The Intertextual Reception of Genesis 1–3 in Irenaeus of Lyons



Stephen O. Presley

BRILL

The Intertextual Reception of Genesis 1–3 in Irenaeus of Lyons

The Bible in Ancient Christianity

General Editor

D. Jeffrey Bingham

Editorial Board

Brian E. Daley
Robin M. Jensen
Christoph Markschies
Peter Martens
David G.K. Taylor
Maureen A. Tilley
Robert L. Wilken

VOLUME 8

The titles published in this series are listed at *brill.com/bac*

The Intertextual Reception of Genesis 1–3 in Irenaeus of Lyons

By

Stephen O. Presley



BRILL

LEIDEN | BOSTON

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Presley, Stephen O.
The intertextual reception of Genesis 1–3 in Irenaeus of Lyons / by Stephen O. Presley.
pages cm. — (The Bible in ancient Christianity, ISSN 1542-1295 ; volume 8)
Includes bibliographical references and index.
ISBN 978-90-04-28990-1 (hardback : acid-free paper) — ISBN 978-90-04-29452-3 (e-book) 1. Bible. Genesis, I–III—Criticism, interpretation, etc.—History—Early church, ca. 30–600. 2. Irenaeus, Saint, Bishop of Lyon. I. Title.

BS1235.52.P74 2015
222'.1106092—dc23

2015008938

This publication has been typeset in the multilingual 'Brill' typeface. With over 5,100 characters covering Latin, IPA, Greek, and Cyrillic, this typeface is especially suitable for use in the humanities.
For more information, please www.brill.com/brill-typeface.

ISSN 1542-1295
ISBN 978-90-04-28990-1 (hardback)
ISBN 978-90-04-29452-3 (e-book)

Copyright 2015 by Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, The Netherlands.
Koninklijke Brill NV incorporates the imprints Brill, Brill Hes & De Graaf, Brill Nijhoff, Brill Rodopi and Hotei Publishing.
All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, translated, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without prior written permission from the publisher.
Authorization to photocopy items for internal or personal use is granted by Koninklijke Brill NV provided that the appropriate fees are paid directly to The Copyright Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Drive, Suite 910, Danvers, MA 01923, USA. Fees are subject to change.

This book is printed on acid-free paper.

For Haley, with love
Haer *5.35.2*



Contents

List of Abbreviations x
Acknowledgments xii

1 Introduction: Toward an Appreciation for Irenaeus' Intertextual Reading of Genesis 1–3 1
1.1 Introduction 1
1.2 Intertextuality in Modern Biblical Studies and the Ancient World 7
1.3 The Intertextual Nature of Irenaeus' Scripture Reading 12
1.4 Framing the Intertextual Reception of Genesis 1–3 in Irenaeus 27
1.5 Methodology and Qualifications 39

2 Reading Gnostic Creation: The Intertextual Reception of Genesis 1–3 in Book 1 of *Adversus Haereses* 46
2.1 Introduction 46
2.2 The Valentinian Reading of Creation: *Haer*. 1.5.1–6 49
2.3 Irenaeus on Creation and Incarnation: *Haer*. 1.9.3 52
2.4 The Marcosian Reading of Creation: *Haer*. 1.14.6 and *Haer*. 1.18.1–4 53
2.5 Irenaeus on Creation and the regula veritatis: *Haer*. 1.22.1 57
2.6 Other Gnostic Readings of Creation: *Haer*. 1.24.1–2, *Haer*. 1.28.1, and *Haer*. 1.30.1–9 59
2.7 Conclusion: Irenaeus and the Gnostics' Intertextual Reading of Gen 1–3 in *Haer.* 1 68

3 Refuting Gnostic Creation: The Intertextual Reception of Genesis 1–3 in Book 2 of *Adversus Haereses* 73
3.1 Introduction 73
3.2 Reading Moses with the Apostles: *Haer*. 2.2.5 74
3.3 The Knowledge of God and the Growth of Humankind in Creation: *Haer*. 2.26.1 and *Haer*. 2.28.1 77
3.4 Refuting Valentinian Anthropology: *Haer*. 2.30.7 and *Haer*. 2.30.9 80
3.5 Creation of the Body and Soul: *Haer*. 2.34.3–4 83
3.6 Conclusion: Irenaeus' Intertextual Reading of Gen 1–3 in *Haer*. 2 85

4 Reading Genesis from Creation to Incarnation: The Intertextual Reception of Genesis 1–3 in Book 3 of *Adversus Haereses* 88
4.1 Introduction 88
4.2 Creation and the Narrative of the Apostolic Tradition: *Haer*. 3.3.3 89
4.3 Son of God in Creation and Covenant: *Haer*. 3.11.5, 8 91
4.4 Salvation from Creation to Incarnation: *Haer*. 3.18.1,7 96
4.5 Creation, Incarnation, and Resurrection: *Haer*. 3.19.3–20.1 98
4.6 Adam, Christ, and Recapitulation: *Haer*. 3.21.10 103
4.7 Adam's Formation and Christ's Incarnation: *Haer*. 3.22.1–4 106
4.8 The Serpent's Deception and the Hope of Adam's Salvation: *Haer*. 3.23.1–8 115
4.9 The Church, the Spirit, and the Knowledge of God: *Haer*. 3.24.1–2 126
4.10 Conclusion: Irenaeus' Intertextual Reading of Gen 1–3 in *Haer*. 3 129

5 Genesis, the Creation, and the Divine Economy: The Intertextual Reception of Genesis 1–3 in Book 4 of *Adversus Haereses* 134
5.1 Introduction 134
5.2 The Heretics and Gen 1-3: *Haer*. 4.pf.3–4 135
5.3 The Framer, Maker, and Nourisher of Creation: *Haer*. 4.6.2 137
5.4 The Son of God Conversing with Adam: *Haer*. 4.10.1 139
5.5 The Divine Economy and the Growth of Humankind: *Haer*. 4.11.1–2 139
5.6 Why God Created Humankind: *Haer*. 4.14.1 142
5.7 The Sign of Sabbath Rest: *Haer*. 4.16.1 143
5.8 Creation and the Supremacy of God Over All Things: *Haer*. 4.20.1–4 144
5.9 Word of God and the Unity of Scripture: *Haer*. 4.32.1 149
5.10 The Spiritual Disciple and the Heretics: *Haer*. 4.33.4 and *Haer*. 4.34.4 151
5.11 Adam in the Parables of Christ: *Haer*. 4.36.2–6 154
5.12 Image, Likeness, and Freedom: *Haer*. 4.37.4 157
5.13 Perfection in the Image and Likeness of God: *Haer*. 4.38.1–4 158
5.14 God Makes and Humankind is Made: *Haer*. 4.39.2 164
5.15 The Prophecy of Eschatological Judgment in Creation: *Haer*. 4.40.3 166
5.16 Conclusion: Irenaeus' Intertextual Reading of Gen 1–3 in *Haer*. 4 167

6 From Creation to the Resurrection of the Body: The Intertextual Reception of Genesis 1–3 in Book 5 of *Adversus Haereses* 172
6.1 Introduction 172
6.2 Refuting Valentinians, Ebionites, and Marcion: *Haer*. 5.1.1–5.2.1 173
6.3 The Resurrection of the Body: *Haer*. 5.3.1 and *Haer*. 5.5.2 181
6.4 Perfection in the Image and Likeness: *Haer*. 5.6.1 185
6.5 The Narrative of Resurrection: *Haer*. 5.7.1–2 188
6.6 The Spirit and the Image and Likeness: *Haer*. 5.8.1 190
6.7 Flesh, Blood, and the Kingdom of God: *Haer*. 5.10.1, *Haer*. 5.12.1–6, *Haer*. 5.14.1–2 191
6.8 Creation, Resurrection, and the Healing of the Blind Man: *Haer*. 5:15.2–16.2 197
6.9 Christ, Adam, and Restoration at the Tree: *Haer*. 5.16.3, *Haer*. 5.17.1–4, *Haer*. 5.19.1, *Haer*. 5.20.2 207
6.10 The Temptations of Adam and Christ: *Haer*. 5.21.1–3 and *Haer*. 5.23.1–2 215
6.11 Creation and Eschatology in Irenaeus: *Haer*. 5.26.2, *Haer*. 5.28.3–4, *Haer*. 5.30.4, *Haer*. 5.33.1–4, *Haer*. 5.34.2, and *Haer*. 5.36.3 223
6.12 Conclusion: Irenaeus' Intertextual Reading of Gen 1-3 in *Haer*. 5 232

7 Conclusion: Irenaeus' Intertextual Reception of Genesis 1–3 in *Adversus Haereses* 240
7.1 Introduction 240
7.2 Irenaeus on the Gnostic Reading of Gen 1–3 241
7.3 Irenaeus' Intertextual Reading of Gen 1–3 245
7.4 Conclusion 262

Appendix 263
Bibliography 268
Index of Scriptures 285
Index of Modern Authors 296
Index of Subjects 298

List of Abbreviations

ACR	*Australian Catholic Record*
AH	*Adversus Haereses, or Against the Heresies*
AHC	*Annuarium historiae conciliorum*
ARC	*ARC: Journal of Faculty Religious Studies McGill University*
ASE	*Abhandlungen zur Socialethik*
AThR	*Anglican Theological Review*
Aug	*Augustinianum*
Bib	*Biblica*
BibInt	*Biblical Interpretation*
BJRL	*Biblical Journal of Religious Literature*
BLE	*Bulletin de Literature Ecclésiastique*
BP	*Biblia Patristica*
CBQ	*Catholic Biblical Quarterly*
Com	*Communio*
Epid	*Epideixis, or The Demonstration of Apostolic Preaching*
ERT	*Evangelical Review of Theology*
ETL	*Ephemerides Theologicae Louanienses*
EvQ	*Evangelical Quarterly*
Greg	*Gregorianum*
HTR	*Harvard Theological Review*
Irén	*Irénikon*
JAAR	*Journal of the American Academy of Religion*
JECS	*Journal of Early Christian Studies*
JR	*Journal of Religion*
JSJ	*Journal for the Study of Judaism*
JTI	*Journal of Theological Interpretation*
JTS	*Journal of Theological Studies*
MAR	*Marianum*
MT	*Modern Theology*
NovT	*Novum Testamentum*
NRT	*Nouvelle Revue Théologique*
NTA	*Neutestamentliche Abhandlungen*
OCP	*Orientalia Christiana Periodica*
ORA	*Oxford University Research Archive*
PL	*Philosophy and Literature*
ProEc	*Pro ecclesia*

REA	*Revue des Études Augustiniennes*
RevB	*Revue Bénédictine*
RHR	*Revue de l'histoire des religions*
RSPT	*Revue des Sciences Philosophiques et Théologiques*
RSR	*Revue des Sciences Religieuses*
RThom	*Revue Thomiste*
RUO	*Revue de l'université d'Ottawa*
SacE	*Sacris Erudiri*
SC	*Sources Chrétiennes*
SecCent	*Second Century*
SJT	*Scottish Journal of Theology*
SMSR	*Studia Materiali di Storia delle Religioni*
StuEv	*Studia Evangelica*
StuM	*Studia Moralia*
StuPat	*Studia Patristica*
StuTh	*Studia Theologica*
SVTQ	*Saint Vladimir's Theological Quarterly*
ThLBer	*Theologische Literaturbericht*
ThQ	*Theologische Quartalschrift*
TS	*Theological Studies*
VC	*Vigiliae Christianae*
VetCh	*Vetera Christianorum*
VT	*Vetus Testamentum*
ZAC	*Zeitschrift für Antikes Christentum*

Acknowledgments

Like Irenaeus' hermeneutical perspective, no portion of this project was completed in isolation, but in constant conversation with a variety of students and scholars at several different academic institutions. The seedbed of this study was planted by Jeff Bingham over a casual lunch conversation, while I was a graduate student at Dallas Seminary. I am indebted to his wisdom and guidance, not only for the initial idea of this project, but also his support throughout the writing process. He inspired my admiration for the Fathers and for Irenaeus in particular. His work on Irenaeus and second century theology and exegesis was foundational for this project and his thoughts continually sharpen my understanding of the early centuries of the church. His editorial comments were also immensely helpful in preparing the manuscript for publication in the *Bible and Ancient Christianity Series* at Brill. Along these lines, I also want to thank the editorial team at Brill for their professionalism and assistance throughout the process of publication and the reviewers who provided helpful comments that served to improve my argument.

This book is a revised version of my doctoral thesis that was carried out under the supervision of Mark Elliott at the University of St. Andrews, Scotland. Mark's knowledge of patristic theology and exegesis is unmatched and his comments always enhanced my writing and thinking. Many others on the faculty of St. Mary's college and in the graduate community of St. Andrews also helped influence portions of this book through formal seminars or even casual conversations in the Roundel. St Andrews was a wonderful place to study and I am forever grateful for the opportunity to participate in the academic life of the university. I am also grateful for Ivor Davidson and Lewis Ayres, who examined the thesis and provided helpful direction for further revisions and publication. I would also like to thank Peeters for the permission to republish a shortened form of my article: "The Lost Sheep who is Found: Irenaeus' Intertextual Reading of Genesis 3 in Adversus Haereses 3.23.1–8," that appeared in *Studia Patristica* 51, pp. 47–59.

While revising this book over the last few years, it has been a pleasure to serve on the faculty of Southwestern Seminary. The community of Southwestern, and especially the faculty at the Houston campus, were very supportive and continued to encourage me during the process. My colleague John Wilsey, in particular, was gracious enough to read portions of this book and discuss the complexity of Irenaean hermeneutics. In addition, I am also grateful for a number of individuals at Southwestern and elsewhere who have read through the manuscript and offered their comments including: Cody Pancamo, Tony

Robinson, Jeff Webster, and my sister Whitney Presley. In particular, I want to recognize two of my student's Jason Gibson and Jason Karch, who worked tirelessly to compile the indices and carefully read through the final draft.

I am also thankful for my parents, Mark and Anne Presley, and my in-laws, Richard and Cathy Thompson. Each of them supported our family during our time in St. Andrews and throughout the revision process. I regret that my father passed away during my first year of postgraduate research at St Andrews and never had the chance to see the final form of this book. He held a Ph.D in geology from the University of West Virginia and served as a dean and college professor in geological sciences in the Dallas Community College system. His knowledge of the geological sciences made him a wonderful dialogue partner on the interpretation of Genesis 1–3. I will never forget our last meaningful conversation before he died, when we walked through Holyrood Park just outside Edinburgh and discussed James Hutton, geology, and the early Christian readings of Genesis 1–3.

Finally, this book is dedicated to my loving wife, Haley. Her patience knows no limits and this small statement of gratitude is woefully inadequate in comparison to her consistent support amid the deadlines, drafts, and revisions of this book. My love for her grows with each passing day and, above all, anything I accomplish is due to her loving sacrifice and commitment. The overall timeline of this project also included the birth of our four children: Isla, Emma, Luke, and Andrew. Every time I slipped away to my writing desk, they always welcomed me home with a smile and a cuddle. The joy they have given me is beyond measure and I hope that one day they might find Irenaeus' scripture reading as interesting as I have.

Stephen O. Presley
Advent, 2014

CHAPTER 1

Introduction: Toward an Appreciation for Irenaeus' Intertextual Reading of Genesis 1–3

1.1 Introduction

The city of Lyons, France is nestled in the heart of the Rhone valley, which has always been an important inland trading route from the bustling seaport in Marseilles. Along this route, Lyons is strategically positioned at the confluence of the mighty Rhone and Saone Rivers that converge in the heart of the city center. Travelers to Lyons, both ancient and modern, who wished to cross these rivers, must rely on a complex series of intersecting bridges spanning the waterways at various points. When I visited Lyons for the first time, I experienced the challenge of navigating around the city firsthand. At the same time, I could not help but observe that this network of bridges crisscrossing Lyons, serves as a fitting metaphor for the nature of biblical interpretation employed by the second century Bishop of Lyons, Irenaeus. Like the intricate network of roadways connecting Lyons city center, Irenaeus' interpretation is characterized by the convergence of scriptural texts flowing together through a variety of methods of interconnectivity and intertextuality. This study gives attention to the ways that Irenaeus reads scripture, particularly Gen 1–3, intertextually. The basic premise guiding this study is that the reception of any particular passage of scripture in Irenaeus necessarily includes the reception of theologically and hermeneutically interrelated passages. Irenaeus receives and interprets texts *in relationship*. Even beginning with opening events of creation, the scriptures, for Irenaeus, are entirely consonant. This intertextual method of reading scripture is not imposed upon him, but clearly reflected in his descriptions of the exegetical task and applied exegesis. These textual relationships, furthermore, are formed and shaped through a series of reading strategies that circumscribe precisely how Irenaeus' works scripture intertextually. These reading strategies are rather diverse and fashioned through highly intensive readings of scripture within particular theological and exegetical debates.

The appreciation of Irenaeus' intertextual scriptural interpretation was overlooked in previous studies that were working on the basis of the assumptions and methods intrinsic to Higher Criticism. When these critical assumptions were applied to Irenaeus' use of scripture, they naturally disconnected the texture of the scriptural networks in attempts to extract isolated sources

© KONINKLIJKE BRILL NV, LEIDEN, 2015 | DOI 10.1163/9789004294523_002

from isolated texts. Hans Frei summarizes the reductionistic effects of the historical-critical method upon pre-critical exegesis saying, "As the realistic narrative reading of the biblical stories broke down, literal or verbal and historical meaning were severed and literal and figural interpretation, hitherto naturally affiliated procedures, also came apart."[1] However, within Irenaean scholarship, Gustaf Wingren, among other scholars, criticized the generation source critics in the early twentieth century that dissected Irenaeus' theological framework. Lamenting their divisive tendencies, Wingren remarked, "one fact is beyond dispute: none of the modern theologians who have broken up his [Irenaeus'] theology into two or more sections comes anywhere near Irenaeus as a systematic theologian."[2] Contrary to those who disparaged Irenaeus' "primitive exegesis and obscure ideas" and applied an "atomistic system of exegetics," Wingren argued for a more systematic structure to Irenaeus' thought by means of closer attention to his biblical theology.[3] He credited Irenaeus with the unique ability to fuse the scriptures and various authorities of the early church into a "harmonious whole."[4] However, even Wingren's search for the fundamental unity of Irenaeus' theological framework did not take into account the unifying features of his exegetical practice itself. The same tendency was perceivable in John Lawson's work that also touted Irenaeus as a biblical theologian and aimed to clarify the "biblical character" of Irenaeus' theology in a more systematic manner. He remarked that even the most casual reader of Irenaeus cannot fail to observe that "chapter after chapter is nothing other than a mosaic of Biblical quotations."[5] Like Wingren, he also disparaged Irenaeus' exegesis as "most commonly allegorical."[6] As a result, his sympathetic inquiry into the patterns of Irenaeus' thought also continued to partition the harmonious nature of his scripture interpretation. Nevertheless, the legacy of their appreciation for Irenaeus' use of scripture incited a new direction in Irenaean scholarship that resulted in a greater appreciation for Irenaeus as a scriptural exegete.

Following the work of Wingren and Lawson, by the late 1960's Irenaean scholars began reevaluating the performance of scripture in the Bishop of

---

1 Frei, *The Eclipse of Biblical Narrative: A Study in Eighteenth and Nineteenth Century Hermeneutics* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1980), 6–7. The early chapters of Genesis in particular (along with the Gospels) received the most intense criticism. Ibid., 17.

2 Gustof Wingren, *Man and the Incarnation: A Study in the Biblical Theology of Irenaeus* (Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock Publishers, 1947), 104. See also Ibid., xi, 106–10. Antonio Orbe, *Teología de San Ireneo: Comentario al Libro V del «Adversus haereses»* (Madrid: Biblioteca de Autroes Crisianos, 1985), 15. Hereafter: *Teología V.1–3*.

3 Wingren, *Man and the Incarnation*, xxi, 104.

4 Ibid., xvi.

5 John Lawson, *The Biblical Theology of Saint Irenaeus* (London: Epworth Press, 1948), 23.

6 Ibid., 23.

Lyons as a new avenue into his thought. Although the study of Irenaeus' use of scripture extends back to Werner's contribution in the nineteenth century, modern treatments began to flourish after the early 1970's beginning with Antonio Orbe's study of the Gospel parables and Peretto's analysis of Romans 1–8.[7] These exegetical works were less concerned with the individual sources behind Irenaeus' writings, and focused more on appreciating Irenaeus' contribution to the history of biblical interpretation. They frequently focused their treatments on his reading of individual books, chapters, passages, phrases, or terms (especially in the New Testament). This trajectory gained momentum in the 1980's and 1990's and in the twenty-first century it has shown no signs of slowing down. Consistently, these studies expose the intricacies of Irenaeus' scripture reading of particular portions of the bible and, in varying degrees, have shown that Irenaeus reads scripture intertextually. This study is indebted to these previous works and contributes to this stream of reception history. However, the purpose of this study is not merely to explain Irenaeus' interpretation of Gen 1–3, but to describe precisely *how* Irenaeus networks these passages with the rest of scriptural witness. For this reason, this analysis begins with an assessment of his hermeneutics rather than an argument for the importance of the creation texts in Irenaeus' theological framework. To be sure, his dependence on creation passages is indisputable. It is not unusual to find Irenaeus labeled a "theologian of creation."[8] The passages of Gen 1–3, however, are not the only texts that contribute to Irenaeus' theology of creation. Irenaeus interprets all of these Genesis texts within carefully constructed scriptural networks of interrelated texts.

This analysis of Irenaeus' intertextual reception of Gen 1–3 shows that his theological assumptions are shaped in and through the nexus of scriptural passages. To be sure, these reading strategies have some correspondence with methods of Jewish midrash and Greco-Roman rhetorical traditions, but no single hermeneutical background can account for the breadth of Irenaeus' intertextual exegetical practices.[9] This study will show that when Irenaeus read Gen 1–3, his mind is actively engaged in surveying the entire corpus of

7 Orbe, *Parabolas evangelicas in San Ireneo*, 2 vols (Madrid: Biblioteca de Autores Cristianos, 1972); Pretto, *La Lettera ai Romani, cc. 1–8, nell' "Adversus Haereses" d'Ireneo* (Bari: Istituto di Litteratura Cristiana Antica, 1971).

8 Matthew Steenberg, *Irenaeus on Creation* (Leiden: Brill, 2008), 4.

9 Hays makes a similar argument for Paul's hermeneutics. Hays, *Echoes of Scripture*, 10–14. Steenberg also discusses Irenaeus' general approach to the interpretation of Genesis under three "interpretive backdrops" termed: "discernment of the motivation or reasons behind God's creative act," "the conception of creation ex nihilo," and "the chiliastic vision of the eschaton." While these interpretive backdrops are certainly represented in Irenaeus, they all participate in Irenaeus' hermeneutical interest in scriptural harmony. Steenberg, *Irenaeus*, 21.

scriptural material as he applies a variety of reading strategies and united disparate texts together.[10] The strategies that circumscribe how Irenaeus works Gen 1–3 intertextually include: literary readings, typological readings, prophecy and fulfillment, verbal connections, organizational functions, illustrative applications, narratival or creedal, prosopological interpretations, and general-to-particular connections. There are also various permutations of these methods within each classification, and I will define each of these more clearly below. These reading strategies are informed by his theological framework and demonstrative of highly intensive scripture reading. Each of these methods is also influenced and shaped by the content of the particular texts in view and their situatedness within the unfolding of the divine economy.

At the same time, his scripture reading and application of these reading strategies is also fashioned by a theological polemic that is engaged in refuting the theological claims of Gnosticism. Thus, in *Haer*. 1–2 Irenaeus presents the Gnostic reading of Gen 1–3 that shares both similarities and differences with Irenaeus' intertextual reading. In many ways, the Gnostic textual networking Irenaeus describes in these books resembles the same reading strategies that he employs—with one exception. Irenaeus presents Gnostics as applying similar styles of verbal connections, prosopological interpretation, and even a general appreciation for the literary context, but he explicitly rejects their use of gematria. Though they use similar techniques in interpretation, these competing theological perspectives of Gen 1–3 motivate them to appeal to different authorities to clarify or correct the Mosaic account, which naturally yields different types of particular intertextual relationships. There is no doubt that Irenaeus' theological polemic contributes to the selections of intertextual relationships he fashions and shapes his polemical arguments. But Irenaeus is interested in clarifying the Mosaic account with the rest of the scriptural witness, while the Gnostics appeal to both scripture and their myth to correct the errors in the Mosaic account. This appreciation for the *way* Irenaeus reads Gen 1–3 in response to Gnosticism and in harmony with the rest of the scriptural witness will serve to establish a framework for a much more comprehensive understanding of the complex performance of these passages in his polemical theology. It will also clearly establish how Irenaeus networks

10 I prefer the language of "interscriptural" instead of "intertextual" because I feel that it provides a more appropriate description of Irenaeus' hermeneutical perspective. The language "interscriptural" highlights Irenaeus' self-understanding as a Christian interpreter that grounds his scriptural networking. But due to the prevalence of "intertextual" and "intertextuality" I continue to use these terms and I will define them more carefully below.

scripture and the key features of the manner in which his textual networking is expressed.

