. Eustathius thinks, like Irenaeus and Marcellus in different ways, that Adam's body is modelled on God, like a statue. But in Eustathius, the human soul in both Adam and Christ serves to keep the Word to some extent at a distance from its image.

Paul Parvis, again, in a typically learned and thoughtful survey of the seven major editions of *Against the Heresies*, looks at the way Irenaeus's work was claimed for various theological causes by its editors over the years, and Irenaeus himself to some extent remade in their image. Erasmus, in 1526, saw Irenaeus as a man of eloquence, learning, and scriptural piety, but above all a man of peace. The editions of the Reformer Gallasius in 1570 and the Franciscan Feuardent in 1575 were rather more interested in

war. They were particularly interested in the heresiological aspect of the work, calling on Irenaeus's support against the presumed heresies of their own day. At the behest of Theodore Beza, Gallasius wrote extensive notes, including "admonition and censure" where Irenaeus's occasional incipient "impurity" left him in disagreement with Reformed thought; these notes themselves spurred Feuardent to respond with pro-Catholic ripostes, as well as the occasional encouragement to violence. Grabe, writing as an Anglican in Oxford in his edition of 1702, returns to a more irenic view of Irenaeus, whose aid he calls in support of a "middle way," looking toward primitive Christianity to reconcile modern doctrinal differences: he was no doubt only confirmed in this approach as he wrestled with the embattled notes of the two previous editors. Nonetheless, his Irenaeus was still too Protestant for Paris, and the Maurist Massuet responded with a major new edition in 1710, much politer and more urbane in his criticisms of his predecessor's edition than Feuardent had been but nonetheless firm in reclaiming Irenaeus for the Roman Catholic tradition. The final two editions, the establishment Anglican Harvey in 1857 and the Trappist monk Rousseau in 1965, bring us to the critical era. Parvis concludes by wondering what sort of Irenaeus our own age deserves.

Finally, Irenaeus M. C. Steenberg looks at Irenaeus's patristic context and legacy. He traces Irenaeus's knowledge of post-biblical writers before and during his own time, and considers his influence on subsequent patristic thought, East and West. On Irenaeus's legacy, he first sketches out evidence for the circulation and translation of Irenaeus's works, and then lists the explicit references to Irenaeus and his writings in the third, fourth, fifth, and later centuries, as well as direct, though unacknowledged, citations that have been identified from his works in various authors. Steenburg notes that Irenaeus, though widely referenced as a heresiologist, is oddly seldom referred to as theologian, despite the fact that his theology clearly influenced many of the great theologians of the fourth century, including Athanasius, Gregory of Nyssa, Gregory of Nazianzus, and Augustine, as well as later figures such as Maximus the Confessor. Steenburg proposes that, far from being a controversial figure in the fourth century, as some have argued, Irenaeus is not mentioned by name because his theology was too normal. It was simply viewed as "Christian theology," the gospel of Christ—which is what Irenaeus himself would have wanted.