Beginning in chapter one I consider the nature of Irenaeus' hermeneutical orientation based upon studies of patristic exegesis and his own descriptions of the exegetical task. I show that Irenaeus purposes to interconnect texts in his refutation and exegesis and I formulate a methodology that can appreciate this intertextual reading of Gen 1–3. I also explain how this book extends the previous theological and exegetical works on Irenaeus' use of Genesis in the contributions of Orbe, Jacobsen, Kannengiesser, Steenberg, and Holsinger-Friesen. This book confirms that every time Irenaeus' appeals to the events in creation, he reads them in continuity with the rest of the scriptural witness and does so though a discernable set of reading strategies.

In chapters two-six, I provide a careful literary analysis of every verifiable echo, allusion, and citation of Gen 1–3 in each book of *Adversus Haereses*. In each case I isolate the performance of every reference to Gen 1–3 and any corresponding intertexts and explain the nature of their hermeneutically symbiotic relationships. Chapter two, and in some instances chapter three, however, are unique in that they present Irenaeus' interpretation of the Gnostic reading of Gen 1–3 that shares both similarities and differences with Irenaeus' intertextual reading. Irenaeus' scripture reading and application of these reading strategies is also fashioned by his theological polemic. In many ways, the Gnostic textual networking Irenaeus describes in these books resembles the same reading strategies that he employs—with the exception of their use of gematria. The distinction between Irenaeus and the Gnostics readings of Gen 1–3 is not procedural, but distinctive theological perspectives that have distinctive views on the integrity of the narratives in Gen 1–3 and the authority of their teaching.

Chapters four-six detail Irenaeus' use of Gen 1–3 in *Haer*. 3–5 that jointly construct the framework of Irenaeus' intertextual reading of creation. While there is considerable overlap in the reading strategies of each book, working through them successively allows his voice to be heard more clearly and ensures that no use of Gen 1–3 is omitted from analysis. Chapter four looks at Gen 1–3 in *Haer*. 3, which also serves as a pivotal turning point in his refutation of the Gnostics as he shifts from refuting doctrines of the Gnostics in *Haer*. 1–2 to defending the apostolic faith in light of scripture and tradition in *Haer*. 3–5. The argument of *Haer*. 3 makes a case for the continuity of the activity of one God from creation to incarnation, and the general thrust of the book discusses the uniqueness of God the Father, Creator of the heaven and earth, and the person and work of Christ, the Son of God. These claims impose a theological pressure upon Irenaeus' interpretation of scripture and contribute to the performance of Gen 1–3 in the context of his intertextual exegesis.

When he reads Gen 1–3 in *Haer*. 3, Irenaeus coordinates texts in a narratival relationship both internally and externally, so that the work of God in Gen 1–3 initiates the unfolding of the divine economy. At the same time, Irenaeus also uses Gen 1–3 generally to order and structure his work, especially in the form of a series of chiasms in the second half of the book. He also uses philological connections between Gen 1–3 and other texts and various kinds of typological relationships to explain aspects of his theological framework. Alongside these reading strategies, he uses a style of interpretation called prosopological interpretation where he identifies the activity of divine persons functioning in Gen 1–3 and other related passages. A similar style also includes an illustrative application of texts, where he uses elements within a passage to exemplify a theological argument.

Chapter five involves the analysis of Gen 1–3 in *Haer*. 4 that aims to prove the continuity of divine activity throughout the course of the history of salvation. He discusses the way that the divine economy is constructed for the growth and maturity of the faithful, and these arguments often include the use of narratival arrangements and typological connections. In other instances he applies the different reading strategies mentioned above. Not all of these categories are mutually exclusive, but often work in harmony as he reads creation. In addition, two references to his predecessors (Justin and the Presbyter) frame the book as a whole and contribute to his intertextual reading of Gen 1–3. In each instance, Irenaeus continually returns to the language, imagery, and events of Gen 1–3 as a means to interpret other passages and images within the rest of the scriptural witness.

Chapter six, which analyses the use of Gen 1–3 in *Haer*. 5, offers the culmination of Irenaeus' intertextual resourcefulness of these creation texts. This is by far the longest chapter and provides the most extensive treatment of Gen 1–3 in Irenaeus' work. The number of references to Gen 1–3 in *Haer*. 5 is extensive, and this book is especially important for understanding how his intertextual reading of Gen 1–3 contributes to his anthropology and eschatology. Like the previous books, his scriptural networking is expressed through a series of reading strategies that support the classifications described in previous chapters, but there are also a number of unique textual relationships such as the extensive number of allusions concerning the formation of Adam and the prophetic reading of the seventh day of creation.

Finally, in chapter seven, I conclude with a summary and cumulative evaluation of Irenaeus' intertextual reading of Gen 1–3. This includes a summary of the continuity and discontinuity between Irenaeus and the Gnostic readings of creation. I argue that Irenaeus and the Gnostics are not arguing over the same individual passages, but over systems and networks of texts fashioned

through similar reading strategies. The rest of the chapter provides a summary of the variety of intertextual reading strategies that Irenaeus applies to Gen 1–3. This summary provides a more comprehensive analysis of the meaning and function of Gen 1–3 in relation to the rest of scripture than previous studies and explains precisely how Irenaeus works these significant passages intertextually. But before I work through a more developed treatment of Gen 1–3 in Irenaeus, below I describe the nature of the intertextual analysis carried out in this study and situate this analysis with the stream of studies on Irenaeus' use of scripture.

1.2 Intertextuality in Modern Biblical Studies and the Ancient World

Within contemporary Biblical Studies the expanding interest in "intertextuality" has generated a variety of definitions and methodologies.[11] Julia Kristeva, building upon the work of Mikhail Bakhtin, first introduced the term in 1966, with the often repeated description that "any text is constructed as a mosaic of quotations; any text is the absorption and transformation of another."[12] Poststructuralist theorists lauded her literary studies and the term "intertextuality" was met with instant approval. But since this initial coinage, the term has assumed an assortment of definitions in a variety of disciplines that extend beyond Kristeva's original intention. Kristeva herself eventually abandoned the term because it was applied too often as simply the "banal sense of 'source criticism' "[13] In her poststructuralist sense Kristeva used the term to focus on the extratextual realities in which a text is received. A text is never a closed system of signs, but read within a contextual environment that opens up the text to ever changing new productions of meaning. Given this ambiguity, some

11 For a summary of these approaches see: Stephen Moyise, "Intertextuality and the Study of the Old Testament in the New Testament," in *Old Testament in the New Testament: Essays in Honour of J. L. North* ed. Stephen Moyise *JSNTSup* 189 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000), 14–41; Michael R. Stead, *The Intertextuality of Zechariah 1–8* (New York: T&T Clark, 2009), 19–27; Stefan Alkier, "Intertextuality and the Semiotics of Biblical Texts," in *Reading the Bible Intertextuality*, eds. Richard B. Hays, Stefan Alkier, and Leroy A. Huizenga, 1–21 (Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2009), and Alkier, "New Testament Studies on the Basis of Categorical Semiotics," in *Reading the Bible Intertextuality*, eds. Richard B. Hays, Stefan Alkier, and Leroy A. Huizenga, 223–248 (Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2009).

12 Julia Kristeva, *Desire in Language: A Semiotic Approach to Literature and Art* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1980), 66.

13 Kristieva, *Revolution in Poetic Language* (Paris, Éditions du seuil, 1974). See also: Julia Kristeva and T. Moi, *The Kristeva Reader* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1986), 59–60.

biblical scholars have suggested dropping the use of the term altogether.[14] For others, though, the theory of intertextuality provided new ways to analyze the historical reception and transmission of texts.

In order to clarify the meaning of "intertextuality" for Biblical Studies, the recent volume, *Reading the Bible Intertextually*, described the methodological framework for intertextual evaluation. The method of intertextual study, as Stefan Alkier defines it, simply assumes the perspective of "investigating the relationships that a text can have with other texts."[15] He distinguishes between three forms of intertextual criticism. First, "Intratextuality" explores the syntactic, semantic, and pragmatic elements of texts in relation to general categories of literary criticism. Second, "Intertextuality" examines the effect of meaning that develops from the merging of two or more texts. Third, "Extratextuality" isolates the effect of meaning located in references to extratextual material.[16] Alkier also distinguishes limited and unlimited concepts of intertextuality that can be further delineated into three perspectives: a production-oriented perspective, a reception-oriented perspective, and an experimental perspective. This present study applies what Alkier terms a "production-oriented perspective," which develops through the evaluation of a series of identifiable texts within a particular work.[17] Alkier classifies the contributions of Richard Hays and Daniel Boyarin under this method of investigation, who have applied intertextuality to the fields of New Testament and Jewish studies. The reception-oriented perspective focuses on received texts in distinct historical contexts, while experimental perspective considers the meaning that arises from the potential merging of texts not grounded in verifiable contexts. For Irenaeus, textual harmonization is a natural part of his own interpretive framework, and thus textual integration and conflation pervades his whole exegetical project. The methodology of this study, therefore, offers a new perspective from which to analyze these scriptural networks. His scripture intertextuality, therefore, is

14 William Irwin, "Against Intertextuality," *PL* 28 (2004): 227–42.

15 Alkier, "Intertextuality," 3.

16 Ibid., 8–9. In a similar framework Steve Moyise identified "intertextuality" as an umbrella concept comprising at least three approaches including: "Intertextual Echo," "Dialogical Intertextuality" and "Postmodern Intertextuality." Moyise "Intertextuality" 17–8. See also: Porter, "The Use of the Old Testament in the New Testament: A Brief Comment on Method and Terminology," in *Early Christian interpretation of the scriptures of Israel: investigations and proposals*, Craig A. Evans, James A. Sanders (Continuum, 1997). T.K. Beal, "Intertextuality," in *Handbook of Postmodern Biblical Interpretation*, ed. A.K.A. Adam (St Louis: Chalice, 2000), 129. T.R. Hatina, "Intertextuality and Historical Criticism in New Testament Studies: Is there a Relationship?," *BibInt* 7 (1999): 28–43.

17 Alkier, "Intertextuality," 10.

not entirely determined by a modern method of literary criticism, but explicit in Irenaeus' own summaries of the exegetical task and applied exegesis.

This focus on Irenaeus' hermeneutic does not overlook that reality that his interest in textual relationships participates in a broader concern for textual harmony in the ancient world. The attentiveness to textual relationships in Biblical Studies has isolated elements of intertextuality in Jewish, Christian, and Hellenistic studies. The works of Fishbane and Boyarin examined the "intertextual" or "inner-biblical" nature of composition of the Hebrew Bible and rabbinic midrash.[18] Their works are some of the first to evaluate the intertextual nature and composition of midrashic texts. In general, Irenaeus' relationship to Judaism is an undeveloped aspect of Irenaean scholarship. Irenaeus mentions some dependence upon Jewish midrash and conversations with Jews over the interpretation of particular texts, but midrashic interpretation is not prominent in his exegesis.[19] Following Paul, Irenaeus is more concerned, with refuting the Gnostic use of Paul by connecting Paul's texts to the Old Testament.

Along these lines, Richard Hays championed intertextual analysis for New Testament Studies with his work on *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul*.[20] Hays defined his intertextual approach as "reading the letters [of Paul] as literary texts shaped by complex intertextual relations with Scripture."[21] Hays' evaluation distinguished Paul's reading of the Old Testament from a strict application of Jewish Midrash, and establishes the complexity of his Christian reading of the Law and Prophets. But given his focus on the New Testament, Hays' analysis is more focused on determining the precise nature of the echoes, allusions, and citations themselves. Irenaeus, on the other hand, works from a

18 Michael Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1985). Daniel Boyarin, *Intertextuality and the Reading of Midrash* (Bloomington, IN, Indiana University Press: 1990). Other discussions of intertextuality and midrash include: S. Handelman, *The SlAyres of Moses: The Emergence of Rabbinic Interpretation in Modern Literary Theory* (Albany: SUNY Press, 1982), J. Faur, *Golden Gloves with Silver Dots: Semiotics and Textuality in Rabbinic Tradition* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1986).

19 For example, see: *Epid.* 43, *Haer.* 3.8.1, *Haer* 3.12.12, *Haer* 4.7.1, *Haer* 4.15.1, and *Haer* 5.33.3.

20 See also John Hollander, *The Figure of Echo: A Mode of Allusion in Milton and After* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1981). Richard Hays, "Die Befreiung Israels im lukanischen Doppelwerk: Intertextuelle Narration als kulturkritische Praxis," in *Die Bibel im Dialog der Schriften: Konzepte intertextueller Bibellektüre*, 117–136 (Tübingen: A. Francke, 2005), 118. For conceptual and categorical connections between apostolic exegesis and Jewish exegesis see: Richard Longenecker, *Biblical Exegesis in the Apostolic Period* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999).

21 Hays, *Echoes of Scripture*, xi.

different vantage point, and endeavors to correlate *both* the New Testament and Old Testament writings into a coherent theological framework. In this sense, he represents one definitive example of an early Christian interpreter modeling the apostolic hermeneutic in the late second century.

In addition to Jewish midrash and apostolic hermeneutics, several studies have considered Irenaeus' indebtedness to rhetoric.[22] Robert Grant analyzed the rhetorical aspect of Irenaeus' work and suggests Irenaeus Christianizes at least three key rhetorical terms: *hypothesis, oikonomia*, and *anakephalaiosis*. Each of these, according to Grant, serve as "structural beams" in his theological framework.[23] According to Grant these rhetorical concepts reflect the "method of correlation" Irenaeus used to relate the concepts and ideas of the various authorities in the tradition. These terms, primarily Pauline in nature, are derived from grammar and rhetoric and developed from their context within the New Testament. But Grant's analysis remains at the theoretical level and does not develop the function of rhetorical arguments in particular instances of Irenaeus' exegesis. More recently Scott Moringiello also stressed this relationship and went so far as to bestow the Bishop of Lyons with the title "Irenaeus Rhetor." He argued that the five books of *Adversus Haereses* correspond to the five movements in forensic speech.[24] The strict framework, though, is not entirely convincing, because Irenaeus' organization is more theological and scriptural than rhetorical.[25] His work does extend the appreciation for Irenaeus' dependence upon rhetoric, but the present study gives more attention to the contours of his arguments with specific tropes that shape his textual integration. This study of Irenaeus' use of Gen 1–3 uses analytical descriptions of Irenaeus' intertextual exegesis that, in certain instances, may draw on specific rhetoric tropes, but rhetorical discourse is not the sole means through which his textual networking is expressed.

Finally, Frances Young described how the concept of intertextuality characterizes the complexity of early Christian exegesis throughout the patristic tradition.[26] According to Young, "Discerning cross-references was taken up with great enthusiasm in the second century."[27] From the second century

22 Grant, *Irenaeus*, 46–53.

23 Ibid., 53. W.R. Schoedel, "Philosophy and Rhetoric in the *Adversus Haereses* of Irenaeus," *VC* 12 (1959): 22–32.

24 Moringiello, *Irenaeus Rhetor*, 7–15.

25 See, for example, the organizational function of scripture in *Haer*. 4 in work of Philippe Bacq. Philippe Bacq S.J., *De l'ancienne à la nouvelle Alliance selon S. Irénée: unite du livre IV de l'Adversus Haereses* (Paris: Presses Universitaires de Namur, 1978).

26 Frances Young, *Biblical Exegesis and the Formation of Christian Culture* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1997).

27 Young, *Biblical Exegesis*, 133.

onwards both the Old Testament *and* the New Testament texts were received together in a complex web of intertextual relationships that extend apostolic exegesis. She located the practice of intertextual readings in the classical and rhetorical education saying, "[t]he fact that education was premised on the imitation of classics meant that intertextuality was an important feature of ancient literary culture. Allusions and quotations laced the correspondence of the literary elite, as well as public discourse."[28] The blending and assembling of texts was an essential part of classical education and a key aspect of rhetorical discourse. The fathers of the church, who were schooled in this classical education, drew from some of these intertextual practices. This included especially the philological technique of "cross-referencing" in the Fathers and the fact that early Christian theological disputes were often located in the disagreements over what constitutes an appropriate cross-reference.[29] Similarly, Elizabeth Clark's study on asceticism also acknowledged that " 'intertextual exegesis' is one of the most frequently employed modes of interpretation found in patristic literature.[30] These summaries begin to explain how textual integration was received and even debated in the later patristic tradition.

At the same time, the reason that textual integration flourished in Irenaeus was not merely polemical, but also cultural and technological. The development of the codex in second century meant that "scriptural texts became randomly accessible: one was able to page through a whole codex to check the exactness of a quotation, on parallel texts, and on various small details in the wording much more quickly than was possible when the text was on scrolls." While we cannot be certain of the form of Irenaeus' documents, at the very least, he must have possessed a codex containing the four Gospels, otherwise his discussion of their canonical arrangement in *Haer*. 3.11.8 would be unnecessary. Thus, in Irenaeus the shaping of the codex was helpful for the theological harmonization of the prophets and apostles in order to defend the church's faith from those who misused the scriptures. Those who came after Irenaeus modified this "new exegetical approach" in the formal scriptural commentaries that developed from the third century, but this " 'compounding' of texts with other texts seems characteristic of second-century Christian use of the Bible."[31]

---

28 Ibid., 97.

29 Young, *The Art of Performance*, 125.

30 Clark, *Reading*, 122.

31 Young, *Biblical Exegesis*, 133. The relationship between the intertextual networking in Irenaeus and the latter tradition is well beyond the scope of this study, but based upon the works of Young and Clark, the textual relationships developed in Irenaeus are extended and debated in subsequent generations.

As the Bishop of Lyons in the latter part of the second century, Irenaeus stands amid this confluence of intertextual pressures. He likely spent time with Justin in Rome, whose Hellenistic training is widely recognized. He came to Lyons from Asia Minor, where he heard the teaching of Polycarp. While his work is set against the theological and philosophical speculation of the Gnostics, he also mentions interactions with Jews, and a number of Hellenistic writers. At the same time, no single influence can explain the diversity of the intertextual performance in Irenaeus. Instead, as I will argue in the next section, textual integration for Irenaeus is based upon the theological notion of scripture harmonization or consonance derived from his understanding of a theology of history and revelation.

1.3 The Intertextual Nature of Irenaeus' Scripture Reading

1.3.1 *Introduction*

The appreciation for Irenaeus' intertextual reading of scripture must begin with a more general discussion of the nature of Irenaeus' hermeneutic framework and his interest in scriptural consonance. Evaluations of Irenaeus' discussion of hermeneutics and his applied exegesis consistently observe that textual harmonization is central to his scriptural interpretation.[32] For Irenaeus the scriptures, beginning with creation, is entirely consonant. Henning Reventlow even suggests Irenaeus' most significant contribution to the history of biblical interpretation is that "he laid the foundation for the concept of harmony for understanding individual passages of Scripture."[33] Irenaeus also offers the earliest and most extensive integration of the prophets *and* apostles in the post-apostolic age.

---

32 See the studies: Herra, *Irénée de Lyon Exégète* (Etude Historique: Paris, 1920). M. Jourjon, "Saint Irénèe lit la Bible," in *Le monde grec ancien et la Bible*, 153–70 (Paris: Beauchesne, 1984). De Andia, "Irénèe théologien de l' unité," *NRT* 109 (1987): 31–48. De Andia, "Modéles de l' unité des testaments Semon Irénée de Lyon," *StuPat* 21 (1989). Simonetti, "Per Typical as vera: Note sull' esegesi di Ireneo, *VetChr* 18 (1981): 357–82. Margerie, *introduction*, 69. Norbert Brox, "Irenaeus and the Bible," in *Handbook of Patristic Exegesis*, vol 1, ed. Charles Kannengiesser (Leiden: Brill, 2004): 483–506. Robert Grant and David Tracy, *A Short History of the Interpretation of the Bible* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984), 49–50.

33 Henning Graf Reventlow, *History of Biblical Interpretation*: Vol 1: From the Old Testament to Origen (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2009), 173. Originally published: *Epochen der Bibelauslegung Band 1: Vom Alten Testament bis Origenes* (Müchen: Verlag C.H. Beck, 1990).

This proclivity for scripture consonance has some resonance with the concept of *harmonia* that developed in Greco-Roman rhetorical and philosophical traditions, but it is most at home in his doctrine of revelation, and more precisely his theology of creation. Irenaeus argues, on the one hand, that God the Father, by means of the Word and Wisdom, has created all things and this creation, though composed of many and various element, is uniformly harmonious. At the same time, the scriptures, which articulate the history of salvation beginning from creation, are given by the same God in varied and diverse forms, but likewise when interpreted properly all portions of scripture are found to be perfectly harmonious and theologically consistent. This perspective of scriptural consonance, moreover, authorizes Irenaeus to use any particular method of exegesis, so long as that method proves the consonance, and not the dissonance, of scripture. Irenaeus is not beholden to any standardized method, but instead fashions a variety of intertextual relationships largely based upon his own extensive knowledge of the scriptures. Naturally, Irenaeus is reading and engaging the writings of other thinkers, but his exegesis is highly intensive and draws on a wide range of scriptural passages. Thus, as he writes his theological polemic against Gnosis in *Adversus Haereses*, Irenaeus consistently integrates the scriptural witness as a means to express the apostolic teaching. While scripture consonance does not solve all the ambiguities in scripture, because some things must be left to God, it is the principal means by which Irenaeus makes sense of the diverse utterance of scripture.

1.3.2 *Consonance in Irenaeus' Theology of Creation and Theology of Scripture*

The continuity between Irenaeus' theology of revelation and theology of creation is worked out most clearly in his polemical discussions against Gnosticism. In *Haer*. 1 he provides a detailed catalog the tenants of the various Gnostic schools with a specific emphasis on the Gnostic views of cosmology and cosmogony. This is where the hermeneutical differences between Irenaeus and his opponents begin. Then in *Haer*. 2, he counters them on particularly crucial points of doctrine, or what Irenaeus calls "major heads" (*magna capitula*) of their theological system.[34] Contrary to the Gnostics, the first "head" of doctrine is a theology of creation that confesses God as the Creator of all things.[35] Irenaeus continually returns to this summary as the most basic statement of the apostolic faith. For example in *Haer*. 4.20.4 Irenaeus writes, "There

34 *Haer*. 2.pf.2.

35 *Haer*. 2.1.1.

is therefore one God, who by the Word and Wisdom created and arranged all things" (*Unus igitur Deus, qui Verbo et Sapientia fecit et aptavit omnia*).[36]

This view of a theology of creation is also the starting point for his theological exegesis and explains why Irenaeus take great pains in proving the errors of Gnostic cosmology. In Irenaeus' reasoning there is a necessary association between a theology of creation and scriptural interpretation. The true understanding of scripture is predicated upon a true confession of who God is and God's work in creation. This is also why Irenaeus focuses on the errors of the Gnostic exegetical practices of numerology and gematria in *Haer*. 2, which he sees as closely associated with their theology of creation. According to Irenaeus, the Gnostics employ a type of Neopythagorean numerology that attempts to validate their theology system through numbers and letters.[37] Logically speaking Irenaeus argues that the good interpreter must acknowledge that the numbers derive from the system, not the system from the numbers. The Gnostics read creation from the wrong perspective. Their inductive reasoning creates divine realties from the numbers represented in creation. They should instead work deductively from the first premise that God is the Creator of all things, in order to give unity to the diversity in creation.

In *Haer*. 2, this hermeneutical continuity between creation and interpretation culminate in the key section of *Haer*. 2.25–28, which Schoedel terms a "small tractate on theological method."[38] In response to Gnostic numerology, Irenaeus restates his first premise that "all things have clearly been made by God harmonious and beautiful with great wisdom and care"[39] Then he adds a few lines later: "There are many and varied things in creation, and they are well ordered and harmonious in relation to the whole creation, though considered individually they are opposed to each other and discordant."[40] The Gnostics observe the discordant nature of creation and, moving from these realities to their system, assume a theological dualism that imagines a diversity of emanations or divine beings working in and through creation. In spite of this diversity, Irenaeus interprets that sensible world as a unified and organized arrangement, which is the product of God's creative wisdom. Connecting the

36 Similar statements surface in *Haer*. 1.10.1, *Haer*. 2.1.1, and *Haer*. 3.24.2. From this premise, Irenaeus' theology of creation is described in terms of a "Trinitarian" act of God the Father creating all things by means of the Son and the Spirit.

37 *Haer*. 2.24.2 and *Haer*. 2.25.1.

38 William R. Schoedel, "Theological Method in Irenaeus (*Adversus Haereses* 2.25–28)," *JTS* 35 (1984), 31–49, 31.

39 *Haer*. 2.25.1.

40 *Haer*. 2.25.1.

harmony of creation with the Wisdom and Spirit of God, Anthony Briggman writes, "the harmonic effect of the wise activity of God in creation is also the effect of the creative activity of Wisdom."[41] The Spirit of God is the wisdom of God and the work of the Spirit naturally produces a wise and harmonious creation.

In the same context, Irenaeus argues that creation and the great diversity of the sensible world must be harmonized (*apta*) with a "fundamental system of truth" (*subiacenti ueritatis argumento*).[42] He suggests the creation is not meaningless or empty, but points to the basic assumption that "all things have come from the one and same God" (*Omnia enim ex uno et eodem Deo*).[43] The harmony in creation naturally raises questions about the origin of these coherent elements. In this regard Irenaeus and the Gnostics have competing theological systems that hinge upon their theology of creation and interpretation of the harmony or disharmony in creation.

To illustrate the creative harmony, he appeals to the instrument of a lyre, which has many different notes, but when it is played there is heard only "one harmonious melody" (*consonantem unam melodiam*).[44] A few chapters latter he will apply the same identical phrase (thus seemingly implying the same illustration) to the diverse elements of scripture. Like the notes of the lyre, each element in creation worthy of its own individual analysis, and when studied individually Irenaeus readily admits that the elements may even appear discordant and contradictory. However, the only way forward is not disparity or confusion, or even seeking after some other god or system of truth to make sense of the enigmas, but instead holding fast to basic doctrine of God as Creator of all things. The nature of creatureliness necessitates a boundary on theological speculation, because only the Creator is without limits.[45] This is, in the words of John Behr, the "unalterable fact of creation."[46] God is always the same, but humankind must receive a "beginning, middle, and addition with increase" (*initium et medietatem et adjectionem et augmentum*).[47] For Irenaeus, God is completely self-sufficient, but the creature has unremitting need and

41 Anthony Briggman, *Irenaeus of Lyons and the Theology of the Holy Spirit*, 140. This is explicit in *Haer*. 4.20.4, where Irenaeus uses the wisdom texts of Prov 3:19–20, Prov 8:22–25, and Prov 8:27–31 in connection with Gen 1:26 to explain the Trinitarian nature of God creating in Genesis.

42 *Haer*. 2.25.1.

43 *Haer*. 2.25.1.

44 *Haer*. 2.25.1.

45 *Haer*. 2.25.4.

46 Behr, *Asceticism*, 37.

47 *Haer*. 4.11.2.

will always be learning.[48] To make his point clearer, he reflects upon Paul's statement in 1 Cor 8:1: "knowledge puffs up but love builds up."[49] He elevates epistemological humility and asserts that it is better to know nothing about the created world and love God, than to fall into confusion by seeking out answers to speculative questions.

Given this disparity between the Creator and creature, Irenaeus draws a direct correlation between this theology of creation and his theology of scripture. The distinction is something of a rhetorical general-to-particular line of reasoning. Within the general realm of revealed knowledge in creation resides in the particular revelation of the scriptures. The scriptures are the particular revelation of God that comes, in the words of Irenaeus, "under our eyes" (*ante oculos nostros, cf.* Psalm 78(79):10).[50] The scriptures demarcate the particular knowledge that "God gave" (*dedit . . . Deus*) to humankind in order that they might gain a certain degree of understanding of divine revelation. So Irenaeus writes:

> The sound and safe and religious and truth-loving mind will readily apply itself to the things of God placed within the power of men and granted to our knowledge. It will make progress in them because by daily exercise it will make easy for itself the acquisition of knowledge. These are the things that come under our eyes and are expressed in the Sacred Scriptures clearly and unambiguously by the words themselves.[51]

---

48 D. Jeffrey Bingham, "Christianizing Divine Aseity: Irenaeus reads John" in *The Gospel of John in Christian Theology*, eds. Richard Bauckham and Carl Mosser (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008): 53–67, 55. Steenberg distinguishes between spatial, temporal, and cooperative self-sufficiency. Steenberg, *Irenaeus*, 73.

49 *Haer*. 2.26.1.

50 It may be that Irenaeus derives this phrase from Psalm 78(79):10. Harnack discusses this phrase. Harnack, *History of Dogma*, 2:232 n473.

51 *Haer*. 2.27.1. All translations of *Adversus Haereses* are made in consultation with a series of translations and critical editions including the English translations in Roberts, A., and J. Donaldson, *Ante-Nicene Fathers. Vol. 1.* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1994), Unger, Dominic J., John J. Dillon, *St. Irenaeus of Lyons: Against the Heresies* (*Book 1*), ACW 55 (New York: Newman Press, 1992). Unger, Dominic J. John J. Dillon, Michael Slusser, *St. Irenaeus of Lyons: Against the Heresies* (*Book 2*), ACW 65 (New York: Newman Press, 2012), Unger, Dominic J. John J. Dillon, Matthew Steenberg, *St. Irenaeus of Lyons: Against the Heresies* (*Book 3*), ACW 64 (New York: Newman Press, 2012), Rousseau, A (et al.) *Contre les hérésies, Livre I–V*. 10 vols. *Sources Chrétiennes*, nos. 100.1–2, 152–3, 210, 211, 263–64, 293–4, Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1965–1982). I also consulted Rousseau's French translation in *Sources Chrétiennes*. In some instances I have updated or altered the language of these

Irenaeus' transition from a theology of creation to a theology of scripture is an epistemological distinction from the general aspects of revelation that are ambiguous to specific revelation that is plain. The scriptures, moreover, are revealed knowledge because they are expressed "in the words themselves" (*ipsis dictionibus*). These scriptures, then, comprised in words, make up the "body of truth" (*ueritate corpus*), that continues to be "harmonious in its members and without disorder" (*simili aptatione membrorum et sine concussione*).[52] In this line of reasoning, the writings of scriptures are the only sure means to attain true knowledge of God and creation. As Irenaeus writes, the scripture express plainly that God made all things through the Word including all things heavenly and earthly. The good and faithful interpreter will apply themselves humbly to the things of God that are plain and obvious in the scriptures, in order that they might grow in love for God.[53]

Irenaeus recognizes, however, that this argument raises the question of the enigmas contained in the scriptures themselves. What is the proper response when an interpreter encounters ambiguities in the plain revelation of scripture? In this instance, Irenaeus' posits the same epistemological tension. The scriptures are given by the Word of God and the Spirit and are "perfect" (*perfectae*), but even in the scriptures there are things that must remain unknown. This is necessary because only the Creator is omniscient, while the creature is always learning. The creature may grow in their knowledge of God and gain some insight to enigmatic questions, but never comprehend all the mysteries of the faith.

In this context, Irenaeus describes his general approach to exegesis based upon his theology of creation and theology of scripture saying:

> all the scripture given us by God harmonizes, and the parables harmonize with the things that are expressly stated, and the plain statements explain the parables. Thus, through the many voices of the passages there will be heard among us one harmonious melody that hymns praises to God who made all things.[54]

---

translations based upon the Latin or the Greek retroversion, or in order to emphasize a particular aspect of Irenaeus' terminology.

52 *Haer*. 2.27.1. A few lines later he reiterates this basic point only in this instance actually specifies the scriptures as the writings of the prophets and Gospels. *Haer*. 2.27.2.

53 *Haer*. 2.28.1.

54 *Haer*. 2.28.3.

In the same way that creation is composed of a variety of elements working in harmony, so also is scripture composed of a variety of passages working in harmony. The clearer expressions in scripture explain the ambiguities, so that, once again like a lyre, they sound together into "one harmonious melody." To be sure, Irenaeus does not demarcate between the nature of revelation in creation and scripture; both are from God and both are perfectly consistent. This reasoning naturally also assumes a close association between text and reality, the narrative and events depicted in scripture are in every way continuous with the realties in creation about which they speak.

1.3.3 *Scripture Consonance as Consistent Summary of Scripture Reading*

With the harmonious nature of scripture firmly in place, Irenaeus reiterates scriptural consonance throughout his work in various summary statements and various illustrations. Levesque has argued that there a clear "scheme" to the logic of his arguments that centers on *consonance* of the church's faith contrary to the disharmony of the Gnostic system.[55] Irenaeus' theological appeal to consonance is most evident through the analysis of two key terms for harmony including: *consonare* and *aptare*, as well as their cognates. Irenaeus also uses a series of rhetorical illustrations that emphasize the church's unified reading of scripture over and against the Gnostic discord. These aspects communicate that Irenaeus' exegesis is an outworking of this theological perspective on scriptural harmony. Together his theology of scripture and descriptions of *consonare* form the basis of his approach to reading scripture intertextually.

1.3.3.1 Consonare and Aptare and the Harmony of Scripture

Irenaeus' emphasis on scripture consonance is evident in the diversity of theological terms and concepts he uses to distinguish between the consistency of the faith of the church and the dissonance of the Gnostic system. While there are a number of terms, the most consistent terms are *consonare* ("to harmonize" or "to sound together") and *aptare* ("to fit" or "to adapt") and their cognates *consonatia* (harmonized) and *apta* (adapted).[56] Irenaeus uses the two

55 G. Levesque, "Consonance chrétienne et dissonance gnostique dans Irénée Adversus haereses IV 18,4 à 19,3," *StuPat*. 16.2 (1985): 193–96, 193.

56 Words studies on these terms also show that he tends to employ the verbal forms *consonare* and *aptare* in *Haer*. 1–2 in order to describe the process of harmonization, while the nouns are concentrated in *Haer*. 3–5 where he composes his own theological framework. The noun *apta* is found in the following sections: *Haer*. 1.8.1(3), *Haer*. 1.9.3, *Haer*. 1.9.4, *Haer*. 1.20.3, *Haer*. 1.22.1, *Haer*. 2.4.1, *Haer*. 2.13.8, *Haer*. 2.14.1, *Haer*. 2.14.6, *Haer*. 2.24.4, *Haer*. 2.25.1, *Haer*. 2.30.9 (2), *Haer*. 2.35.4, *Haer*. 3.17.1, *Haer*. 3.20.5. The verb *aptare* is also found

terms together (*consonare and aptare*) in a number of sections (*Haer*. 1.10.2, 2.15.2, 2.25.2, 2.28.2, 3.12.11, 4.14.2, 4.38.3, and 5.36.3), but they are directly linked in *Haer*. 4.38.3 when he describes how God's wisdom is expressed in having made all things "harmonious and consistent" (*apta et consonantia*). He uses these terms to convey both the sense of continuity among interpretations of scripture within the church and the continuity among the contents of scripture itself.[57]

In the classical sense, *consonare* (or *consonantia*) is a rhetorical term that comprises both "logical coherence and aesthetic fitness."[58] It is closely related to the Greek concept of *harmonia* that means simply "joining together" and that indicated any king of equilibrium in Greco-Roman society including musical, social, political, and marital aspects.[59] The term *harmonia* was employed by a variety of classical authors beginning with Homer. The works of Plato and Aristotle frequently used the term to describe the symphonic joining together of musical instruments.[60] Briggman analyzes the background to Irenaeus' use of the illustration of the lyre in *Haer*. 2.25.2 and observes similar illustrations in Plato, Philo, and Heraclitus, whose use of the lyre imagery is also quoted by Hippolytus.[61]

At the same time, it seems that Irenaeus' appeal to *consonare* shows some dependence upon scripture. In *Haer*. 4.14.2, he emphasizes the importance for exegeting texts within the economic trajectory of salvation history, which he terms the "harmony of salvation" (*consonantiam salutis*). Rousseau references

---

in the following sections: *Haer*. 1.pf.2, *Haer*. 1.8.3, *Haer*. 1.10.2, *Haer*. 1.19.4, *Haer*. 1.21.2, *Haer*. 1.31.3, *Haer*. 2.pf.2, *Haer*. 2.2.4, *Haer*. 2.5.1, *Haer*. 2.13.10, *Haer*. 2.15.2, *Haer*. 2.19.4, *Haer*. 2.25.1, *Haer*. 2.30.4, *Haer*. 3.5.2, *Haer*. 3.11.1, *Haer*. 3.12.9, *Haer*. 3.12.11, *Haer*. 3.16.6, *Haer*. 3.16.7 (2), *Haer*. 3.19.3, *Haer*. 4.11.1, *Haer*. 4.12.2, *Haer*. 4.13.3, *Haer*. 4.14.2 (2), *Haer*. 4.15.2, *Haer*. 4.15.2 (2), *Haer*. 4.16.5, *Haer*. 4.20.6, *Haer*. 4.25.1, *Haer*. 4.25.3, *Haer*. 4.30.3, *Haer*. 4.34.5, *Haer*. 4.38.3, *Haer*. 4.39.3, *Haer*. 4.40.2, *Haer*. 5.24.3, *Haer*. 5.26.1, *Haer*. 5.28.1(2), *Haer*. 5.28.4, *Haer*. 5.36.5. References to consonare and its cognates include: *Haer*. 1.10.2, *Haer*. 2.10.1, *Haer*. 2.15.2, *Haer*. 2.25.2, *Haer*. 2.28.2, *Haer*. 3.11.8, *Haer*. 3.12.11–12, *Haer*. 3.13.3, *Haer*. 4.14.2, *Haer*. 4.18.4, *Haer*. 4.38.3, *Haer*. 4.41.4, *Haer*. 5.35.1, and *Haer*. 5.36.3.

57 *Haer*. 1.10.2, *Haer*. 3.12.9, 11, *Haer*. 4.11.1, *Haer*. 4.25.1, 3, and *Haer*. 4.38.4. Irenaeus will also use *apta* and *aptum* to characterize his response and other aspects of the fitness of creatures and creation. *Haer*. 2.pf.2, *Haer*. 2.5.1, *Haer*. 4.11.1, *Haer*. 4.12.3, *Haer*. 4.13.3, *Haer*. 4.14.2, *Haer*. 4.15.2, *Haer*. 4.16.5, *Haer*. 4.20.6, *Haer*. 4.25.1, *Haer*. 4.30.3, *Haer*. 4.34.5, *Haer*. 4.49.3, *Haer*. 4.40.2, *Haer*. 5.24.3, *Haer*. 5.26.1, and *Haer*. 5.28.2, 4.

58 Osborn, *Irenaeus of Lyons*, 159.

59 Sheramy Bundrick, *Music and Image in Classical Athens* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 140.

60 Ibid. 140.

61 Briggman, *Irenaeus of Lyons*, 142–5.

this as an allusion to the parable of the Prodigal Son, where the son hears the "music" or "symphony" (συμφωνίας), a term closely associated with *harmonia*, and runs to his father's house.[62] In the same context, Irenaeus also points to the language of φωνή or "voice" where it applies to the Spirit in Rev 1:15. The harmony of the music in the parable of the Prodigal Son is, for Irenaeus, representative of the harmony of the work of the Spirit orchestrating the progress of salvation within the divine economy. In *Haer*. 4.20.7 he also describes the manifold ways that God in Christ has directed salvation history, such as the various prophecies and theophanies, with a succession of rhetorical terms that illustrate the harmonious nature of all salvific events that are fittingly and properly arranged in and through Christ.

In addition to *consonare*, he also employs the term *aptare* meaning "to adapt" or "to fit," to describe the unity of scripture.[63] Like *consonare*, there is a long history of "fitness" (*aptum*) in rhetorical traditions and classical thought. The origins of the term extend back at least to a Pythagorean sense of harmony as it applies to cosmology and music. It is also used by Aristotle as an essential element of proper rhetorical speech.[64] Like *consonare*, Irenaeus frequently uses this term in exegetical contexts and applies it to the "fitness" of the various elements of scripture.[65] This is the "effect" of the work of Wisdom in creation. The significance of the terms "does not lie in the particular verbs

62 See also Luke 5:36. Other uses of the term *symohoneo*, which also means "to agree" and its cognates are found in Matt 18:19, Matt 20:2, 13, Luke 5:36, Acts 5:9, Acts 15:15, 1 Cor 7:5, and 2 Cor 6:15. In the LXX these terms appear in: Gen 14:3, 2 Kings 12:8, 4 Mac 7:7, 14:3, 6–7, Eccl 7:14, Isa 7:2, and Dan 3:5. The terms *harmozo* and *harmonia* are not found in the New Testament but in the LXX they appear in: 2 Sam 6:5, 2 Sam 6:14, 2 Mac 14:22, 3 Mac 1:19, Psalm 151:2, Prov 8:30, Prov 17:7, Prov 19:14, Wis 16:20, Nah 3:8, Ezek 23:42, and Ezek 37:7. These passages establish the possibility of scriptural basis for these terms.

63 Passages that use apta in this sense include: *Haer*. 1.pf.2, *Haer*. 1.8.1, *Haer*. 1.9.3–4, *Haer*. 1.20.3, *Haer*. 2.13.10, and *Haer*. 2.19.4. Passages that use consonare in this sense include: *Haer*. 2.15.2, *Haer*. 4.18.4, and *Haer*. 5.35.1.

64 Aristotle, *Rhet* 3–7, especially *Rhet* 7.

65 Other related terms include: *Textum* (woven fabric, *Haer*. 1.8.1) *Constans* (consistent), *Congruum* (agreeing), *Coaptare* (to fit), *Aptare* (to fit, *Haer*. 1.9.3, *Haer*. 1.18.1, *Haer*. 4.20.4, *Apta* (adapted), *Compingere* (to join together), *Consonare* (to harmonize), *Consonantia* (harmonized), *Disponere* (to arrange), unitatem (to unify), and *transpose* (*Haer*. 1.18.1). The notion of harmony is also found in other terms such as the related concept of "order" (*ordo*; *ordinatio*). Like consonare the term is ontologically oriented because it assumes "God made all things with measure and order" (*omnia enim mensura et ordine Deus facit*). The *ordo* of scripture supplies a temporal or chronological aspect to the nature of scriptural harmony.

used, but rather in the common effect associated with the terms."[66] Repeatedly Irenaeus circles back to these terms (*consonare* and *aptare*) in exegetical contexts (i.e. *Haer*. 1.8.1–10.2, 1.22.1–2, 2.25.1, 2.30.4–9, 3.11–12, 4.11–16) as a means to express the harmony of scripture. Farkasfalvy goes so far as to say that the consistent use of *consonare* in exegetical contexts gives the impression that it serves as a "technical term of his exegesis."[67]

When he deploys these terms, Irenaeus argues for the harmony among of the contents of scripture and also among the interpretations of scripture within the church. Beginning in *Haer*. 1.10.1 he describes how the church affirms the apostolic doctrine in one accord and hands it down in "harmony" (*consonanter*).[68] He acknowledges the diversity of nations and languages that comprise the church, but nevertheless affirms that throughout all this diversity there is unity in the church's doctrine of faith. In *Haer*. 3.12.11 he asserts that all the apostles agree (*consonantes*) in their confession of the Creator, and all are united in their understanding of the continuity between the Mosaic Law and the New covenant. Then, in *Haer*. 3.12.12 he extends his reflection on the covenants arguing that though they are distinct they all maintain "unity and harmony" (*unitatem et consonantiam*). In *Haer*. 3.11.8, he observes theological continuity between the Gospels and the four living creatures of Rev 4:7, saying that the Gospels "harmonize" (*consonantia*) with nature of the creatures around Christ's throne.[69] Each of the faces of the living creatures characterizes one of the four Gospels: the Human face is Matthew, the Eagle is Mark, the Ox is Luke, and the Lion is John. In *Haer*. 3.13.3, Irenaeus claims that Paul's autobiographical statements in Galatians "harmonize" (*consonantes*) with Luke's account of the apostles in the Acts of the Apostles. In *Haer*. 3.12.9 Irenaeus reports that all Paul's epistles are "consonant" (*consonant*) with his declaration that there is one God who created all things (Acts 14:15–17).

Amid his commentary on Paul in *Haer*. 3.12, Irenaeus interjects a comment that epitomizes the general nature of his intertextual hermeneutic saying, "proofs in the Scriptures cannot be shown except from the Scriptures themselves" (*ostensiones quae sunt in Scripturis non possunt ostendi nisi ex ipsis Scripturis*). In other words, the interpretation of scripture necessitates

66 Briggman, *Irenaeus of Lyons*, 140.

67 Farkasfalvy, "Theology of Scripture," 328.

68 *Haer*. 1.10.2.

69 He connects this text with the description of the Cherubim in Psalm 79:2(80:1). He observes correspondence between "fourfold" objects, that is a unified object containing four distinct elements. He mentions that the earth is comprised of four zones with four directional winds.

scripture. Irenaeus has already informed the reader that in *Haer*. 3 he will confront his opponents with proofs from the scriptures, but in this case these proofs are based in scriptural harmony. These proofs from the scriptures yield lengthy arguments that condense the manifold witness of the scriptures, so that Irenaeus' intertextual argumentation frequently weaves texts into a complex set of intertextual networks. Considering the literary structure of *Adversus Haereses*, Irenaeus' opening exegetical arguments in *Haer*. 3 also points to the importance of this textual networking for Irenaeus' own theological argumentation throughout *Haer*. 3–5.

Finally, in *Haer*. 4.41.4, Irenaeus references the words of the Lord in the Gospels and concludes that though the words of the Lord are numerous they are theologically harmonious since they all proclaim the same God and Father. In the same context he describes how Paul proclaimed, "all things harmonious" (*omnia consonantia*) with the preaching of the truth.[70] Finally, in *Haer*. 5.36.3 he describes how the prophets "harmoniously" (*consonanter*) announce this resurrection of the faithful and restoration of creation.[71] Therefore, both the summary of the faith of the church and his reading of the specific elements of scripture, including the covenants, prophets, Gospels, the words of the Lord, and the writings of Paul, are all harmonious among themselves.

On the other hand, he uses these terms in settings that contrasts the unity of the church's reading of scripture with the unharmonious and dissonant readings of the Gnostics. In *Haer*. 2.10.1 Irenaeus remarks that the Gnostics try to explain ambiguous passages of scripture by appealing to their myth. Similarly, in *Haer*. 1.3.6, Irenaeus explains that the Gnostics "strive to adapt the good words [of scripture] to their own wicked inventions" (*adaptare cupientes ea quae bene dicta sunt his quae male adinuenta sunt ab ipsis*).[72] The only resolution for enigmatic sayings is reading them alongside passages that are "manifest, and harmonious, and clear" (*manifestis et consonantibus et claris*).[73] According to Irenaeus, the Gnostic teaching deviates from the true path and the scriptural exegete becomes hopelessly lost as they wonder down various unmarked roads, so that their opinions have no agreement or connection (*inconsonanter et inconsequenter*).[74] Thus, while the church reads the distinct

70 *Haer*. 4.41.4.

71 *Haer*. 5.36.3.

72 For a more detailed discussion see: G.P. Luttikhuizen, *Gnostic Revisions of Genesis Stories and Early Jesus Traditions* (Leiden: Brill, 2006).

73 *Haer*. 2.10.1.

74 *Haer*. 5.20.1.

portions of scripture harmoniously, the Gnostic doctrines are dissonant and disrupt the theological consonance of the scriptures.

1.3.3.2 Polemical and Rhetorical Illustrations of Scriptural Consonance

Alongside his emphasis on harmony and consonance, Irenaeus also provides several polemical and rhetorical illustrations of his exegesis that communicate, both directly and indirectly, a general perspective of the unity and harmony of the scriptures. His rhetorical illustrations are drawn from a variety of sources including art, music, kingship, and gymnastics.[75] These illustrations place emphasis on the image or pattern of harmony, rather than the particular terminology, and each one communicates the importance of scriptural integration.

First, Irenaeus uses polemical illustrations to characterize the way Gnostic exegesis interposes dissonance into the fundamental unity of the scriptures.[76] Instead of reading the scriptures coherently, the Gnostics adapt the various elements of scripture with other Gnostic sources. In *Haer*. 1.8.1 and 2.10.1, Irenaeus compares Gnostic exegesis to braiding a rope of sand or weaving a patchwork of fables. He argues that the Valentinians "disregard the order and the connection of the Scriptures" (*ordinem quidem et textum Scripturarum supergredientes*).[77] In the same context he offers his well-known example of the mosaic of the king in *Haer*. 1.8.1 and the Homeric cento in *Haer*. 1.9.4. Comparing scripture passages to tiles on a mosaic representing a king, Irenaeus describes how the Gnostic exegetes "transfer" (*transferunt*) passages and rearrange them to distort the image of the king and fashion the image of a fox or dog.[78] The only fitting solution, for Irenaeus, is to return the tiles to their proper arrangement. Similarly, he cites a collection of Homeric verses arranged in a cento extracted from both the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*. Just as this cento comprises an assortment of Homeric verses variously arranged to tell a different story that the author never intended, the Gnostics remove names and sayings of scripture and adapt them to their own narratives. According to Irenaeus, the faithful interpreter will recognize the words and verses, but not the themes of the storyline, and only when the verses are returned to their

75 Grant describes many of these rhetorical illustrations as well as others. Grant, "Irenaeus and Hellenistic Culture," in *After the New Testament*, 158–169 (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1967), 167.

76 *Haer*. 1.pf.1, *Haer*. 1.3.6, *Haer*. 1.8.1 and *Haer*. 1.9.4. See also: Bingham, *Irenaeus*, 16–18. Behr, *The Way to Nicaea*, 20.

77 *Haer*. 1.8.1.

78 *Haer*. 1.8.1.

proper order will the reader recognize the true story.[79] Likewise only when the scriptures are framed within their proper order and connection and fitted "to the body of truth" (*veritatis corpusculo*) will the true meaning avail itself.

In another illustration, Irenaeus compares the isolated Valentinian interpretation of 1 Cor 15:50 to an amateur wrestler who latches onto *one part* (*unam partem*) of his opponent's body with a *single* move.[80] Through a *combination* of moves, his opponent has no trouble pinning the unskilled wrestler to the ground. Not to be outdone, and to the amusement of all the spectators, the conquered wrestler foolishly maintains his hold on the *one part* of his opponent and tries to claim victory. In the same way, the Valentinians latch on to one verse (1 Cor 15:50) to support their anthropological dualism and, prefer to interpret the passages *in isolation* (*ipsas*, μόνον) from the actual sense of terms in relation to the rest of the Pauline corpus and salvation history.[81] According to Irenaeus, by neglecting the true understanding of one passage (1 Cor 15:50) they misunderstand a multitude of others.[82]

Throughout his work, Irenaeus provides a variety of illustrations that communicate this same basic critique of the Gnostic division, separation, and isolation of scripture, which dissects the body of truth.[83] The Gnostic reading of scripture (and Gen 1–3 in particular) purges the texts of any concept of temporality and alters the metaphors and characters in the opening drama in order to produce an original narrative. Gnostic interest in an epistemological approach to salvation, according to J. Williams, determines a variety of "exegetical changes," or careful alterations to the texts of scripture, in order to convey this theological perspective.[84] In doing so, the Gnostics excise portions of scripture, isolate truths from various sources, and "redeploy them in new myths."[85] The often repeated words of the author of the *Apocryphon of John*, "Do not think it is as Moses said . . .," are particularly illuminating, especially in comparison to Irenaeus' defense of the authority of Moses in *Haer*. 2.2.5.[86]

---

79 *Haer*. 1.9.4.

80 *Haer*. 5.13.2. See also *Haer*. 5.14.4.

81 *Haer*. 5.13.2. Orbe, *Teología v.1*, 618–9.

82 *Haer*. 5.13.5.

83 *Haer*. 4.pf.4. See also *Haer*. 5.20.1–2.

84 Jacqueline Williams, *Biblical Interpretation in the Gnostic Gospel of Truth From Nag Hammadi* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1988), 190.

85 Behr, *The Way to Nicaea*, 21.

86 *ApocJohn*, *NHC II*, 13:19–21, 22:22–24, 23:3–4, 29:6–7. See also Zlatko Pleše, *Poetics of the Gnostic Universe: Narrative and Cosmology in the Apocryphon of John* (Leiden: Brill, 2006), 67.

Second, Irenaeus also describes his hermeneutics of scripture consonance with other general illustrations. I have already mentioned the use of the instrument of the lyre, where the various scriptures are the various notes of the instrument that sound together to make music. In another illustration he draws on Paul's imagery of the body in Eph 4:16/Col 2:19 to compare scriptures to the human form. He argues that the creation of all things by means of the Word as the "head" (*caput*) that orders the rest of the scriptural body.[87] Only when an interpreter grasps this theological "head" will the remaining part of the body of scripture be fitted together properly. Those who confess the true Creator will find themselves reading scripture in continuity with the apostolic teachings and, as a result, every word of scripture "will appear consistent" (*constabit*). So creation by means of the Word is a hermeneutical key that unlocks the door to unity of salvation history and the continuity of scripture. Finally, this summary also includes the methodological summaries mentioned earlier in *Haer*. 2.27.1. Following his summary of his theology of revelation and theology of scripture, he argues that ambiguous expressions ought to be interpreted in correspondence with the "body of truth" (*veritatis corpus*) in order to yield the "similar adaptation of its members" (*simili aptatione membrorum*) and avoid any "disturbance" (*concussione*) of its parts.[88] In all these ways Irenaeus' description of the exegetical task, both directly and indirectly, is an emphasis on scriptural consonance and his intention to integrate scripture is essential to his reading of Gen 1–3.

1.3.4 *Scripture Consonance in Irenaeus' Applied exegesis*

Therefore, in both word and image, Irenaeus' theological exegesis is shaped by a perspective of scriptural consonance. When the Bishop of Lyons turns to scripture he assumes that every passage is theologically consistent and he reads scripture as a coherent summary of the continuous work of God. The extension of this concept of scripture consonance to the level of his applied exegesis is evidenced by a willingness to use any particular method of exegesis that fosters textual correspondence. As he works scripture, Irenaeus' mind is actively engaged in integrating and interrelating the scriptural witness. Irenaeus shows willingness to use a variety of methods of textual correspondence including: literary reading, prophecy-fulfillment, typology, catchwords, organizational or structural function, narratival or creedal arrangements, prosopological interpretation, illustrative interpretation, and general-to-particular reasoning. In each case, Gen 1–3 is a pivotal piece of a larger exegetical puzzle that Irenaeus

87 *Haer*. 4.32.1.

88 *Haer*. 2.27.1.

is working to dismantle the theology of his opponents and express his own theological framework.

In order to preview these reading strategies, the following is a brief summary and description of each of these intertextual reading strategies that circumscribe the complexity and style of Irenaeus' reading of Gen 1–3 throughout his work. First, he provides a literary reading that appreciates the original literary context of Gen 1–3 and the genre of the creation accounts. He reads Gen 1–3 as a coherent historical narrative accurately depicting the creation and formation of all things. Second, in conjunction to his literary reading, Irenaeus also emphasizes prophetic texts that are fulfilled in Christ or the New Testament. His prophetic uses of Gen 1–3 are less focused on the original literary context, and give more attention to the correspondence between the referent discussed at a later stage of the divine economy. Third, Irenaeus' typological correspondence is closely related to the prophetic readings. His use of typology is diverse and intricate and he extends the typological framework established by Paul and others in the New Testament. Many of these connections are formed through verbal associated or patterns, while others are linked by more general conceptual or theological association. It is common for these connections to have some relation to decisive aspects of the Christ event. Fourth, Irenaeus will use verbal connections to link terms, concepts, and imagery between passages. The imagery of Gen 1–3 provides a fertile seedbed of images that produce a wide assortment of intertextual relationships are often assembled through a variety of philological associations or patterns. These catchwords frequently serve to qualify or define the meaning of related terms in other scriptural contexts. Fifth, Irenaeus will often organize or structure his work with the contents of Gen 1–3. In these instances the use of Genesis is shaped by the general arrangement of his argument and the way the Bishop of Lyons orders scriptural material in light of his polemical theology. Sixth, Irenaeus also coordinates texts in narratival or chronological relationships. These are often presented in the form of a summary of the covenants or decisive events recorded in scripture. These narratival summaries can also assume a creedal form that provides more detailed theological explanation of the Trinitarian activity of God in creation. Seventh, Irenaeus also uses a style of reading called prosopological (or prosopographical) interpretation. This is a method that involves careful literary analysis that focuses on the interlocutors within the fabric of the textual dialogue. It gives attention to the specific characters, speakers, titles, pronouns, or persons, who are active in the narrative of Gen 1–3 and connects these specific individuals with persons of the Trinity. Eighth, Irenaeus also applies the images and language of Gen 1–3 in an illustrative manner. These uses focus on the way the narratives and images in Gen 1–3

express a precise aspect of his polemical theology. This most often takes the form of identifying those of his contemporary setting with particular characters and images in the Genesis creation accounts. Ninth and finally, Irenaeus uses the classical general-to-particular style of argumentation. He will often link other passages with Gen 1–3 by the way they depict either the general or particular aspects of a specific theological concept.

Therefore, these reading strategies explain just how Irenaeus reads Gen 1–3 and intentionally coordinates and cross-references passages. As the subsequent chapters unfold, each of these categories will become more developed and clarified. Irenaeus is not, however, beholden to a set of specific strategies, but to particular theological convictions about the apostolic faith. From Irenaeus' perspective, the unity of divine activity throughout both testaments implies the faithful are "justified to use all current methods (allegory, etymology, grammatical analysis, number symbolism, etc.) in order to discover the mysteries of Christ hidden in the text."[89]

1.4 Framing the Intertextual Reception of Genesis 1–3 in Irenaeus

1.4.1 *Introduction*

In order to situate this contribution, below I survey the literature on Irenaeus' reading of scripture in general, and his interpretation of Gen 1–3 in particular. There is a long stream of analysis on Irenaeus' use of scripture that describes his interpretation of the biblical text, and, in varying degrees, alludes to his intertextuality or scriptural consonance. While references to Irenaeus are scattered throughout the Christian tradition, strongly critical appraisals of Irenaeus pervade the nineteenth century.[90] Even in the early twentieth century scholars frequently characterized his thought as confused and incoherent.[91] Johannes Quasten sums up this thinking by stating that Irenaeus' work "suffers from any clear arrangement or unity of thought."[92] This perspective

89 Farkasfalvy, "Theology of Scripture," 327.

90 For a summary that is now dated but still helpful see: Mary Ann Donovan, "Irenaeus in Recent Scholarship," *SecCen* 4.4 (1984). For a brief discussion of the reception of Irenaeus in the tradition prior to the eighteenth century see Steenberg, *Of God and Man*, 18–9.

91 Orbe, *Teología v.1, 5*. Steenberg, *Irenaeus*, 3–4.

92 Johannes Quasten, *Patrology* (Allen, Texas: Christian Classics, 1983), 289. See also Donovan, "Irenaeus," 222. Some of these studies include: Bousset, *Jüdisch-christlicher Schuldetrieb in Alexandria und Rom: Literarische Untersuchungen zu Philo und Clemens von Alexandria, Justin, und Irenäus* (Göttingen, 1915) and Friedrich Loofs, *Theophilus von Antiochien adversus Marcionem und die anderen theologischen Quellen bei Irenaeus* (Lepzig, 1930).

was challenged by the biblical theology movement in the mid-twentieth century that aimed to focus the discussion on the analysis of Irenaeus' use of the biblical text itself.[93] By the late 1960's, following this move toward the biblical text there is a noticeable trend in the positive appraisal of Irenaeus' exegesis, beginning with Peretto's analysis of Irenaeus' reading of Rom 1–8 and Orbe's work on Irenaeus' reading of the Gospel parables.[94] Twenty-five years later Orbe was still advancing the thesis that a closer analysis of the Irenaeus' exegesis is an important avenue into his thought.[95] The analysis below, then, is a survey of the works that examined his reading of various Old Testament and the New Testament passages.

1.4.2 *Studies on Irenaeus' Reading of the New Testament*

The majority of studies on Irenaeus' exegesis concentrate on his use of the New Testament, and of these studies the analysis of the Pauline elements is a well-worn path. Older studies that question the integrity of Irenaeus' use of Paul include Werner (1889) and Aleith (1937).[96] Recent studies paint a more positive portrait of Irenaeus' use of Pauline literature, including Bentivegna (1968), Coolidge (1975), McHugh (1982), Norris (1990), Balás (1992), Olsen (1992), Ruiz (1992) and Tosaus Abadía (1995), Bingham (2005, 2012), Graham (2005), and Blackwell (2011).[97] The definitive study is the work of Rolf Noormann, *Irenäus*

---

93 Wingren, *Man and the Incarnation*, 104.

94 Elio Pretto, "Il pensiero di S. Ireneo su Rom 1:20," *RBibIt* 8 (1960): 304–23. Pretto, *La Lettera ai Romani*. Orbe, *Parabolas*.

95 Orbe, *Teología v.1*, 15–16. For more general studies on the performance of scripture in Irenaeus see: J Hoh, *Die Lehre des hl. Ireäus über das Neue Testament* (Münster: Verlag der Aschendorffschen Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1919). H. von Campenhausen, "Irenäus und das Neue Testament," *TLZ* 90 (1965): 1–8.

96 Johannes Werner, *Der Paulinismus des Irenaeus* (Leipzig, 1889). Eva Aleith, "Paulusverständnis in der alten Kirche," *ZNT* (1937): 70–81.

97 J. Bentivegna, "Pauline Elements in the Anthropology of St. Irenaeus," *StuEvan* 5 (1968): 229–33; J.S. Coolidge, The Pauline basis of the concept of Scriptural form in Irenaeus, The Center for Hermeneutical Studies in Hellenistic and Modern Culture, Berkeley, California, Protocol of the eighth colloquy, 4 November 1973 (Berkeley, CA: The Center for Hermeneutical Studies, 1975); J. McHugh, "A Reconsideration of Ephesians 1,10b in Light of Irenaeus," in *Paul and Paulinism*: *Essays in Honour of C.K. Barrett*, ed. M.D. Hooker and S.G. Wilson, 302–9 (London: S.P.C.K., 1982); R.A. Norris, "Irenaeus' use of Paul in his polemic against the Gnostics," in *Paul and the legacies of Paul*, ed. W.S. Babcok, 79–98 (Dallas: SMU Press, 1990); David L. Balas, "The Use and Interpretation of Paul in Irenaeus' Five Books Adversus Haereses," *SecCen*, 9 (1992); M.J. Olsen, *Irenaeus, the Valentinian Gnostics and the Kingdom of God* (*A.H. Book v*)*: The Debate About 1 Corinthians 15:50* (New York: Mellen Biblical Press, 1992); G. Ruiz, " 'Ma puissance se déploie dans

als Paulusinterpret, who isolates and evaluates the nature of Irenaeus' allusions and citations of Paul in *Haer*. 1–5. Noormann is more sympathetic to the nuances of Irenaeus' argumentation and his use of the Pauline material. He provides a strong critique of Werner and concludes that Irenaeus is a rather faithful interpreter of Paul.[98] At the same time, his analysis of the extensive number of texts Irenaeus reads alongside Paul is limited. For example, more than one scholar observes Noormann's isolation of Irenaeus' use of Paul apart from his use of other scriptural material, which is essential to Irenaeus' polemical arguments (cf. *Haer*. 5.13.2).[99]

Studies on Irenaeus' use of the synoptic Gospels have also been a significant point of focus, especially given that Irenaeus is the first to mention the four-fold Gospel canon.[100] As mentioned above, Orbe and Bacq produced several studies on the Gospel parables and Jesus sayings, while studies on particular Matthean and Lukan texts include: Houssiau (1953), Luckhart (1953), Siniscalco (1967), Czesz (1977), Andia (1984) Bellinzoni (1992, 1998), and Stanton (2003) with many additional studies on the significance of particular events in the life of Christ.[101] The most comprehensive is D.J. Bingham's (1998) publication

---

la faiblesse' (2 Cor 12:9): An Interprétation d'Irénée de Lyon," in *Recherches et tradition: Mélanges patristiques offerts à Henri Crouzel, S. J. sous la direction d'A. Dupleix*, 259–69 (Paris: Neauchesne, 1992); J.P. Tosaus Abadía, *Cristo y el universo: Estudio linguístico y themático de Ef 1:10h en Efesios y en la obra de Ireneo de Lyon*, (Salamanca: Universidad Pontificia, 1995); D.J. Bingham, "Irenaeus reads Romans 8: Ressurection and Renovation," in *Early Patristic Readings of Romans*, eds Kathy L. Gaca and L.L. Welborn, 114–32 (New York: T&T Clark, 2005); Susan L. Graham, "Irenaeus as Reader of Romans 9–11," in *Early Patristic Readings of Romans*, eds Kathy L. Gaca and L.L. Welborn, 87–113 (New York: T&T Clark, 2005); Benjamin Blackwell, "Paul and Irenaeus," in *Paul and the Second Century: The Legacy of Paul's life, Letters, and Teaching*, ed. Michael F. Bird and Joseph R. Dodson, 190–206 (London: T&T Clark, 2011); Bingham, "Irenaeus and Hebrews," in *Christology and Hermeneutics of Hebrews: Profiles from the History of Interpretation*, eds by Jon C. Laansma and Daniel J. Treier (New York: Continuum, forthcoming).

98 Rolf Noormann, *Irenäus als Paulsinterpret* (J.C.B. Mohr: Tübingen, 1994), 1.

99 Annette Yoshiko Reed, "Review of Rolf Noormann, *Irenäus als Paulusinterpret*," unpublished conference presentation, Presented at the North American Patristics Society, Annual Meeting Book Session: Irenaeus in Recent Scholarship, May 29, 2004. Pheme Perkins, Review of Rolf Noormann, *Irenäus als Paulusinterpret*, *CBQ* 58 (1996): 762–764.

100 There are also a number of studies on the four-fold gospel canon including: T.C. Skeat, "Irenaeus and the Four-Gospel canon," *NovT* 34 (1992): 194–99; R. Robert, "Le témoignage d'Irénée sur la formation des évangiles," *RThom* 87.2 (1987): 243–59.

101 A. Houssiau, "L'exégèse de Mt 11:27b selon S. Irénée," *ETL* 29 (1953): 328–54; R. Luckhart, "Matthew 11,27 in the 'Contra Haereses' of Saint Irenaeus," *RUO* 23 (1953): 65–79; M. Siniscalco, "La parabola del figlio prodigo (Lc 15:11–32) in Ireneo," *SMSR* 38.2 (1967):

Irenaeus' use of Matthew's Gospel in Adversus Haereses. Bingham's volume is a careful reading of Irenaeus' use of Matthew and, in contrast to Noormann, his discussions of the bishop intertextual reading of Matthew are extensive. The first point of Bingham's conclusion is the observation that Irenaeus reads Matthew "inter-textually."[102]

In addition to the synoptic Gospels, several studies discuss the influence of Johannine thought upon Irenaeus including: Ferlay (1984) and Poffet (1990), and more recently Hill (2004).[103] Most recently B. Mutschler published *Irenäus als johanneischer Theologe*, and two years later published a second monograph entitled *Das Corpus Johnneum bei Irenäus von Lyon*.[104] The later volume is a systematic treatment of the use of John's Gospel in *Haer*. 3 while the earlier work is a synthesis of the Johannine influence upon Irenaeus. He follows the methodology of Noormann, and, in doing so, Mutschler concludes that Irenaeus is the primary Johannine theologian until Origen.[105] These studies of Pauline or Johannine features of Irenaeus' exegesis point out various aspects of Irenaeus' scriptural exegesis and observe several examples of intertextuality in Irenaeus' applied exegesis, but they do not give adequate attention to Irenaeus' intertextual exegesis and explain precisely how he navigates the scriptural witness. The same point is also evident in the studies on his use of the Old Testament.

5326–53; B. Czesz, "La parabola del figlio prodigo (Lc 15, 11–32) in Ireneo," *AugR* 17 (1977): 107–11; Y. de Andia, "L'interprétation irénéenne de la beatitude des doux: 'Bienheureux les doux, ils recevront la terre en héritage' (Mt 5:5)," *StuPat* 18.3 (1989): 85–102, originally published "La beatitudine dei miti (Mt. v,5) nell'interpretazione di S. Ireneo," *RSLR* 20 (1984): 275–86; Bellinzoni, "The Gospel of Matthew in the Second Century," *SecCen* 9.4 (1992): 197–269; Bellinzoni, "The Gospel of Luke in the Second Century," in *Literary Studies in Luke-Acts*, ed. R.E. Thompson and T.E. Phillips, 59–76 (Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1998); G. Stanton, "Jesus Traditions and Gospels in Justin Martyr and Irenaeus," in *The Biblical Canons, ed. J. M. Auwers and J. H. de Jonge*, 92–109 (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2003).

102 Bingham, *Irenaeus*, 304.

103 P. Ferlay, "Irénée de Lyon exegete du quatrième évangile," *NRT* 106.2 (1984): 222–34; J.M. Poffet, "Indices de reception de l'évangile de Jean au IIe siècle, avant Irénée," in *Communauté johannique et son histoire*, 305–26 (Genova: Labor et Fides, 1990); Charles Hill, "Irenaeus of Lyon," in *The Johannine Corpus and the Early Church*, 95–118 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004).

104 Bernhard Mutschler, *Irenäus als johanneischer Theologe* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004); Bernhard Mutschler, Das *Corpus Johnneum bei Irenäus von Lyon* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006).

105 Mutschler, *Irenäus*, 84.

1.4.3 *Studies on Irenaeus' Reading of the Old Testament and Genesis*

Outside of the New Testament, appreciation for Irenaeus' use of the Old Testament remains scarce. With the exception of Genesis, Irenaeus' reading of any Old Testament passage or book is reserved to a few studies on the Psalms or Isaiah.[106] Clearly Genesis has received the most attention and, other than a few studies on key theological issues or persons such as Abraham and Isaac, most studies on Genesis are reserved to the opening chapters.[107] Some of the Pauline studies mentioned previously allude to the function of Gen 1–3, but the majority of the evaluations of Gen 1–3 are found in the theological studies, especially works on Irenaeus' anthropology. The work of J.T. Nielsen (1968) was the first to offer critical evaluation of the Adam-Christ typology in Irenaeus.[108] Orbe (1969) also published his work on the Bishop's anthropology, which contains discussions of the key Genesis passages.[109] After these publications, more recent studies assessed various aspects of the Bishop's theological systems and, in doing so, comment on relevant Genesis passages including: Brown (1975), Donovan (1988), Constantelos (1989), Fantino (1986, 1992, 1998), Sesboüe (2000), Behr (2001), Weinandy (2003) and Steenberg (2004).[110] But these studies

106 J.A. Aldama, "La naissance du Seigneur dans l'exégèse patristrique du Ps 21:10s (=22:10a)," *RSR* 51 (1963): 5–29; H.-J. Vogt, "Die Geltung des AT bei Irenäus von Lyon," *ThQ* 60 (1980): 17–28; C. Basevi, "La generazoine eternal di Cristo nei Ps 2 e 109 secondo S. Giustino e S. Ireneo," *Aug* 22.1–2 (1982): 135–47. Lawson provides a general analysis of Irenaeus' reading of Isaiah and select Psalms. Lawson, *Biblical Theology*, 55–66.

107 D.E. Lanne, "La 'xeniteia' d'Abraham dans l'oeuvre d'Irénée," *Irén* 47 (1974): 163–87; R. Tremblay, "La signification d' Abraham dans l'oeuvre d'Irénée de Lyon," *Aug* 18 (1978): 434–57; J. Roldanus, "L'héritage d'Abraham d'après Irénée," in *Text and Testimony: Essays on New Testament and Apocryphal Literature in Honour of A. F.J. Klijin*, ed. T. Baarda, 212–24 (Kampen: Kok, 1998); B.D. Chilton, "Irenaeus on Isaac," in *StuPat* 17.2 ed. E.A. Livingstone 643–47 (Oxford: Pergamon Press, 1982).

108 J.T. Nielson, *Adam and Christ in the Theology of Irenaeus of Lyon* (Assen: Van Gorcum, 1968). See also: J.A. Aldama, "Adam, typus futuri," *SE* 13 (1962): 266–80.

109 Orbe, *Anthropologia*.

110 Robert F. Brown, "On the Necessary Imperfection of Creation: Irenaeus' Adversus haereses IV, 38," *SJT* 28.1 (1975): 17–25. Mary Ann Donovan, "Alive to the Glory of God: A key Insight in St. Irenaeus," *TS* 14.2 (1990): 99–112; J. Demetrios Constantelos, "Irenaeus of Lyon and his Central Views of Human Nature," *SVTQ* 33.4 (1989): 351–63. Jacques Fantino, *L'homme, image de Dieu chez saint Irénée de Lyon*, (Paris: Editions du Cerf, 1986); Jacques Fantino, "La creation ex nihilo chez saint Irénée," *RevueSPT* 76.3 (1992): 421–42; Jacques Fantino, "Le passage de premier Adam au second Adam comme expression de salut chez Irénée Lyon," *VC* 52.4 (1998): 418–29; Bernard Sesboüe, *Tout Récapituler dans le Christ: Christologie et sotériologie d'Irénée de lyon* (Paris: Desclée, 2000); Behr, *Asceticism*. Thomas Weinandy, "St. Irenaeus and the Image Dei: The Importance of Being Human," *Logos* 6.4

are theologically oriented, and they give more attention to the synthesis of Irenaeus' arguments rather than his applied exegesis. For example, Nielsen's critical evaluation of the Adam-Christ typology only references Irenaeus' use of Genesis in a few instances, even though echoes and allusions pervade nearly all of his citations of Irenaeus.[111]

Amid these studies, the assessment of Irenaeus' interpretation of Genesis is a recent development. The importance of Genesis in Irenaeus' thought went undetected in earlier works. Lawson, for example, provides a whole chapter of Irenaeus' exegesis and only explores Irenaeus' reading of Isaiah, a few select Psalms, and Romans.[112] According to Lawson, Irenaeus is chiefly concerned with Old Testament prophecy and Paul; there is no substantial reference to the function of Genesis. This view, however, has come full-circle in recent years with the works of Steenberg and Holsinger-Friesen. Holsinger-Friesen even goes so far as to argue that, for Irenaeus, Gen 1:26 and Gen 2:7 are "peerless" in relation to all other biblical texts.[113] Alongside these works, there have been several recent studies that evaluated Irenaeus' reading of Gen 1–3.

1.4.3.1 Studies on Irenaeus' Reading of Genesis: Antonio Orbe, Charles Kannengiesser and Anders-Christian Jacobsen

The first works to consider Irenaeus' reading of Genesis are three articles that examine the Bishop's reading upon these texts from a variety of perspectives. Orbe composed an article on the complex interpretation of Gen 2:17b in *Haer*. 5.23.1–2 and later analyzed his use of Gen 3:15.[114] His focused treatment on Gen 2:16–17 locates no less than five plausible interpretations that Irenaeus offers of this divine prohibition. Each one proves God is true and the serpent is a liar (John 8:44), because Adam and Eve truly died the day they ate of the fruit. Orbe shows that in the midst of his polemics Irenaeus will provide highly intense readings of particular terms, phrases, and concepts in Genesis that contribute to his theological argument. Given the spectrum of interpretive options, Orbe also demonstrates that Irenaeus is comfortable with any interpretation that proves the truth of the Lord's words in John 8:44 and the veracity

(2003): 15–34; Matthew Steenberg, "Children in Paradise: Adam and Eve as 'Infants' in Irenaeus of Lyon," *JECS* 12.1 (2004): 1–35.

111 Nielson, *Adam and Christ*, 17, 79.

112 Lawson, *The Biblical Theology*, 55–86.

113 Thomas Holsinger-Friesen, *Irenaeus and Genesis: A study of Competition in Early Christian Hermeneutics* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2009), 40.

114 Orbe, "Cinco exegesis Ireneanas de Gen 2:17b *adv. haer*. V 23, 1–2," *Greg* (1981): 75–113; Orbe, "Ipse tuum calcabit caput, San Ireneo y Gen 3:15," *Greg* 52 (1971): 71–127.

of God's prohibition in Gen 2:17. But in this article, as well as his treatment of Gen 3:15, Orbe does not always emphasize how Irenaeus arrives at these various readings or the way that each of them are dependent upon distinctive textual relationships.

While Orbe's article is highly focused, Charles Kannengiesser's article entitled, "The 'Speaking God' and Irenaeus' Interpretative Pattern: The Reception of Genesis," is much more general as it evaluates the function of the book of Genesis as a whole in Irenaeus.[115] Kannengiesser's attention to the performance of Genesis discerns several interesting features of Irenaeus' use of Genesis passages including his preference for texts that contain divine discourse and the way Irenaeus' allusions to Genesis follows, more or less, the contours of the biblical narrative itself. However, Kannengiesser states that he "deliberately ignores the connections established between Genesis and other biblical books and proceeds in a methodological abstraction to postpone more complex inquiries."[116] Therefore, his work reveals some key aspects of Irenaeus' interpretation, but purposely ignores the connections between Genesis and other passages which are essential to his reading of Genesis.[117]

Another significant article surfaced in 2004 by Anders-Christian Jacobsen entitled "The Importance of Genesis 1–3 in the Theology of Irenaeus."[118] Similar to Kannengiesser, Jacobsen aims for a deeper appreciation of Irenaeus' exegetical strategies as the "unavoidable first step" in the appreciation of his theological framework.[119] He argues for the formative role of Gen 1–3 in Irenaeus' theological integration of creation and consummation and the anthropological implications of humanity's creation in the image of the divine Logos.[120] Irenaeus' vision of salvation is the fulfillment of the conditions of creation established in the opening scenes of Gen 1–3. He rightly argues that

115 Charles Kannengiesser, "The 'Speaking God' and Irenaeus' Interpretative Pattern: the Reception of Genesis," *ASE* 15.2 (1998): 337–352.

116 Ibid., 339. This also does not address the fact that Kannengiesser limits his brief investigation to "quotations" rather than considering any allusions or echoes.

117 For example, Irenaeus most frequently cites the dialogical texts in Genesis in continuity with New Testament dialogical texts, such as Christ "speaking" in the Gospels, in order to link the identities of both individuals. See: *Haer.* 5.17.1 with the allusions to Gen 3:9 and John 9:1–7.

118 Anders-Christian Jacobsen, "The Importance of Genesis 1–3 in the Theology of Irenaeus," *ZAC* 8 (2004): 299–316.

119 Ibid., 316. Orbe also shares this general view. Orbe, *Teología V.1*, 10.

120 Ibid., 299. While Genesis may play a formative role in, say his theological concept of recapitulation, it is not Gen 1–3 alone, but Gen 1–3 in dialogue with other texts (i.e. Eph 1:10, Rom 5:12, and 1Cor 15:45–47).

Irenaeus explains the central issues of the faith with "biblical key-texts," but Jacobsen does not mention the way Irenaeus reads Gen 1–3 within theological networks or how textual networking constructs his theological vision. Like Kannengiesser, Jacobsen's general thesis is helpful in the way that it establishes the theological continuity between his protology and other aspects of his theology, but he does not describe how Irenaeus' intertextual reading of Gen 1–3 is expressed.

1.4.3.2 Matthew Steenberg and Thomas Holsinger-Friesen on Irenaeus' Reading of Genesis 1–3

Finally, in recent years there have been two monographs published on Irenaeus' use of Genesis. The first published in 2008 by Matthew Steenberg entitled *Irenaeus on Creation: The Cosmic Christ and the Sage of Redemption*. Steenberg's volume is an analysis of Irenaeus' use of Gen 1–11, with respect to his reading of creation. He attempts to read "the author's varied cosmological and anthropological statements within a larger interpretive framework on creation and the human person."[121] Even though Irenaeus has long been regarded as a "theologian of creation," Steenberg's work is the first systematic treatment of Irenaeus' reading of any Old Testament book or extended pericope.[122] He also frames Irenaeus' theology of creation within the patterns of early Christian thought and compares his thought with Justin, Theophilus, and the Gnostic literature. Steenberg recognizes, however, that Irenaeus presents no single isolated treatment of the creation accounts, instead his reflections on creation are scattered throughout his work and woven into his varied theological and polemical reflections. Citing the language of C.R. Smith, he sets out to prove that Irenaeus is a "consistent creationist," thereby orienting his analysis of Gen 1–11 toward the "interrelationships" amid Irenaeus' protology and other aspects of his theological perspective.[123] Steenberg realizes the fallacy of packaging Irenaeus' theology into isolated doctrines that disrupt the integrated nature of his theology. Irenaeus' Christology and anthropology, for example, are closely aligned with his protology and eschatology.[124]

---

121 Steenberg, *Irenaeus*, 4.

122 Ibid., 5.

123 Ibid., 2, 9. C.R. Smith, "Chiliasm and recapitulation in the theology of Irenaeus [sic]," *VC* 48 (1994): 313–331, 320.

124 The language "protological" pervades the works of Holsinger-Friesen, Steenberg, Behr, and others. In my view, this modern categorization runs the risk of anachronism and continues to force Irenaeus' use of scripture into rigid categories he does not use. In other words, what Irenaeus conceives as "protological" cannot be reserved to Gen 1–3, but must

However, on one hand Steenberg must acknowledge that Gen 1–11 is "hardly the sole testimony to creation contained in the scriptures," because Irenaeus will fashion his theology of creation without mentioning Genesis, and yet the basis of research remains the allusions and citations to Gen 1–11, even though Irenaeus uses a range of passages outside of Gen 1–11 to fashion his theology of creation.[125] Thus, the object of Steenberg's research is concerned with the "interrelation" of Irenaeus' theology of creation with the rest of his theological perspective, not necessarily appreciating how Irenaeus reads these creation texts in continuity with other scriptures, which continually inform is theology of creation.[126] Neither do Steenberg's general summaries of Irenaeus' theology take into account the more fundamental analysis of terms, phrases, images or concepts imbedded in Gen 1–3 and the way these orient the interrelational nature of Irenaeus' exegesis of Gen 1–3 that informs his theological perspective. Steenberg readily acknowledges Irenaeus' tendency to conflate Gen 1–3 with other texts and he also observes that Irenaeus reads Genesis in continuity with the rest of salvation history.[127] However, Steenberg rarely scrutinizes the host of scriptural allusions that stand in interpretative relationship with Gen 1–3, because evaluating these scriptural interrelationships is not essential to his methodology.[128] What we have in Steenberg, therefore, is not Irenaeus'

include reference to other texts with creation themes and concepts. These texts, furthermore, are not altogether disconnected from his use of other theologically and hermeneutically related texts. However, given the prominence of this term in the literature, I continue to use it here to refer to Irenaeus' understanding of cosmogony.

125 Steenberg, *Irenaeus*, 61. For example, Psalm 32(33):6 and John 1:1–3 are essential to his theology of creation. Furthermore, Irenaeus can speak about creation or utilize creation imagery and never appear to reference Gen 1–3. See also: *Haer*. 4.19.2 that alludes to Isa 40:12 and Eph 3:18, 21. Steenberg's monograph is still organized by allusions to Gen 1–11; *cf*. Steenberg *Irenaeus*, 5, 61.

126 Steenberg, *Irenaeus*, 9.

127 Ibid., 66. He goes so far as to point out that *Haer*. 1.22.1, *Haer*. 2.2.5 and *Epid* 43 all conflate Gen 1:1 with John 1:1–3 and the immediate context also contain allusions to Psalm 32(33):6 and 9, respectively. He even claims that "no single verse of New Testament writings is of stronger influence on Irenaeus' cosmological considerations than John 1:3." While John 1:3 may be essential, as my analysis shows, it participates in a much broader intertextual reading of Gen 1–3. Ibid., 69.

128 For examples of discussion of scriptural interactions see: Steenberg, *Irenaeus*, 58–9, 66, 69, and 70–1. Generally speaking, I cannot agree with Steenberg's arbitrary analysis of Gen 1:26. He distinguishes between intentional and unintentional references Genesis in his use of the language "image and likeness." There are no instances where Irenaeus uses this language that he does not, on some level, have the creation accounts in view. Steenberg, *Irenaeus*, 217; *cf*. Ibid., 73–4.

comprehensive theology of creation shaped by *all* creation passages, or the analysis of interrelated creation texts, but Irenaeus' theology of creation with respect to explicit allusions and citations of Gen 1–11.[129] As a result, this present intertextual evaluation will supplement his contribution and extend his exegetical evaluation of Irenaeus' use of Gen 1–3 by showing how Irenaeus networks these creation texts with the rest of the scriptural witness.

In the year following Steenberg's publication, Thomas Holsinger-Friesen published another work on Irenaeus and Genesis entitled, *Irenaeus and Genesis: A Study of Competition in Early Christian Hermeneutics*.[130] His monograph is the inaugural volume of the supplemental series to the *Journal of Theological Interpretation* and, as the subtitle suggests, is more hermeneutically focused than Steenberg's treatment. Like Kannengiesser, his evaluation of Genesis also attempts to illuminate exegetical methodology in light of his interlocutors.[131] Holsinger-Friesen rightly argues that theological investigations of Irenaeus have, by and large, undervalued his more fundamental exegetical methodology.[132] But despite the implication of his title, Holsinger-Friesen is not concerned with Irenaeus' reading of Genesis as a whole, nor even Gen 1–2, but with the his reading of Gen 1:26 and Gen 2:7, insofar as they elucidate his "innovative manner of reading biblical texts as Christian Scripture."[133]

---

129 While some might object to the validity of certain echoes or allusions to Gen 1–3, it is more responsible to be exhaustive and address all potential references to Gen 1–3. As Bacq has proven, closer scrutiny of Irenaeus' less obvious allusions is necessary for understanding his argument, structure, and exegesis. Bacq, *De l'ancienne*, 19–20. See also: Orbe, *Teología v.1*, 10, Bingham, *Irenaeus'*, 12, and Donovan, *One Right Reading?*, 17. Louis Painchaud argues the same thesis for the use of scripture in Gnostic literature. Louis Painchaud, "The Use of Scripture in Gnostic Literature," *JECS* 4.2 (1996): 129–47, 130–1.

130 Steenberg also revised a portion of his monograph on Gen 2:16–17 and published an article that extends the previous work of Orbe on the same text. Steenberg, "To Test or Preserve?: The Prohibition of Gen 2:16–17 in the Thought of Two Second-Century Exegetes," *Greg* 86 (2005): 723–41.

131 Holsinger-Friesen, *Irenaeus*, 106–7.

132 Ibid., x. His work opposes the influence of Adolf von Harnack whose inflated view of Irenaeus' doctrine of recapitulation, according to Holsinger-Friesen, has dominated scholarly discussions of Irenaeus to the present day. For a similar observation, see: Jacobsen, "The Importance of Genesis 1–3," 300–1 n2.

133 Ibid., 2. He does not examine *all* of Irenaeus' uses of Gen 1:26 and Gen 2:7. His evaluation is reserved to the Gnostic uses in *Haer*. 1.1–7 and *Haer*. 1.30.1–9 and a few selective uses in *Haer*. 3.18, *Haer*. 4.20 and *Haer*. 5.3–16.2. In contrast, I analyze all uses of these passages throughout *Adversus Haereses*.

Irenaeus' use of Gen 1:26 and Gen 2:7 is a mere "test-case" to this end and his evaluation of these two texts is highly selective.[134]

Nevertheless, Holsinger-Friesen is helpful for the way he describes the intricate readings of Gen 1:26 and Gen 2:7 that reveals the utilitarian function of these texts in the interpretive hands of Irenaeus.[135] His utilitarian focus provides glimpses of Irenaeus' theological weaving of scripture, and he even observes that Irenaeus' exegesis involves the "conjunction" of texts. However, Holsinger-Friesen never accentuates these relationships or elucidates the more intricate nature of Irenaeus' textual harmony.[136] Instead, he draws on the utilitarian nature of Gen 1:26 and Gen 2:7 within the hermeneutical disputes of the second century, and frequently describes each as a "hermeneutical tool." This is certainly correct in one sense, but Irenaeus never uses one scripture (or one "tool") to refute the Gnostics. Instead he always uses a collection of scriptures that are linguistically, theologically, structurally, or conceptually bound together in various intertextual relationships. Therefore, while Gen 1:26 and Gen 2:7 may be *pivotal* in many instances, they are not "peerless," precisely because they have many scriptural "peers" that join together with them in the contours of his exegesis to refute his opponents.[137]

At the same time, Holsinger-Friesen's comparison of Irenaeus and the Gnostic's reading of Gen 1:26 and Gen 2:7 also presumes they are competing over the *same* particular texts (i.e. Gen 1:26, Gen 2:7), when in reality Irenaeus and the Gnostics are not competing interpretations of the same *individual* passages, but competing networks or systems of texts that are distinctive, even though they apply similar procedures to explain their reading of creation. In many cases, texts that are crucial to a Gnostic reading of creation, such as Gen 1:2, Gen 1:3–25, and Gen 3:21 are never interpreted by Irenaeus in any substantial way. Instead, Irenaeus defends his reading of creation with distinctive theology of creation that produces distinctive interrelated networks of passages, which may or may not be important to any given Gnostic reading.

---

134 Ibid., 142, 219.

135 Holsinger-Friesen, *Irenaeus*, 218–21. As I argue below there are good reasons to explore Gen 1–3 as a unit in Irenaeus, and the way these texts contribute to his intertextual argumentation.

136 Holsinger-Friesen, *Irenaeus*, 38.

137 Ibid., 40. In the same context he continually refers to them as "focal texts," which also construes the harmonious nature of Irenaeus' hermeneutics and separates Irenaeus' reading of Gen 1–2 from Gen 3, even though there is clear precedent for evaluating these chapters together. Ibid., 33, 38–9.

Finally, Holsinger-Friesen's primary conclusion is what he terms Irenaeus' "protological orientation" that privileges the theological and Christological application of Gen 1:26 and Gen 2:7. This may be a helpful corrective to the earlier studies of Steenberg and Behr who argue that Irenaeus is *eschatologically oriented* even in terms of his use of Gen 1–2.[138] But Irenaeus' exegesis is not altogether protologically oriented, nor is it entirely eschatologically oriented. Instead, his reading of Genesis is *intertextually oriented*. He is not concerned with Gen 1:26 or Gen 2:7 *alone* at any stage of the unfolding of the divine economy, but instead with Genesis in connection with others texts. At times the texts of Gen 1–3 function as controlling texts ordering his argument, while in other instances Gen 1:26 or Gen 2:7 are supporting texts that buttress his theological positions. In every instance these texts are blended and conflated with other passages. All of these passages, furthermore, participate in a variety of intertextual relationships fashioned through a variety of means. Therefore, Irenaeus is not concerned purely with the protological matters, but with the way all portions of scripture are ordered and connected as they anticipate the work of Christ, the church, and the eschatological kingdom of God.

1.4.4 *Conclusion*

In conclusion, this stream of studies on Irenaeus use of scripture contributes a variety of aspects of Irenaeus' intertextual reading of scripture in general and Gen 1–3 in particular. The past fifty years have produced an extensive amount of treatments of Irenaeus use of both the Old and the New Testament. Studies on Irenaeus' use of the Gospels, Paul, and Genesis have shown that Irenaeus reads scripture intertextually. These studies also demonstrated various aspects of his theological and exegetical perspective. At the same time, they do not explain precisely *how* Irenaeus' intertextual hermeneutic is expressed. Thus, there is a need for a closer evaluation of the nature of the Bishop's hermeneutics and his intertextual reading of Genesis in particular. Situated between the emphasis on the theological integration of Irenaeus' thought in Steenberg, and the importance of Irenaeus' hermeneutics in Kannengiesser, Jacobsen, and Holsinger-Friesen, I advance the understanding of Irenaeus' reading of Gen 1–3 by showing the sophistication of his textual networking and the way he orders and connects Gen 1–3 with a variety of other scriptures. Through this

138 Steenberg, *Irenaeus*, 9. He also suggests Irenaeus' use of "image and likeness" in Gen 1:26 is "eschatologically oriented." Steenberg, *Irenaeus*, 56; *cf.* Steenberg, *Of God and Man*, 42–3. Steenberg will use the language of "protological orientation," but he is specifically speaking of Irenaeus' reading of the creation accounts as the opening scenes of the divine economy, not the reference to Genesis in the latter stages. Steenberg, *Of God and Man*, 22.

analysis, I classify the variety of reading strategies mentioned above. This study will be sensitive to Irenaeus' intertextual scriptural interpretation, and evaluate not only his reading of Gen 1–3, but also the other scriptural texts that exist in various interpretative symbiotic relationships with Gen 1–3. From this evaluation I will explain *how* the Bishop of Lyons networks texts as he defends his understanding of the apostolic faith beginning with these creation texts.

1.5 Methodology and Qualifications

1.5.1 *Introduction*

Given Irenaeus' supreme concern for the proper integration of scriptural revelation, this inquiry into Irenaeus' reading of scripture will explain the nature of the harmonious interplay of scriptures in his thought and argumentation. Gerard Luttikhuizen makes a similar observation from his evaluation of Gnostic readings of Genesis. Citing the contribution of Grivel, he writes: "Reading is an act of 'intertextualization,' because during the reading process, the reader's knowledge of other oral and written texts is constantly activated. If we want to know how a given Gnostic text is understood by ancient or modern readers, we should therefore try to find out what are the texts in the light of which it is read."[139] In a similar way, I recognize that the appropriate way to understand Irenaeus' reading of scripture is to identify the intertexts he reads alongside any given text and determine how he utilizes a variety of intertextual interpretive strategies to arrange these textual relationships.

In order to survey Irenaeus' intertextual hermeneutic, this work will proceed in a systematic fashion through the entire corpus of Irenaeus' principle work, *Adversus Haereses*, and explain the way that he reads Gen 1–3 intertextually within the contours of his scripture hermeneutic. Given that this method could be applied to any portion of Irenaeus, I have chosen Gen 1–3 for several reasons. First, the material of Gen 1–3 is cited considerably throughout Irenaeus' corpus. Following Isaiah and the Psalms, it is the most frequently cited portion of the Old Testament.[140] Due to the extensive range of allusions, Kannengiesser remarks that reading through *Adversus Haereses* gives the impression that Gen 1–3 appears to sit at the forefront of Irenaeus' mind.[141]

---

139 Luttikhuizen, *Gnostic Revisions*, 162. See also: C Grivel, "Thèses préparatoires sur les intertexts," in R. Lachmann, Dialogizität, *Theorie und Geschichte der Literatur und der schönen Künste*, 237–48 (Munich: Fink, 1982).

140 Holsinger-Friesen, *Irenaeus*, 4 n. 14.

141 Kannengiesser, *The 'Speaking* God', 350.

Therefore, I have many and various textual relationships to compare. Second, the creation accounts have long been recognized as central to Irenaeus' theological framework.[142] If creation is essential to Irenaeus' thought, this concentration on the intertextual reception of Gen 1–3 will provide an array of scriptural texts that are essential to his theological framework. Third, he presents a series of interpretations of the concept of "day" in the divine command in Gen 2:16–17 and appears sympathetic to the view that all the events of Gen 1–3 transpire on the same "day of creation."[143] He presents one reading of "day" that interprets the creation of Adam and Eve, their disobedience, and their expulsion (Gen 1:26–3:24) take place on the sixth day of creation, since the seventh day is only interpreted eschatologically. Given this position there is a conceptual unity to the events of Gen 1–3. Fourth, Irenaeus' doctrines are inundated with references to creation. He is interested in the notions of the divine economy of salvation and the economic connections between creation and eschatology. As Steenberg puts it, "Nowhere in his thought will Irenaeus consider the later events of the economy-the incarnation, the passion, the resurrection-without explicit reference back to the first moments of God's creative act."[144] Finally, Irenaeus' chiliastic vision of the cosmos helps him to read the "beginnings" and the "ends" of scripture together. This aesthetic parallelism fashions decisive scriptural harmonies between Gen 1–3 and the unfolding of divine drama of salvation.[145] Furthermore, in *Haer*. 5.28.3 Irenaeus states explicitly that he reads the creation accounts in two senses. They are indeed a literal account of creation, but also a "prophecy of what is to come" (*futrorum prophetia*). So, while Irenaeus is concerned with the order, connection, and harmony of all scriptures, he is particularly concerned with the relationship of Gen 1–3 to the rest of scripture. Given these arguments, Gen 1–3 is a good starting point for understanding the way Irenaeus links these texts to the rest of the scriptural witness.

1.5.2 *Methodology*

The methodology of this study follows closely with a precedent established by other studies in related fields of Biblical Studies.[146] For the intertextual analysis

142 Steenberg, *Irenaeus*, 1.

143 *Haer*. 5.23.2. Iain MacKenzie, *Irenaeus's Demonstration of the Apostolic Preaching: A Theological Commentary and Translation* (Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2002), 119.

144 Steenberg, *Irenaeus*, 21.

145 Smith, "Chiliasm," Steenberg, *Irenaeus*, 49–60.

146 James W. Voelz, "Multiple Signs and Double Texts: Elements of Intertextuality," in *Intertextuality In Biblical Writing: Essays in honour of Bas van Iersel* (Uitgeversmaatschappij

of scripture, Ellen Van Wolde proposes the following procedure: (1) identify a particular intertextual relationship between two or more texts and study each text on its own, (2) compose an inventory of the repetitions of the compared texts, (3) analyze the new network of meaning generated from the meeting of the two texts. S.D. Giere follows a modified version of Van Wolde's criteria. Giere's study is also a diachronic analysis assessing a broad range of ancient texts. My analysis on the other hand, is a focused synchronic examination of a singular pericope throughout the work of a single author. In this present study I will apply a revised version of Van Wolde's procedure, which has other similarities to Giere.

First, I have identified all the allusions to Gen 1–3 in *Adversus Haereses*.[147] The basis for this identification is the indices of the critical editions in *Sources Chrétiennes* (*SC*), and I have also cross-referenced these allusions with those cited in *Biblia Patristica* (*BP*) to ensure that all relevant texts are identified. I have also compared these allusions with the passages identified in Antonio Orbe's translation and commentaries of *Haer*. 4 and *Haer*. 5.[148] *BP* is more generous, and not all suggested allusions could be verified or accepted. I have noted these instances in the introduction to each appropriate chapter.

Second, I have identified the intertexts that are hermeneutically and contextually linked with the allusions to Gen 1–3 in Irenaeus. In most cases these intertexts are scripture passages, but there are also several extra-biblical references. The identification of these intertextual allusions will rely again upon *SC* and *BP*. The references to Gen 1–3 and the intertext(s) form the intertextual relationship(s) that are the focus for this study. As I will show, the relationship between Gen 1–3 and the intertext(s) sheds light upon the "meaning and function" of Gen 1–3 in Irenaeus.[149] I readily admit that this notion of "text" and "intertext" are imposed upon Irenaeus, and the use of "text" or "intertext" does not assume priority or hierarchy within the rhetorical argumentation

---

J.H. Kok: Kampen, 1989); Ellen Van Wolde, "Texts in Dialogue with Texts: Intertextuality in the Ruth and Tamar Narratives," *BibInt* 5.1 (1997); S.D. Giere, *A New Glimpse of Day one: Intertextuality, History of Interpretation, and Genesis 1:1–5* (Walter de Gruyter: Berlin, 2009). Van Wolde is effectively a simplified version of Voelz's more detailed approach and Giere follows Van Wolde with some modifications. Stead synthesizes a diachronic and synchronic approach in his " 'contextual' intertextuality." Stead, *The Intertextuality of Zechariah 1–8*, 18–9.

147 I have identified all the uses of Gen 1–3 in Irenaeus' *Epideixis*, which I will mention wherever appropriate. However, I will reserve the comprehensive evaluation of the intertextual performance in the *Epideixis* for a separate publication.

148 Orbe, *Teología* IV, V.1–3.

149 Van Wolde, "Texts in Dialogue", 7.

of Irenaeus.[150] Nor does "text" assume that Irenaeus is interpreting the entire verse or passages in its original context. Furthermore, most scripture references involve key terms or phrases and do not assume the passage as a whole.

Third, I have identified theological, structural, or linguistic markers or patterns uniting the texts.[151] Similar to Van Wolde's second step, these repetitions and intertextual markers or patters including various "signs" such as: words, semantic fields, concepts, imagery, structures, themes, characters, actions, or narratological representations.[152] The most consistent means of connection are what Philippe Bacq terms "linking words" or *mot chrochets*.[153] However, not *all* textual connections can be attributed to philological connections. Some are more conceptually, theologically or structurally related. I have discussed each of these wherever appropriate, and discussed the theological implications of whatever intertextual strategy Irenaeus' is applying. Understanding the literary, rhetorical, or theological nature of these textual relationships serves to explain the meaning and function of these texts in his thought. However, if I cannot identify any type of intertextual relationship, or if the relationship is not conceptually or contextually apparent, I will not make any case for intertextual connections, and I will not argue that these texts contribute to Irenaeus' use of Gen 1–3. This step protects this study from the charge of arbitrary connections that extend *ad infinitum*.

Fourth, similar to Van Wolde's third step, I will analyze the "new network of meaning" that originates from the connection of Gen 1–3 and the intertext(s).[154] However, this study is distinct from Van Wolde (but similar to Giere's) in that I am not imposing a notion of intertextuality to create new meanings, but using intertextuality as a "foundational lens through which to make 'new' observations of 'old' exegesis."[155] Furthermore, I am not merely concerned with the "new meaning" generated from the union of texts, but the nature of the networks that Irenaeus creates. This step allows us to make new observations of the meaning and function of Gen 1–3 in Irenaeus and examine how his networking of scripture shapes his theological perspective. Irenaeus has already worked Gen 1–3 intertextually, and I intend to describe precisely how he per-

150 *Cf.* Clark, *Reading*, 5.

151 Van Wolde, "Texts in Dialogue", 7; Giere, *A New Glimpse*, 12.

152 Van Wolde, "Texts in Dialogue", 7–8; Giere, *A New Glimpse*, 12. Voelz refers to this as "matrixed" saying, "… textual events or ideas are matrixed with other textual events or ideas." Voelz, "Multiple Signs," 30.

153 Bacq, *de l'ancienne*, 20.

154 Van Wolde, "Texts in Dialogue", 8. Giere, *A New Glimpse*, 12.

155 Giere, *A New Glimpse*, 12.

formed the task. Finally, I conclude each chapter with a summary description of Irenaeus' scriptural networking framed by a set of conceptual terms that define the multiple aspects of his intertextual reading of Gen 1–3.

1.5.3 *Categorical Qualifications*

This methodology requires a few categorical qualifications regarding the nature of the scriptural references and interpretive perspective. First, in order to identify direct and indirect references to the scriptural material, I followed Stanley Porter's classifications that distinguish between echo, allusion, and citation.[156] Generally speaking, "echo" is reserved for language that is thematically related to a particular text, while "allusion" has a greater degree of specificity with identification of particular terms or concepts associated with an identifiable source. A "citation" has even more specificity, and is identified by an explicit grouping of parallel language and terms. As Patricia Tull has argued, these classifications are located on a spectrum of identifiability from unknown to certain.[157] In light of this fluidity, I proceed with caution in applying these labels stringently. Typically any more than three parallel terms qualifies as a citation. To be sure these classifications are not without implication in Irenaeus. In certain instances a simple echo can carry the full force of a direct citation, given that an echo can reveal the way a passage has already been absorbed into a theological framework. Even though it is worthwhile to analyze the nature of the particular echoes, allusions, or citations, I am more concerned with the intertextual connections between texts than with the qualitative nature of the textual reference or similarity of texts to their original sources.

Second, I intentionally avoided distinguishing typology and allegory in Irenaeus' interpretations. The discussion on these terms is extensive and the definitions are far from settled. In many cases, the intertextual relationships I identify in Irenaeus could be classified as typological or even possibly allegorical. Some Irenaean scholars, such as Orbe, continue to argue for the distinction between typology and allegory in Irenaeus, but the Bishop's use of scripture is

156 Stanley E. Porter, "Further Comments on the Use of the Old Testament in the New Testament," in *The Intertextuality of the Epistles: Explorations of Theory and Practice*, eds. T.L. Broder, D.R. MacDonald, and S.E. Porter, *NTM* 16, 98–110 (Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2007); S. Porter, "Allusions and Echoes," in *As It Is Written: Studying Paul's use of Scripture*, 29–40 (Leiden: Brill, 2008).

157 Patricia Tull (Willey), *Remember the Former Things: The Recollection of Previous Texts in Second Isaiah* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1997), 61. See also Stead, *The Intertextuality of Zechariah*, 20–21.

much more complicated.[158] It is especially problematic when Irenaeus composes intricate networks of highly conflated echoes and allusions to distinct texts covering both testaments.[159] Peter Martens has also made the strong case that the distinction between typology and allegory is unhelpful and potentially misleading.[160] He proposes the need for alternative labels for the various forms of non-literal interpretations. In light of her discussion on intertextuality, Young also suggests the normative categories of "literal," "allegory," and "typology" are inadequate to describe the practice of patristic exegesis.[161] Instead, she describes patristic exegesis as "an intertextuality of imaginative and creative play, far removed from the historicism of modern interpretation."[162] Irenaeus does speak of Paul's Adam-Christ typology, but he also repudiates the use of allegory–even though he appears to utilize allegory on occasion–because allegory is characteristic of Gnostic exegesis. Therefore, intertextuality simply emphasizes the more general observation that, for Irenaeus, texts exist in relationship and I have formulated a group of conceptual categories that explain how Irenaeus arranges these intertextual relationships.

1.5.4 *Potential Limitations*

This methodology also raises some potential limitations. First, I am not concerned with influence or dependence, even though this may be implied from my analysis. While this is an important discussion, identifying dependence in the ancient world is a highly involved task in its own right and well beyond the scope of this study. I have already noted several works that labored to find Irenaeus' sources and produced nominal results.[163] In addition, given the nature of Irenaeus' intertextual orientation, there is greater need for closer scrutiny of Irenaeus' contributions and appreciation of his own argumentation. Second, some scholars have claimed that intertextuality is a dubious category because intertextual connections extend *ad infinitium*. There is merit to this critique and it is true that these intertextual connections can digress into unmanageable and unconvincing relationships. Therefore, I have limited the intertextual connections to the texts and intertexts in the immediate context linked through some kind of identifiable conceptual relationship. In most

158 *Haer*. 5.35.1; Orbe, *Teología v.1*, 12–3.

159 For example see: *Haer*. 3.23.1–8 and *Haer*. 4.20.1–4.

160 Peter Martens, "Revisiting the Allegory/Typology Distinction: The Case of Origen, "*JECS* 16.3 (2008): 283–317, 315–6. See also: De Lubac, "Typologie' et 'allegorisme" *RSR* 34 (1947): 180–226. Ayres, *Nicaea*, 31. Clark, *Reading*, 70–78.

161 Young, *Biblical Exegesis*, 116.

162 Young, *The Art of Performance*, 128.

163 Wingren, *Man and the Incarnation*, xvi–ii.

cases this involves the connections to the chapter and paragraph of *Adversus Haereses* in *SC* containing the allusions to Gen 1–3. However, in a few instances I include an additional paragraph, either before or after, if it is closely related to the same line of argumentation. This analysis also demands close attention to Irenaeus' overall polemic and the structure of his argumentation. The works of Donovan, Bacq, and Orbe were important for locating the structure of Irenaeus' work and determining the flow of argumentation that links these texts. As I mentioned in step three of the methodology above, if there is no specific or discernible relationship, there is no textual relationship discussed. Third, I consistently try to balance any discussion between Gen 1–3 and the related intertexts. While in certain instances it might appear as though Gen 1–3 recedes into the background of this study, it is because I believe the intertexts are essential for understanding the way Irenaeus reads Gen 1–3. That being said, I have made every effort to only discuss passages that in some way inform Irenaeus' reading of Gen 1–3 and serve to explain how Irenaeus works scripture intertextually.

1.5.5 *Conclusion*

Therefore, the contemporary discussions on intertextuality in Fishbane, Boyarin, Hays and Young have recognized a greater appreciation for intertextuality in the ancient world and Irenaeus in particular. In addition, Irenaeus' own descriptions of the exegetical task argue for a general intertextual manner of reading scripture. Previous studies on Irenaeus' use of scripture observed many important aspects of Irenaeus' hermeneutical perspective and his penchant for reading scripture intertextually. In terms of Genesis, Orbe, Kannengiesser, and Jacobsen turned our attention to his reading of Genesis and the significant contribution of this book to Irenaeus' theological vision. Following these studies, Steenberg highlighted the theological integration of Irenaeus' thought with respect to his use of Gen 1–11. Irenaeus' views on creation are consistent with the entire thrust of this theological framework. Finally, Holsinger-Friesen, in concert with Kannengiesser and Jacobsen, continued to evaluate the importance of studying Irenaeus' scripture hermeneutic. Building upon these studies, this study demonstrates Irenaeus' intertextual reading of Gen 1–3 by means of the textual relationships he fashions with these protological texts, and outlines the specific reading strategies he employs to fashion these specific textual relationships. With the passages of Gen 1–3 as my textual landmark, I will show how Irenaeus utilizes these texts *in continuity* with other scriptural passages through a series of reading strategies. This mode of enquiry is more sensitive to Irenaeus' expressed methods of exegesis and the range of studies on his exegetical methodology, and this manner of intertextual inquiry will reveal a deeper appreciation for his reading of Gen 1–3 than any study to date.

CHAPTER 2

Reading Gnostic Creation: The Intertextual Reception of Genesis 1–3 in Book 1 of *Adversus Haereses*

2.1 Introduction

This study of Irenaeus' intertextual reading of Gen 1–3 begins with *Haer*. 1, where the Bishop of Lyons composes a protracted critique of the Gnostic communities found in Lyons and throughout the Mediterranean region.[1] In the opening lines of *Adversus Haereses* he explains that he is writing to expose their origin, nature, and doctrine. He begins with the Valentinian thought precipitating in the followers of Ptolemaeus, since he is particularly concerned with the way their teaching had been taking root in the communities surrounding the Rhone Valley.[2] Irenaeus reports that he had personal conversations with the disciples of Valentinus and other sects in order to get a firsthand account of their doctrines, and he compiles his understanding of their basic theological assertions.[3]

Therefore, the texts of *Haer*. 1 unfolds as a carefully summarized theological catalogue of Ptolemean Valentinianism and other related streams of Gnosticism, with particular attention given to the theological and cosmological

1 *Haer*. 1.pf.1. Following the contributions of Michael Williams and Karen King, the labels "Gnostic" and "Gnosticism" continue to be problematic and potentially misleading. Wherever possible I will identify the specific school or community in view. However, I will retain the label "Gnostic," because some of Irenaeus' discussions are intentionally general thus the more inclusive descriptions are necessary as indicators of all the groups Irenaeus' mentions throughout *Adversus Haereses*. See Williams, *Rethinking "Gnosticism."* Karen L. King, *What Is Gnosticism?* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2003). For a similar suggestion see Steenberg, *Irenaeus*, 15. For a discussion of various labels Irenaeus' gives his Valentinian opponents see Einar Thomassen, *The Spiritual Seed: The Church of the 'Valentinians'* (Leiden: Brill, 2006), 13–22.

2 *Haer*. 1.13.7. Grant, *Irenaeus*, 21.

3 *Haer*. 1.pf.2. He also mentions Ptolemaeus in *Haer*. 1.12.1 and *Haer*. 2.4.1. W.C. Van Unnik, *Newly Discovered Gnostic Writings: A preliminary survey of the Nag Hammadi find* (London: SCM Press, 1960), 62. See David Tripp, "The Original Sequence of Irenaeus 'Adversus Haereses' 1: A Suggestion," *SecCent*. 8 (1991): 157–62. Eusebius mentions this work in *Hist. eccl*. 3.23.3 and *Hist. eccl*. 5.7.1.

© KONINKLIJKE BRILL NV, LEIDEN, 2015 | DOI 10.1163/9789004294523_003

framework of each sect.[4] Excluding the preface in *Haer*. 1.pf.1–2 and the conclusion in *Haer*. 1.31.3–4, the contents comprise three main sections. First, in *Haer*. 1.1–9 Irenaeus examines the doctrines of Ptolemean Valentinianism, especially their cosmology and cosmogony. Second, in *Haer*. 1.10–22 he contrasts the diversity of the heretics' systems with the unity of the teaching of the church. Finally, in *Haer*. 1.23–31.2 he identifies the origins and ancestry of Valentinianism.[5] While Irenaeus' catalog of heretics is clearly dependent upon earlier sources, his summary of Valentinianism and related streams is the oldest surviving account.[6]

Within this summary, Irenaeus provides several descriptions of the Gnostic reading of Gen 1–3. Though scholars question the reliability of Irenaeus' presentation of the views of his opponents, his analysis of their views is brief and focused.[7] His evaluation of their exegesis shows that the Gnostics actually utilize reading strategies that, in many ways, mirror Irenaeus' own intertextual exegesis.[8] Beginning with *Haer*. 1, Irenaeus describes how Gnostic intertextuality unites the texts of Gen 1–3 with other scriptural imagery and extra-biblical material. The style of these intertextual connections can be framed within a set of conceptual categories including: a general *literary* reading of Gen 1–3, catchwords or verbal connections, prosopological interpretation, illustrative application, and gematria.

The Gnostics, however, are less concerned with the intertextual connections between scriptural passages than with the harmonization of scripture to their various cosmological accounts. In his summary of the Gnostic exegesis of Gen 1–3, Gerard Luttikhuizen makes a similar observation saying, "[t]he intertextual tension between the biblical texts and their Gnostic interpretations betrays that on essential points the thought structure of the interpreters

4 The summary of the contents of *Haer*. 1 is also found in *Haer*. 2.pf.1. On the relationship (or lack there of) between Valentinus and the Valentinians see: Christoph Markschies, *Valentinus Gnosticus? Untersuchungen zur Valentinianischen Gnosis mit einem Kommentar zu den Fragmenten Valentinus* (Tübigen: Mohr-Siebeck, 1992).

5 *SC* 264.28–152.

6 Thomassen, *The Spiritual Seed*, 9; *cf. Haer*. 1.pf.2; 1.13.3; 1.15.6; 3.17.4; 4.pf.2.

7 *Haer*. 1.pf.2. For a discussion on the reliability of Irenaeus' representation see: Steenberg, *Irenaeus*, 11; Thomas Holsinger-Friesen, *Irenaeus*, 43–50; Thomassen, *The Spiritual Seed*, 12–13; Perkins, "Irenaeus and the Gnostics: Rhetoric and Composition in Adversus Haereses Book One," *VC* 30 (1976): 193–200.

8 *BP* notes a reference to Gen 1:26 in *Haer*. 1.15.3, Gen 3:1 in *Haer*. 1.30.14, and Gen 3:18 in *Haer*. 1.24.2, but these echoes were not definitive enough for consideration.

differed from what they found in these texts."[9] For the Gnostic, the Mosaic account is dubious, because he wrote before the full revelation of knowledge given in their redeemer figure. Thus, while the early chapters of Genesis were essential to Gnostic interpretation, they frequently correct or amend the creation texts when they deviate from their own theological traditions and more recent revelation.[10] In this sense Gnostic intertextuality tends toward the conflation of Gen 1–3 with their own myth, where the Genesis language and images are absorbed into a separate mythical system. In the words of Irenaeus, "they speak the same language we do, but intend different meanings (*similia quidem nobis loquentes, dissimilar uero sentientes*)."[11] The Mosaic terms remain, but they are redefined and redeployed to portray distinct narratives.

In addition to the Gnostic perspective on Gen 1–3, in *Haer*. 1 Irenaeus also provides a few instances of his own intertextuality and theological reasoning that begins to characterize his intertextual reading of scripture evidenced in the rest of *Adversus haereses*. These two instances (*Haer*. 1.9.3, 1.22.1) are part of his broader discussion of the rule of faith, or *regula*, that punctuate his presentation of Gnosis. In these readings he shows how his scriptural networking competes with the Gnostic interpretation of these creation passages. Their manner of conflating texts is quite similar (with the exception of their use of gematria), thus, the distinguishing feature of Irenaean and Gnostic hermeneutics then is not the particular methods of reading Genesis, but a theological perspective that informs the intertextual relationships each are fashioning. The Gnostics, Irenaeus argues, amend and correct the errors of the creation accounts with their myth, as well as the apostolic writers, while Irenaeus accepts the authority of the Mosaic account and looks for patterns of continuity between Moses and the apostles. This contrast between Irenaeus and the Gnostics is evident in the nature of the different textual networks that each creates and the rest of this chapter traces these intertextual readings of Gen 1–3 as presented by Irenaeus in *Haer*. 1.

9 Luttikhuizen, *Gnostic Revisions*, 5. Friedrich Weiss, *Frühes Christentum und Gnosis: Eine rezeptionsgeschichtliche Studie* (Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 2008), 500.

10 Giverson, "The Apocryphon of John," 75–6; Holsinger-Friesen, *Irenaeus*, 61, 101–3; Pheme Perkins, "Gnosticism and the Christian Bible," in *The Canon Debate*, ed. L.M. McDonald and J.A. Sanders, 355–71 (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2002), 370.

11 *Haer*. 1.pf.2.

2.2 The Valentinian Reading of Creation: *Haer*. 1.5.1–6 (Gen 1:26, Gen 2:5, Gen 2:7, Gen 3:21)

In the opening chapters of *Haer*. 1, Irenaeus begins his summary of Valentinian cosmology and anthropology with a description of the nature of the Pleroma and the primordial defection of Sophia.[12] For the Valentinian these protological matters are necessary prolegomena for any proper reading of Gen 1–3.[13] The fall of Sophia, recorded in *Haer*. 1.2–3, is the crucial event that casts a shadow of ignorance over the subsequent cosmological activities recorded in the Genesis account.[14] Sophia errs, according to Irenaeus, by attempting to comprehend the greatness of the perfect Father.[15] She also does so apart from the union with her cohort. As a result, she gives birth to the Demiurge that bears the nature of her own ignorance, grief, fear, and bewilderment.[16] The outcome of Sophia's passion and the formation of the Demiurge is the infusion of ignorance into all materiality.

This Demiurgic ignorance is Irenaeus' "cardinal objection" to Valentinian cosmology and, more specifically, their reading of Gen 1–3.[17] The nature of ignorance and related imagery permeates the description of the Valentinian formation of the world depicted in *Haer*. 1.5.1–4. In this account, the creation of the world is enacted through the cooperation of Achamoth and the Demiurge, though the Demiurge was ignorant of Achamoth's assistance.[18] This ignorance

12 *Haer*. 1.1–3.6. For a representation of this system see: Thomassen, *Spiritual Seed*, 195–96. Thomassen divides Valentinian pleromatology into two primary camps distinguished by the "detail" they ascribe to the personal names of the pleromic aeons and their relationship to the initial existence of the Father. Irenaeus falls into the group that ascribes more specificity to the aeons and theorizes about the thirty aeons coupled in syzygic pairs. Ibid., 193–6.

13 On the debate over the reliability of Irenaeus' presentation see: Pagels, "Conflicting Versions of Valentinian Eschatology: Irenaeus' Treatise vs. Excerpts from Theodotus," *HTR* 67 (1974): 35–53. Holsinger-Friesen, *Irenaeus*, 43–50.

14 Hellenistic Jewish sources, such as Philo, never cast the Creator as ignorant. Steenberg, *Irenaeus*, 30.

15 Many have pointed to parallels with Gnostic texts such as: *Apocryphon of John, On the Origin of the World*, and the *Hypostasis of the Archons*.

16 *Haer*. 1.2.3.

17 Steenberg, *Irenaeus*, 24. The scope of this study is only concerned with the scriptural references to Gen 1–3 in Irenaeus' presentation of Gnosis. For an evaluation of the performance of Gen 1–3 in the Gnostic literature see: L. Painchaud, "The Use of Scripture in Gnostic Literature," *JECS* 4.2 (1996): 129–46; S. Giverson, "The Apocryphon of John and Genesis," *StuTh* 17 (1963): 60–76; Luttikhuizen, *Gnostic Revisions*, 17–81.

18 *Haer*. 1.5.3.

is made explicit when the Demiurge admires his creation and makes the prideful declaration, "I am God and besides me there is no one" (*Ego Deus, et praeter me nemo*, Isa 45:5).[19] In order for the Gnostics to depict the ignorance of the Demiurge, they turn to language of Isa 45:5. In this sense, Isa 45:5 serves as an *illustration* of the Demiurgic ignorance and, more so than any other passage, clearly communicates the true nature of the Demiurge's arrogance and ignorance in creation. The means of conflating the Mosaic imagery with later revelation is similar to the methods Irenaeus' employs in the rest of the work, but the nature of the Creator is distinct. The Valentinian account of creation contains only general echoes of Gen 1–3. Some language and images bear a resemblance to the creation accounts, such as the attributes of "heavenly" (*caelestia*) and "earthly" (*terrena*) (*cf.* 1 Cor 15:48), but there is no substantive reference to Gen 1–3 other than the general echoes of creation of the world. The limited use of Genesis here, and in the formation of Adam in the next section, suggests a degree of separation from any dependence upon the Mosaic account for the understanding of cosmology.

In *Haer*. 1.5.5–6, Irenaeus transitions from a description of Valentinian cosmology and cosmogony to anthropology.[20] The Valentinians read the narrative of the formation from the dust in Gen 2:7 in light of the language of the "earthly element" (χοϊκός; *choicum*) drawn from 1 Cor 15:47. The Valentinians deny that Adam was made from the "dry earth" (*arida terra*, Gen 2:5), but "from the invisible substance and from fusible and fluid matter" (*ab inuisibili substantia et ab effusibili et fluida materia*).[21] The distinction is, as Dunning rightly observes, substantial in nature and not a rejection of materiality altogether.[22] In other words, the Valentinians observe a different *substance* of creation and prefer the Pauline description to the Mosaic substance. In this sense, Paul and Moses are at odds with one another. The language of "earthly" (*choicum*; χοϊκός) describes the true formation from the dust in Gen 2:7 rather than the substance of the dry earth in Gen 2:5. In this type of harmonization, the Valentinian interpretation of the Pauline image amends the Mosaic account, and offers the true

19 *Haer*. 1.5.4.

20 Holsinger-Friesen compares the Valentinian account with Plato's *Timaeus*. Holsinger-Friesen, *Irenaeus*, 90–92.

21 *Haer*. 1.5.5. Although this allusion is not noted in BP or SC, the reference to "dry earth" (*arida terra*) in refers to Gen 2:5 prior to God watering the earth in Gen 2:6. *cf. Epid* 32; *Haer*. 3.18.7; *Haer*. 4.39.2.

22 Benjamin H. Dunning, "Virgin Earth, Virgin Birth: Creation, Sexual Difference, and Recapitulation in Irenaeus of Lyons," *JofR*, 89.1 (2009): 57–88, 70.

formation of the spiritual Adam. These types of emendations are one of the distinguishable features between their competing readings of Gen 1–3.

Within their description of the process of Adam's formation, the Valentinians argue that the Demiurge breathed into this creature the "psychic element" (*psychicum*), so that the first creature is composed of both an earthly (Gen 2:7a) and psychic element (Gen 2:7b). They also separate the terms "image and likeness" (*imaginem et similitudinem*) and apply them to these two elements of the first-created man. The material or "earthly" (*choicum*) element was created after the "image" (*imaginem*), while the "psychic" (*psychicum*) element was after the "likeness" (*similitudinem*).[23] The psychic element was also termed the "spirit of life" (*spiritum vitae*, Gen 2:7), because it derived from a "spiritual emission" (*spiritali defluitione*).[24] The final stage in the formation of humankind is completed when the creature is clothed in a "skin-like garment" (*dermatinam tunicam*, Gen 3:21) that becomes the sensory fleshy substance.[25] This complex interpretation of Gen 1:26, Gen 2:5, Gen 2:7, and Gen 3:21 shows that the Valentinians have not completely written off the creation accounts. Despite the inconsistencies, the Valentinians use the creation imagery to illuminate the understanding of the true narrative behind Adam's formation. In their reading, the creation of Adam occurs in stages. The imagery of Gen 2:7 depicts the first two phases connected to the image and likeness of God (Gen 1:26), while the final stage is the application of the fleshy covering. All of these texts are connected through their anthropological imagery, and the way they describe Adam and Eve's formation. This type of intertextual reading takes into account the immediate context of these texts, and, in this sense, offers a careful literary reading of Adam's creation. There is, then some appreciation for the immediate literary context of these passages, though their intertextual reading absorbs this complex arrangement of texts into different understanding of Adam's formation. In this sense, the Valentinians read Gen 1 and Gen 2 sequentially as stages in the process of creation, Irenaeus, as he describes in various places, interprets them concurrently as two accounts of the same act of creation.

Irenaeus provides further background to the Valentinian creation of humankind in *Haer*. 1.5.6. Unbeknownst to the Demiurge, Achamoth deposits the true "spiritual man" (*spiritalis homo*) while the Demiurge breathes in the breath of life (Gen 2:7), or the psychic element. Borrowing middle-platonic imagery, this spiritual deposit is planted as a seed into the soul of the creature and functions

23 *Haer*. 1.5.5.

24 *Haer*. 1.5.5.

25 *Haer*. 1.5.5.

as a spiritual womb.[26] In time the spirit seed will grow and become the receptor "of the perfect Knowledge" (*perfectae Rationis*).[27] The action of Achamoth completes the fourfold elements of humanity where the first man has "his soul is from Demiurge, his body is from the earth, his fleshy element is from matter, and his spiritual element is from his Mother Achamoth" (*animam quidem a Demiurgo, corpus autem a limo, et carneum a material, spiritalem uero hominem a matre Achamoth*).[28] These four elements are interpreted in an intricate chronological understanding of the formation of Adam that conflates of imagery resident in Gen 1:26, Gen 2:7, Gen 3:21, and 1 Cor 15:47, but infuses them with the images and characters of the Valentinian myth.

2.3 Irenaeus on Creation and Incarnation: *Haer*. 1.9.3 (Gen 2:7)

Having laid the basis of the Valentinian myth, in *Haer*. 1.8–9 Irenaeus addresses specific exegetical and hermeneutical issues with the Valentinian use of scripture. Using the example of the mosaic representing the image of a king and a Homeric cento (alongside other polemical illustrations) he argues that the Valentinians abuse the scriptures because they consistently "adapt" (*aptare*) them to the structure of their myth.[29] In terms of their reading of Gen 1–3, Irenaeus has already showed how the Gnostics reject the terminology of the Mosaic account in preference for the imagery of the prideful deity in Isa 45:5, or the earthly substance in 1 Cor 15:47.

In this section Irenaeus suggests that the apostle John, contra the Valentinians, never intended in his work to reveal the Ogdoad in their cosmological system. Instead, he argues that John only preached one God and one Christ Jesus, the Word of God who became flesh (John 1:14).[30] The Valentinians, on the other hand, deny the Word become flesh, because the Savior assumed a psychic body that mysteriously became visible. In order to define what John means by "flesh" (*caro*) in John 1:14, Irenaeus reads this passage in continuity with the formation of Adam from the dust in Gen 2:7.[31] In Irenaeus' intertextual exegesis, the σάρξ of John 1:14 is identical to the "ancient handiwork made by God out of the earth as in Adam" (*vetus de limo secundum Adam facta plas-*

26 Holsinger-Friesen, *Irenaeus*, 83.

27 *Haer*. 1.5.6.

28 *Haer*. 1.5.6.

29 *Haer*. 1.8.1–2.

30 *Haer*. 1.9.1.

31 *Haer*. 1.9.3.

matio a Deo).[32] Through this intertextual reading, the common vocabulary of Adam's formation and Christ's incarnation are the catchwords that bind these passages together. The imagery of Adam's formation actually *defines* the nature of flesh in John's gospel. He even goes so far as to suggest this intertextual connection is the apostle's intention by which he aimed to dismantle their first and principal Ogdoad. In other words, through uniting the nature of Adam and Christ's flesh, the apostle John contradicted the Valentinian interpretation of the substance of Adam's formation in Gen 2:7. This essential hermeneutical link between Gen 2:7 and John 1:14 will resurface in Irenaeus' intertextual exegesis throughout *Haer*. 3–5.

2.4 The Marcosian Reading of Creation: *Haer*. 1.14.6 and *Haer*. 1.18.1–4

After engaging the Valentinian system in *Haer*. 1–9 and responding to some of their theological perspectives, in *Haer*. 1.13–20 Irenaeus turns his attention to Marcus and the Marcosians who offer an adapted version of the Valentinian myth.[33] In terms of intertextuality, the Marcosians have an acute fascination for gematria and the numeric correspondence between scripture and their cosmological myth. They also conflate the Adamic creation imagery in a manner similar to the Valentinians. The attention given to numerology is the clearest methodological distinction between Irenaeus and the Gnostics. Irenaeus rejects this method outright because the numbers are interpreted symbolically in accordance with the Gnostic system and not interpreted in their literal sense, and within the contours of the divine economy.

2.4.1 *Marcus and the Sixth Day of Creation*: Haer. *1.14.6* (*Gen 1:31*)

While Irenaeus describes other aspects of their system, in *Haer*. 1.14.1–4 he focuses on the revelation Marcus received from the Tetrad who descended in the form of a woman and revealed to him the origin and meaning of all things. He argues that the cosmological system revealed to him is confirmed through various kinds of numerology or gametria. The exegetical method of gematria is

32 *Haer*. 1.9.3.

33 Ismo Dunderberg, "The School of Valentinus," in *A Companion to Second-Century Christian 'Heretics,'* eds. Antti Marjanen and Petri Loumanen, 64–99 (Leiden: Brill, 2005), 82; Grant, *Gnosticism and the Early Church* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1966), 64; Thomassen, *The Spiritual Seed*, 499.

the practice of interpreting a word based upon the numeric value of its letters.[34] Marcus' gametria, though, does not merely count letters, but also entities, beings, titles, or anything within a text that corresponds to the numeric values of his theological system. The philosophical basis for the numerical representation is the ontological congruence between "being" and "truth" in the form of speech, so that "what is spoken is at the same time that which it speaks about."[35] This kind of correspondence unnerves Irenaeus, because of the obvious rejection of the plain sense meaning of the terms and concepts in Gen 1–3, and direct correspondence with similar images of found elsewhere in scripture. In addition, the correspondence between scriptural terms and their assumed referent comes to bear upon Irenaeus' understanding of the correspondence between the divine titles and pronouns in scripture and the identity of the persons of the triune God.[36]

While his presentation of Marconian gametria is rather developed, in *Haer*. 1.14.6 Irenaeus recounts a series of passages united through representation of the number six. Matt 17:1 describes the transfiguration on the sixth day when Jesus took Peter, James, and John up to the mountain. Then, after Moses and Elijah appeared the number of those present at the transfiguration also totaled six. In John 19:14 Jesus prepared for the Passover at the sixth hour and he also suffered death on the cross in Matt 27:45 at the sixth hour.[37] Of course,

---

34 B. Ehrman, *The New Testament: A Historical Introduction to the Early Christian Writings* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), 387, 454.

35 Thomassen, *The Spiritual Seed*, 243.

36 In *Haer*. 1.9.3, he has already previewed this argument by asserting that all the individual aeons comprising the Valentinian Ogdoad (Word, Only Begotten, Life, Light, Savior, Christ, and Son of God) as the one and same Son of God who became incarnate in the person of Christ. This point will be essential to a reading strategy called "prosopological exegesis" which I will discuss in subsequent chapters. For a discussion of prosopological exegesis see: Carl Andresen, "Zur Entstehung und Geschichte des trinitarischen Personbegriffes," *ZNW* 52 (1961): 1–39; Marie-Josèphe Rondeau, *Les commentateurs patristiques du Psautier* (*IIIe–Ve siècls*), (2 vols; Rome: Pont. Institutum Studiorum Orientalium, 1982, 1985), 1:19; Michael Slusser, "The Exegetical Roots of Trinitarian Theology," *TS* 49 (1988): 461–476, 462–3; Matthew W. Bates, *The Hermeneutics of the Apostolic Proclamation: The Center of Paul's Method of Scriptural Interpretation* (Waco: Baylor University Press, 2012); Stephen O. Presley, "Irenaeus and the Exegetical Roots of Trinitarian Theology," in *Irenaeus: Life, Scripture, Legacy* (ed. P. Foster and S. Parvis; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2012), 165–71. Andresen uses the term "prosopographic exegesis" as a method of listing or cataloging the speaker(s) in a text, but Rondeau and Slusser agree that "prosopological exegesis" more clearly explains this early Christian method of exegesis, because this term implies the process of identifying the speakers in a text. Slusser, "Exegetical Roots," 462–63.

37 *Cf*. Luke 15:33.

this numerological conflation also includes the formation of humankind on the "sixth day" (*sexta die*), echoing the creation of Adam in Gen 1:31. Adam's creation on the sixth day, therefore, is not interpreted in its normal literary sense as it contributes to the description of the formation of creation and humanity. Instead, it is excised from this context and linked with other scriptures that contain similar numeric values in order to demonstrate the features of their theological system.

2.4.2 *The Marcosians on Creation*: Haer. *1.18.1–4* (*Gen 1:2, Gen 1:3–27, Gen 1:26, Gen 2:10*)

In the intervening chapters between *Haer*. 1.14–18, Irenaeus continues detailing the complexity of Marcosian gametria. This includes some general speculation about their cosmogony and cosmology, which includes many terms and images from creation, but nothing that is explicitly derived from Gen 1–3.[38] However, in *Haer*. 1.18.1–4 Irenaeus focuses more precisely on the details the Marcosian theory of the creation. According to Irenaeus, they assert the mother of the Demiurge used him as an instrument and, in continuity with middle-platonic metaphysics, created the visible world after the pattern of invisible beings. To validate this theological perspective, the Marcosians continue to utilize gametria and organize a complex set of passages bound by common numerological references that typify the Tetrad, Decad, Deodecad, and Triacontad. Irenaeus characterizes this method of exegesis as progressive and evolving, saying that they "transform" (*transformantes*) the writings from the prophets as they regularly amend their myth.[39] In addition, according to Irenaeus, the identification of this system is based upon a concept of inspiration where the Spirit of these realities communicates through Moses.

When they turned to Gen 1–3, Irenaeus reports that the Marcosians find a type of the Tetrad in the opening verses with the four terms: "God and Beginning, the heavens and the earth" (*Deum et principium, caelum et terram*, Gen 1:1).[40] A second Tetrad, which is an offspring of the first, is found in the terms of Gen 1:2: "deep" (*abyssum*), "darkness" (*tenebras*), "water" (*aquae*), and "Spirit" (*Spiritus*).[41] In *Haer*. 1.18.2, a Tetrad is found in the formation of the sun on the fourth day in Gen 1:14–19, the colors of the curtains of the tabernacle in Exod 26:1/36:8, and the four rows of stones on the priestly robe in Exod 28:17.

---

38 *Cf. Haer*. 1.17.1–2.

39 *Haer*. 1.18.1. *cf. Haer*. 1.21.5. Steenberg, *Irenaeus*, 27; Dunderberg, "The School of Valentinus," 83.

40 *Haer*. 1.18.1. *cf*. "Beginning" in *Haer*. 1.14.1.

41 *Haer*. 1.18.1.

They also identify the same kind of numerology in Gen 1:3–12 that records the Decad in the ten terms: light, the day, the night, the firmament, the evening, the morning, the dry land, the sea, the plants, and the trees.[42] Similarly, Gen 1:14–27 contains a representation of the Dodecad with the terms: sun, moon, stars, seasons, years, sea monsters, fishes, reptiles, fowl, quadrupeds, beasts, and humans.[43] The whole of Gen 1:1–27, therefore, speaks of the cohort of thirty aeons known as the Triacontad.[44]

Implanted within these numerical calculations, Irenaeus also reports that the Marcosians interpret the "invisible" (*invisibile*) nature of the Tetrad through the description of the invisible and unformed earth in Gen 1:2. This brief reference is distinct from the gametria applied to Gen 1:2. In this instance the language of 'invisible" is retained not for its numerological value, but in the normal spiritual sense. They apply the characteristics of the invisible and formless earth to the nature of the Tetrad, so that the language "invisible" refers directly to the nature of the divine beings, not their quantity. This kind of spiritual reading isolates the characteristic of invisibility from the context of the creation account, and applies it to the deities within their myth.

The same numerology applies to the formation of humankind and the various components that comprise the human anatomy. The human person is created in the "image of the Power on high" (*imaginem superioris Virtutis*), echoing Gen 1:26.[45] The human form possesses one fountain in the brain out of which flows "four powers" (*virtutes IIII*), echoing to the rivers flowing from Eden in Gen 2:10. These powers numerologically reflect the Tetrad, as do the four senses of sight, sound, hearing, and taste (they disregard the sense of touch). The Ogdoad is also witnessed in two ears, two eyes, two nostrils and double sense of taste (that is bitter and sweet). The Decad is found in the ten fingers, and the Duodecad in the twelve members of the body, which together represent the Triacontad. The intertextual relationship between these texts is again located in their numeric associations and their unified representation of the Triacontad, and Irenaeus suggests these passages are merely exemplary of their gematria.[46] He reports a series of other passages they use in continuity with these numerical representations including: Gen 6–50, Exod 24–36,

42 *Haer*. 1.18.2.

43 *Haer*. 1.18.2.

44 Apart from this context and an implicit echo in *Haer*. 5.30.4, Irenaeus never mentions any passage from Gen 1:6–25, which is remarkable given the importance of the days of creation for other second century fathers such as Theophilus. For an explanation of Theophilus' understanding of creation see Steenberg, *Irenaeus*, 88–92.

45 *Haer*. 1.18.2. *cf. Haer*. 2.pf.1.

46 *Haer*. 1.18.1.

Josh 3–4, 1 Sam 9:22, 1 Sam 20:1–42, 2 Sam 23:13, 1 Kgs 11:21, 1 Kgs 18:31, 1 Pet 3:20 and John 20:24. They assemble any passage that could be used to represent the various elements of their Triacontad.[47] The anthropological texts in Genesis, as well as the imagery of human formation are also mined for the ways their numeric representation.

In the same context the Bishop of Lyons summarizes the complex Marcosian understanding of human formation. He observes competing Marcosian interpretations of Adam's formation that, in different ways, read the creation narratives of Gen 1–2 sequentially as two separate stages. He reports that most believe Adam was formed on the eighth day, representing the Ogdoad, but some distinguish between the "earthly" (*choicum*, 1 Cor 15:47) part that was formed on the sixth day from the "fleshy" (*carnalem*) part that was formed on the eighth day.[48] The earthly part (1 Cor 15:47) refers to the formation in Gen 2:7, while the fleshy part is the covering of sensible skin applied in Gen 3:21. This reading is similar to the anthropological dualism of the Valentinian interpretation, and renders Adam's formation in a progressive manner that transpires over a series of stages throughout Gen 1–3.[49]

Other Marcosians, according to Irenaeus, partition the creation of Adam into two separate accounts with the formation of two distinct types of persons. The spiritual man was made bisexual after the image and likeness (Gen 1:26) and the earthly man was formed from the earth (Gen 2:7).[50] This distinction implies that some Marcosians view Gen 1:26 and Gen 2:7 as successive stages in the formation of Adam, while others understand them as two distinct accounts forming two types of human persons. These narratives are woven into Gnostic perspectives on redemption and the salvation of the spiritual man that is saved through knowledge. But in terms of the Marcosian intertextual methods, they focus upon the numerological and spiritual readings that reconcile the scriptural account of creation with their own Gnostic myth.

2.5 Irenaeus on Creation and the regula veritatis: *Haer*. 1.22.1 (Gen 1:1, Gen 2:7)

Like *Haer*. 1.9.3, Irenaeus' own reading of Gen 1–3 surfaces again in *Haer*. 1.22.1. This is a significant section due to the discussion of the *regula veritatis/fidei*,

47 *Haer*. 1.18.3–4.

48 *Haer*. 1.18.2.

49 *Haer*. 1.5.5–6.

50 *Haer*. 1.18.2.

which he previously mentioned in *Haer*. 1.10.1.[51] His theology of creation is an essential prolegomena for the theological structure of the *regula* that forms the prelude to the divine activity throughout the scriptures. His description of the *regula* comprises echoes to the creation of the world in Gen 1:1 and the formation of Adam in Gen 2:7 alongside a host of intertexts including: Hermas, *Mand* 1.1, Psalm 32(33):6, John 1:3, Col 1:16, 2 Cor 4:18, Exod 3:6,[52] and Eph 1:3. These passages are united through the catchwords and narratival arrangement that binds together texts within the contours of Irenaeus' interpretation of the divine economy.

The *regula* begins with a general reference to God as the Creator of all things. The meaning of "all things" (*omnia*), he reasons, must include both the world and humankind. Contrary to the Gnostic cosmological dualism, Irenaeus offers this apologetic for the universality of creation under the administration of God. In a general-to-particular style of argumentation, he begins with citations of the Shepherd of Hermas, *Mand* 1.1, Psalm 32(33):6, and John 1:3, but then interprets these texts with the particular passages of Gen 1:26, Gen 2:7, and Col 1:16. Noormann observes that the theological concept of creation by means of the Word links these texts together, but technically speaking, it is actually the creation and administration of "all things" (*omnia*).[53] All three opening passages (*Mand* 1.1, Psalm 32(33):6, and John 1:3) share the common linking term "all things" (*omnia*), and Irenaeus brings them together because he wants to prove that God the Father by means of the Word created *all* existing realities. In the words of Irenaeus, "From this *all* nothing is exempt" (*ex omnibus autem nihil subtractum est*).[54]

Irenaeus supports this general postulate of the creation of all things in *Mand* 1.1, Psalm 32(33):6, and John 1:3 with a rejection any angelic mediation in creation and a narratival framework that stresses the continuity between the Father's creation and administration over all things. First, Irenaeus' emphasis on the creation of all things, means that God did not create by means of independent Angels or Powers (Col 1:16), but instead made all things by his own Word and Spirit. Naturally, this implies a "foundational paradigm" or "hypothesis" where God the Creator creates as a triunity of Father, Son, and Spirit.[55] But in this case, the echo of Col 1:16 works to support his argument by

51 While the *regula* is arguably more prominent in *Haer*. 1.10.1, I did not include it because it does not contain any discernible allusion or echo to Gen 1–3.

52 Matt 22:29–32.

53 Noormann, *Irenäus*, 85.

54 *Haer*. 1.22.1.

55 Steenberg, *Irenaeus*, 67.

excluding the possibility that any autonomous being contributed to the work of creation.

Second, Irenaeus also arranges a set of passages that argue for unity of God's creation and economic administration over salvation history. His narratival arrangement includes references to God as the Creator of the world (Gen 1:1), the Creator of humanity (Gen 2:7), the Father of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob (Exod 3:6), and the Father of Jesus (Eph 1:3). Though the shift from Abraham to Christ is dramatic, within the context of the other allusions there is an obvious economic structure to his arrangement. In this case, linking terms are the divine titles, and the identity of God as Creator and Father. Together these passages identify God the Father of Abraham and Christ as the Creator of the both world and humankind, thus demonstrating the same God who has given all things existence in Gen 1:1 and Gen 2:7 administered over all of salvation history from Abraham to Christ. The combination of catchwords, narratival arrangements, and theological identification begins to unveil the complexity of methods employed in Irenaeus' intertextual hermeneutic.

2.6 Other Gnostic Readings of Creation: *Haer*. 1.24.1–2, *Haer*. 1.28.1, and *Haer*. 1.30.1–9

After his brief interlude on the *regula* in *Haer*. 1.22.1–2, the remaining portion of his first book (*Haer*. 1.23–31) describes the tenants of various Gnostic streams that sprouted from the thought of Simon Magus.[56] The intertextual readings of Gen 1–3 surface in three instances in these chapters including the views of Saturninus (*Haer*. 1.24.1–2), Tatian and the Encratites (*Haer*. 1.28.1), and the Ophites (*Haer*. 1.30.1–9). The most developed reading is the Sethian Gnostics, the Ophites, who provide a highly detailed recounting of their creation narrative. This includes an intricate web of allusions drawn from Genesis and elsewhere. These descriptions of Gnostic intertextuality continue to develop the intertextual interpretive practices that have characterized their exegesis to this point including the application of prosopological interpretation, narrative readings, and verbal connections.

2.6.1 *Saturninus on Creation*: Haer. *1.24.1–2* (*Gen 1:26, Gen 2:7, Gen 3:19*)

In *Haer*. 1.24.1–2, Irenaeus recounts the views of Saturninus on the origin and formation of humankind, and he who followed a system similar to that of

56 See *Haer*. 2.pf.1 and Acts 8:18–24.

Menander.[57] Irenaeus' presents his cosmological views as an unmistakable revision of Gen 1–3, which correlates Gen 1:26, Gen 2:7, and Gen 3:19 with additional background narratives.[58] These reading frame these events sequentially, and they interpret the key figures prosopologically. According to Irenaeus, Saturninus casts the unknown Father as the Creator of all spiritual realities, but the world and human beings were created by the work of seven angels, one of whom is the God of the Jews.[59] These angels witnessed a certain "shining image" (*lucida imagine, cf.* Gen 1:26) from the sovereign Power above. They are unable to possess the image because it quickly ascended, so they declared to one another, "Let us make man after an image and likeness" (*Faciamus hominem as imaginem et similitudinem*, Gen 1:26).[60] This background presents the command in Gen 1:26 as the proclamation of a gathering of imperfect angels, including the God of the Jews, who are overcome by their desire to possess the image or the supreme Power.

Due to their weakness the angels were not strong enough to create a true, living form so the newly fashioned man could only squirm along the ground like a worm. The supreme Power had pity on the flaccid creature, because "he was made in his likeness" (*in similitudiem eius factus esset*, Gen 1:26).[61] He responds by emitting a "spark of life" (*scintillam vitae*, Gen 2:7) that immediately enlivened the man and enabled him to stand erect.[62] After death the same body fashioned by the angels separates again and decomposes back into the earth (Gen 3:19), so this spark of life can ascend again. This "spark of life," however, was not implanted into everyone. These angels, Irenaeus reports, actually created two types of individuals. The faithful ascetics that maintain a high degree of temperance and retain the "spark of life," while the wicked, who were created through the assistance of demons, marry and beget children. When the Savior appeared as a man, he came to rescue those who are good, release the spark of life, and destroy the evil angels including the God of the Jews.[63]

This intertextual reading of Gen 1–3 frames these texts into sequential creative episodes where Adam's creation occurs in distinct phases. The identity

---

57 Markschies, *Gnosis: an Introduction* (New York: T&T Clark, 2003), 77.

58 *BP* suggests that death here refers to the command in Gen 2:17, but clearly the nature of the allusion has the description of the dissolution of the flesh in Gen 3:19 in view.

59 *Haer*. 1.24.2. Saturninus links Menander's unknown Father to Simon Mangus (*Haer*. 1.23.5).

60 *Haer*. 1.24.1. The angelic mediation in creation is attested to in a verity of Gnostic texts such as the *Apocryphon of John* and *On Origin of the World*.

61 *Haer*. 1.24.1.

62 *Haer*. 1.24.1.

63 *Haer*. 1.24.2. Markschies, *Gnosis*, 78.

of the creators in Gen 1:26 is collection of inept angelic beings, who greedily desire to possess the image of the supreme power. This type of reading resembles the type of prosopological reading that Irenaeus' uses in the remaining books. Their intertextual reading focuses on the identity of the characters in the narrative and the correspondence of particular images from Gen 1–3, such as "image," "spark of life," "death," and "good." Select images, phrase, and segments of the narrative are ascribed to particular characters within their myth. The image of the "spark of life," in particular, is important to the narrative as the object of salvation, as well as the dissolution of the flesh in Gen 3:19 as the final destiny for the material creation.

2.6.2 *Asceticism in Tatian and the Encratites*: Haer. *1.28.1* (*Gen 1:27–8, Gen 2:7*)

In *Haer*. 1.28.1 Irenaeus briefly surveys the views of Tatian and the Encratites, who are known for their rigorous ascetic practices such as vegetarianism and celibacy. They are also known for their theological rejection of Adam's salvation.[64] Their beliefs sprout from Marcion, Cerdo, and Saturinus, whom he also reports had their rise from Simon. From this analysis, there appears to have been various forms of Encratism known to Irenaeus, but an essential aspect of their thought is the attention given to asceticism that reflects an anti-corporeal dualism.[65]

Irenaeus' summary focuses on their asceticism, and especially their rejection of marriage. When they abstain from marriage they "reject God's ancient creation" (*frustrantes antiquam plasmationem, cf*. Gen 2:7) and rebuke God's purpose for the propagation of the human race intended in the creation of male and female (Gen 1:27).[66] The rejection of the physical substance implies a dualistic anthropology similar to what was presented in Saturninus and the other Gnostic accounts of Adam's formation. Tatian takes this a step further when he outright rejects the salvation of the "first-formed man" (*primus plasmatus est*). Irenaeus reports that Tatian studied under Justin, but after his death he apostatized from the church and invented the doctrine that denies Adam's

64 *Cf*. Col 2:16. See also Basilides on food in *Haer*. 1.24.5.

65 William L. Petersen, "Tatian the Assyrian," in *A Companion to Second-Century Christian 'Heretics'*, eds Antti Marjanen and Petri Luomanen (Leiden: Brill, 2005), 143. Here again Irenaeus laments the challenge of describing the systems and doctrines of the various Gnostic sects because of their fluidity and inventive nature. *Cf. Haer*. 1.21.5; *Haer*. 1.28.2; *Haer*. 1.29.1.

66 The imagery of the "ancient creation" (*antiquam plasmationem*) is often used to refer to God's creation of Adam in Gen 2:7.

salvation.[67] He addresses Tatian's views in more detail in *Haer*. 3.23.1–8, but in this context he is clear that Tatian's denial of Adam's salvation is his invention.[68] Both Tatian and the Encratites read the anthropological texts in Gen 1–3 in a manner similar to their forbearers. They draw out specific elements of the narrative and conform them to their myth. In general they continue to devalue the flesh and deny any notion of a bodily resurrection.

2.6.3 *The Ophites on Creation*: Haer. *1.30.1–9*

Irenaeus concludes his first book with an extended discussion (*Haer*. 1.30.1–15) of the Ophites, or Sethian Gnostics, who share many similarities to the Valentinian system mentioned in *Haer*. 1.1–7.[69] The context of *Haer*. 1.30.1–9 recounts the events of the primeval world that borrows extensively from the terms, images, and passages contained in Gen 1–3. Their reading the scriptures does not strictly follow the chronology of the narrative within the text, but instead they use these images to explain their own story of creation and salvation. The key terms and images are applied to their divine realities and the events surrounding their cosmological activities. Although their dependence on Gen 1–3 concludes with *Haer*. 1.30.9, the remaining chapters (*Haer*. 1.30.10–14) frame these passages within a larger recounting of the Ophite history of salvation. In terms of salvation, Sethian Gnosticism "de-temporalized" history into an eternal present where salvation is a self-actualized, ever present reality.[70] Therefore, even as the narrative of salvation unfolds, a realized view of salvation becomes actualized through these opening events in the Ophite myth. Their reading of Gen 1–3 utilizes a type of prosopological reading that resembles the way Irenaeus interprets scripture in light of Christ. While the both read passages prosopologically, they maintain different conceptions of the nature of the divine beings functioning in the passages.

---

67 *Haer*. 1.28.1.

68 The seedbed of this view is present in Tatian's extant writings. Petersen, "Tatian the Assyrian," 150–52.

69 On the relationship of the Ophites and Valentinians see: Bentley Layton, *The Gnostic Scriptures* (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1995) 170; Kurt Rudolph, *Gnosis: The Nature and History of Gnosticism* (Edinburgh, T&T Clark, 1983), 308–326; Holsinger-Friesen, *Irenaeus*, 51–56.

70 John D. Turner, "Time and History in Sethian Gnosticism," in *For the Children, Perfect Instruction*, ed. H.G. Bethge, et al., 203–14 (Leiden: Brill, 2002), 213.

2.6.3.1 Ophites on the Primeval World: *Haer*. 1.30.1–3 (Gen 1:2–3, Gen 1:7–8, Gen 3:20)

In these opening descriptions, Gen 1:2 is the locus of the origins of the Ophite myth, because it contains the key imagery of the Spirit hovering over the watery chaos. Irenaeus reports that the Ophites assume the highest deities are prosopologically represented in the imagery of this passage. To draw out their identity, they infuse the imagery of Gen 1:2 with the titles of deities drawn from other (especially Pauline) scriptures. They also connect the waters above and the waters below in Gen 1:7–8 with Sophia, and the waters of Gen 1:2. In this instance the connection with the formation of the heavens originates from the watery substance that Sophia assumes in Gen 1:2.

Irenaeus' account of the Ophites begins with a description of Bythus, who is the "Father of all things" (*Patrem omnium*) or the "First-Man" (*Primum Hominem*).[71] Bythus emitted the "Second-man" (*Secundum Hominem*) or "Son of Man" (*Filium Hominis*) and below these existed the Spirit, who is also called the "First-Woman" (*Primam Feminam*).[72] This Spirit hovered over the four elements of Gen 1:2: "water, darkness, abyss, and chaos" (*aquam, tenebras, abyssum, chaos*). The First-Woman was also wedded to the First-Man and the Son of Man and they gave birth to an incorruptible Light (*cf.* Gen 1:3), who is also called Christ. As a result the Woman becomes the "Mother of the living" (*Matrem uiuentium*, Gen 3:20).[73] Therefore, Gen 1:2 is the central text in the description of the primordial world in the Ophite myth. The term "Spirit" in this passage becomes a key figure that emits Sophia and begins the drama of creation. The other titles mentioned above are also scriptural (especially Pauline): Father of all (Eph 4:6), First Man/Second Man (1 Cor 15:47), and Son of Man (abundant in the prophets and the New Testament). Together with the title "first woman" (*cf.* Gen 3:20), this conflation of scriptural names with the opening scene of creation in Gen 1:2 allows the Ophite to delineate the origin of their myth.

Then, Christ is caught up to the upper regions where he joins with the Father, Son and, Mother to be the true and holy Church, while the Power, or Sophia, which overflowed from the Woman, descends downwards into the waters and disturbs them (Gen 1:2). From this action she assumes the substance of a fluid body that imprisoned her divine light, so that she nearly became submerged into matter. She desperately wished to ascend back to her Mother, but was held back by her body. However, through the power of her moisture of light, she was

71 *Haer*. 1.30.1.

72 *Haer*. 1.30.1.

73 *Haer*. 1.30.2.

lifted up and spread out her watery body as the visible heavens (Gen 1:7–8).[74] She remained under the heavens until she was ultimately freed from the body by the power she received when she was seized by a longing for the higher light.

2.6.3.2 Ophites on the Creator Jaldabaoth and His Sons: *Haer*. 1.30.4–5 (Gen 1:1, Gen 1:2, Gen 1:26, Gen 3:1–6)

The Ophites intertextual reading of Gen 1–3 borrows heavily from scriptural terms and titles as they conform them to their myth. The introduction of the various archons expands the identities of the spiritual realities operating within the Ophite account of creation, and especially the context of Gen 1:2. They continue to demonstrate their affinity for key terms and titles that they attribute to various deities. These titles are, once again, drawn from passages in Pauline literature and conflated with the imagery in Genesis. These descriptions extend the prolegomena necessary for understanding the nature of creation.

As the narrative continues, Sophia's son, Jaldabaoth, also had an innate desire for incorruption imparted from his Mother. In a similar way he drew upon the waters of Gen 1:2 and emitted a succession of six sons "in the imitation of his Father" (*secundum patris imitationem*, Gen 1:26).[75] These sons are called "Jao," "Sabaoth," "Adoneus," "Eloeus," "Horeus," "Astaphaeus."[76] There is debate about the translation and meaning of these names, but clearly they are derived from Hebrew titles for God in the Old Testament.[77] He also adds that

---

74 *Haer*. 1.30.3.

75 *Haer*. 1.30.4. The meaning of the name Jaldabaoth is disputed, and scholars cannot agree on its relationship to the various Semitic languages. It was thought to mean, "Son of Chaos" with connections to Gen 1:2, but the Aramaic background is more closely related with the concept of shame instead of chaos so the name could mean "Son of Shame." Matthew Black, "An Aramaic Etymology for Jaldabaoth?," in *The New Testament and Gnosis: Essays in honour of Robert Mcl. Wilson*, eds A. Logan and A. Wedderburn (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1983): 69–72, 71.

76 *Haer*. 1.30.4. See also *Haer*. 2.35.3.

77 The origin and meaning of these names are also disputed. Howard emphasizes the background in Jewish magic traditions, and assumes that Sethian Gnostics wanted to impart an "aura of mystery" to their myth by borrowing Semitic-looking names. Origen made a similar argument in *Contra Celsum* 6.32. There is no doubt that most of these names are related to the Old Testament: "Jao" could be an abbreviated form of Yahweh, "Sabaoth" is close to the Hebrew word for hosts, "Adoneus" may be derived from the title Adonai, and "Eloeus" must be related to the title Elohim. The names are similar to titles found in the *Apocryphon of John*, and may also be related to the planets or celestial bodies. Nicola D. Lewis, *Cosmology and Fate in Gnosticism and Graeco-Roman Antiquity: Under Pitiless Skies* (Leiden: Brill, 2013), 46–50. See Rudolph, *Gnosis*, 23.

the sons are the "Angels, Archangels, Virtues, Powers, and Dominions" (*Angelos et Archangelos et Virtutes et Dominationes, c.f.* Eph 1:21, 6:12) that rule of heavenly and earthly things.[78] In the same context he also cites similar terminology including: "Heavens, Virtues, Powers, Angels, and Creators," (*Caelos et Areothas et Virtutes et Angelos et Conditores*). This list of angelic beings or powers parallels the lists in Eph 1:21 and 6:12 that describe the rulers of the earthly realm in a similar fashion. Eph 1:21 in particular uses the two parallel terms "powers and dominions" (δυνάμεως καὶ κυριότητος), and argues that Christ has risen above all these powers. The sons sit with Jaldabaoth in heaven according to their birth rank and together they rule over all "the heavenly and earthly things." (*caelestia et terrestria, cf.* Gen 1:1).[79] However, Jaldabaoth became distressed because his sons quarreled amongst themselves over their individual ranks. In his sadness he fixed his desire upon the material substance so that a son called Mind is born. This Mind twisted himself into the form of a serpent and begot all forgetfulness, wickedness, jealousy, envy, and death.[80] This is the same serpent that upset the Father Jaldabaoth with his wickedness in heaven and paradise (*cf.* Gen 3:1–6).

2.6.3.3 Ophites on the Formation and Disobedience of Adam and Eve: *Haer.* 1.30.6 (Gen 1:26, Gen 2:7, Gen 2:16, Gen 2:22, Gen 3:20)

At this stage in the Ophite myth, Jaldabaoth makes a rather crucial mistake. In the presence of the other Angels and his Mother, he declares his preeminence over all things with the words of Isa 45:5, "I am the Father and God, and there is no one above me" (*Ego Pater et Deus, et super me nemo*).[81] This passage from Isaiah has particular explanatory power for the Gnostic reading of creation and the nature of the Demiurge. When Jaldabaoth's Mother hears this scandalous proclamation she snaps back, "Do not lie, Jaldabaoth, for there is above you the Father of all things, who is First-Man, and so is that Man who is the Son of Man" (*Noli mentiri, Ialdabaoth, est enim super te Pater omnium Primus Anthropus, et Anthropus Silius Anthropi*).[82] Since the angels did not know of the Mother's existence, her words frightened them and they began questioning the source of the voice. Jaldabaoth, however, remained unaffected by the voice and moved to corral his rulers with the declaration of Gen 1:26, "Come,

78 *Haer.* 1.30.4–5.

79 *Haer.* 1.30.5.

80 *Haer.* 1.30.6.

81 *Haer.* 1.30.6. See also the use of Isa 45:5/46:9 by the Demiurge in *Haer.* 1.5.4 and the Barbelo-Gnostics in *Haer.* 1.29.4.

82 *Haer.* 1.30.6.

let us make man to the image" (*Vienite, faciamus hominem ad imaginem*).[83] Hearing of Jaldabaoth's plan, the Mother seized this opportunity and gave the six other angels an idea of the human form so that through the man she could deprive them of their power.[84] Borrowing loosely from the imagery of Gen 2:7, the cohort of angels assembled the man that was immense in breadth and length. The man, however, could not manage to stand erect and only wriggled across the ground.[85] So the Angels brought him before Jaldabaoth, who acts out the description of Adam's formation in Gen 2:7 and breathes into the man the "spirit of life" (*spiritum uitae*).[86] But the Mother arranged this plan in order that when Jaldabaoth breathed into the man, he unknowingly surrendered his power. After receiving the breath of Jaldabaoth, the newly created man came alive. Immediately, the enlivened man gave thanks to the First-Man and rejected Jaldabaoth his Maker.[87]

Disturbed by the loss of his power, Jaldabaoth, borrowing from Gen 2:22, created a woman from his own thought in order to deceive the man and take back his power. But no sooner was she created than Sophia deprived her of her power by means of the serpent, when she transgressed the prohibition of Gen 2:16 and ate from the tree of Knowledge.[88] What is more, the sons of Jaldabaoth came to admire her beauty and "called her Eve" (*uocasse eam Euam*, Gen 3:20) and begat sons with the woman (Gen 6:2).[89]

This series of events continues to portray the incompetence of the Creator God to manage his own creation and the astuteness of Sophia to recover the power from Jaldabaoth. Irenaeus' description of Adam and Eve's formation in the Ophite narrative relies more directly on the events recorded in Gen 1–2. They assume the words of Gen 1:26 were uttered by Jaldabaoth to his cohort of angels, as he was trying to impose order over his subjects. Jaldabaoth even reenacts the creation imagery of Adam's formation in Gen 2:7. Even the key dialogical passage of Isa 45:5 is helpful for the Ophites to portray the arrogance

---

83 *Haer*. 1.30.6. On the tradition of angelic mediation and the interpretation of Gen 1:26 and Gen 2:7 see Jarl Fossum, "Gen. 1,26 and 2,7 in Judiasm, Samaritanism and Gnosticism," *JSJ* 16.2 (1985): 203–39.

84 *Haer*. 1.30.6.

85 *Haer*. 1.24.1–2. Irenaeus speaks of a worm-like man in Saturnius and Basilides in *Haer*. 1.24.1.

86 *Haer*. 1.30.6.

87 *Haer*. 1.30.6.

88 Like many other titles, the meaning Prounikos is disputed. See *SC* 264.303; Dominic Unger and John Dillon, *St. Irenaeus against Heresies* (New York: The Newman Press, 1992), 260; Layton, *The Gnostic Scriptures*, 174.

89 *Haer*. 1.30.7.

of the Creator. In these accounts, their narrative patches together scripture language and images to describe their perspective of creation.[90]

2.6.3.4 Ophites on the Disobedience and Expulsion of Adam and Eve: *Haer*. 1.30.7–9 (Gen 2:7, Gen 2:16–7, Gen 3:1–6, Gen 3:7, Gen 3:20, Gen 3:23)

The Ophites interpretation of the temptation account of Gen 3:1–6 follows the text more closely than any previous account. Sophia, working through the serpent, leads Adam and Eve "to transgress the precept of Jaldabaoth" (*supergredi praeceptum Ialdabaoth*, Gen 2:17).[91] This remark assumes that Jaldabaoth uttered the prohibition against eating of the Tree of Knowledge of Good and Evil in Gen 2:16–7. In the Ophite reading, however, the outcome is entirely different, they are fortunate that through their disobedience they received the "knowledge of that Power which is above all things" (*cognouisse eam quae est super omnia Virtutem*, Gen 3:7) and in doing so rejected their Maker.[92] With this knowledge, the lie Jaldabaoth uttered when he called himself Father of all (Isa 45:5) was exposed and the malevolent God of Creation is overcome. In the closing lines of *Haer*. 1.30.15, Irenaeus reports one variation on this account saying that some of the Ophites identify Sophia as the serpent. In this rendering the serpent implanted Adam and Eve with the true knowledge and, as a result, is considered wiser than all others (Gen 3:1).[93] While this account is a clear contrast to Irenaeus' reading of the same narratives, the Ophites utilize many of the key images and terms to explain their cosmology.

In *Haer*. 1.30.8–9a, Irenaeus reports Jaldabaoth threw Adam and Eve out of paradise and into the world because they had transgressed his command (Gen 3:23). Likewise, the serpent was cast into the world and generated six sons, who are the seven devils of the world that oppose humankind. When Adam and Eve were in paradise they had spiritual bodies, but through their transfer into this present world they became encumbered by their physical bodies. Even their souls, according to Irenaeus, were languid because they only had the "mundane breath" (*insufflationem mundialem*, Gen 2:7) from their Maker.[94] Prounikos sees Adam and Eve in this sluggish and feeble state and has pity upon them. Acting in the in the manner of Gen 3:7, he enlivened them, causing

90 *Haer*. 1.8.1.

91 *Haer*. 1.30.7.

92 *Haer*. 1.30.7.

93 *Haer*. 1.30.15.

94 *Haer*. 1.30.9.

them to realize they were naked and weighed down by a material body. In their wisdom, though, they knew this would be only for a short time.

In *Haer*. 1.30.9b Irenaeus continues discussing Gen 4 and the birth of Abel along with details of how the serpent used Cain to slay his brother Abel, and in *Haer*. 1.30.10–14 he mentions Noah, Abraham, Moses, and the Prophets before moving into commentary on Jesus traditions. Eventually the First-Man sends Christ to aid his sister Sophia and announce the unknown Father.[95] This summary demonstrates a theological narrative that links scriptural texts to descriptions of the primordial world to Jesus traditions. They follow the general contours of the scriptural narrative that includes a detailed description of the primeval world, the origin of the Creator God and his archons, the creation, disobedience and expulsion of Adam, Eve, and the Serpent, and other key events of biblical history that lead up to the Jesus traditions. However, the specific Mosaic account of creation is not normative for the Ophites as they excise key terms and images, conflate them with other scriptural images and key elements of their myth, and incorporate them into their theological perspectives on creation. In the context of Gen 3:1–6, they utilize various styles of intertextuality they carefully reconstruct the narratives. They assume that Jaldabaoth gave the command in Gen 2:16–7, and tried to deceive Adam through the formation of the woman. He was also the one to expel the first couple from paradise.

2.7 Conclusion: Irenaeus and the Gnostics' Intertextual Reading of Gen 1–3 in *Haer*. 1

In *Haer*. 1 the Gnostics, including the Valentinians, Marcosians, Saturnius, the Encratites, Tatian, and the Ophites all make use of narratives and imagery in Gen 1–3. The imagery and terminology has particular explanatory power for their system, and they adapt, transpose, or divide passages in order to elucidate their own distinctive cosmology and cosmogony. Irenaeus' presentation of the Gnostic reading of Gen 1–3 shows that they utilize a diverse set of intertextual reading practices including: a *literary* reading, verbal connections, prosopological interpretation, illustrative application, and gematria. In several ways, this summary mirrors the reading strategies he uses to read these texts with the exception of gematria. At the same time, Irenaeus has two sections that communicate his own reading of these creation texts and begin to show his intertextual reading of these texts.

95 *Haer*. 1.30.12.

First of all, the Gnostics provide a *literary* interpretation of Gen 1–3, where they read specific Genesis texts in correspondence to other texts within their original context as a general description of creation. They understand the genre of these chapters, and, in varying degrees, their interpretation follows the general contours of Gen 1–3, especially Gen 3. However, even though they value the literary nature of these passages as a creation narrative, they reject the accuracy of the details in the text, and absorb key events into their theological perspective. His account must be carefully amended where he does not conform to the Gnostic doctrines. Their fragmentation of the narrative, however, does not preclude the Gnostics from following the broad patterns of the narrative includes: origins of the primordial world, creation of Adam and Eve, and disobedience and expulsion of the first couple.

In terms of the specific literary reading, Gen 1:2 is a pivotal text that stages the creation narrative as a whole. Gen 1:2 is the focal texts in the accounts of origins and subject to a hub of activity from a variety of Gnostic deities. The imagery of the "Spirit," "water," "formless" and "abyss" are the key terms that unite this passage to the activity and characters in the opening scenes of their myth.[96] Interestingly, Irenaeus never alludes or cites this passage directly. In fact with the exception of Gen 1:26, Irenaeus rarely mentions any passage from Gen 1. These sections suggest that they are not arguing over the interpretations of individual passages, but broader patterns or networks of texts.

Second, along the lines of the imagery in Gen 1:2, Irenaeus' presentation of Gnosis reveals their use of catchwords or linking terms to unite passages. In many cases these linking terms are explicit, but in other cases they are implied or supplied by the elements of their creation myth. This practice, though, is not widespread since they are more interested in conforming the narrative to their specific cosmological systems, rather than harmonizing the scriptural narrative within itself. For example, in *Haer*. 1.5.1–4 the Valentinianism account of the formation of Adam uses the descriptive language of "earthly" (*choicum*, 1 Cor 15:47) to explain the nature of Adam's substance, rather than the plain sense reading of "dust" (*limus*) or "earth" (*terra*) in Gen 2:5–7. In *Haer*. 1.18.2 the Marcosians provide a similar intertextual use of 1 Cor 15:47 in connection to the formation of Adam on the sixth day in Gen 2:7, but they also add that his "fleshy" (*carnalem*) part was formed on the eighth day in Gen 3:21. The texts of Gen 1:26, Gen 2:7, Gen 3:19 and Gen 3:21 also provide a set of images that are essential to the Gnostic myth. The terms "image and likeness" in Gen 1:26, the "spirit of life" in Gen 2:7, the dissolution of the "flesh" in Gen 3:19, and the

96 *Haer*. 1.18.1, *Haer*. 1.30.1–5.

"skin-like garment" in Gen 3:21 provide the images to explain their anthropological dualism.[97]

Third, the Gnostics employ a type of prosopological interpretation whereby they identify specific persons in the Genesis narratives with figures in their own mythical system. For example, the Valentinians and Ophites reimagine the divine proclamation of Isa 45:5 as a declaration of the Demiurge in creation that exposes his ignorance and arrogance.[98] Other accounts stage the Gnostic deities as the actors in the creation episodes. The Demiurge and his archons are involved in the formation of Adam in Gen 1:26 and Gen 2:7.[99] A similar reading is found among the Ophites in *Haer*. 1.30.1–9. They identify Jaldabaoth and his angelic sons as the divine beings working in the creation of Adam in Gen 1:26, Gen 2:7, Gen 2:17, Gen 2:22, Gen 3:1–6, Gen 3:7, and Gen 3:20. The dialogical portions, such as "Let us make man" in Gen 1:26, and the decisive actions, such as breathing the breath of life into Adam, are retained and applied, often in modified forms, to specific divine persons. To be sure, these descriptions are often supplemented with non-scriptural background, such as Adam laying flaccid on the ground after his creation, or Sophia assuming the image of the serpent. These contributions supplement the dramatic nature of the prosopological readings of Gen 1–3.

Fourth, the Gnostic use a variety of texts outside Gen 1–3 to serve as illustrations or titles for deities active in creation. In the first instance, the most important illustrative text is Isa 45:5. This passage is highly effective for communicating the wickedness of the Demiurge. There is no passage in Gen 1–3 that supports this type of correspondence or this understanding of the nature of the Creator, instead the Valentinian and Ophite perspective draws out this Isaianic passage and infuses it into the narrative of creation. In a similar way, the Gnostic accounts link the titles of deities taken from other passages and use them to interpret the divine activity in creation. Much of this is taken up in the discussions on gametria mentioned above, but titles like "Father of all things" (*Patrem omnium*), "First-Man" (*Primum Hominem*), "Second-man" (*Secundum Hominem*) or "Son of Man" (*Filium Hominis*), and "First-Woman" (*Primam Feminam*) are derived from a variety of New Testament (especially Pauline) texts including Eph 4:6 and 1 Cor 15:47 (*cf.* Gen 3:20). The sons of Jaldabaoth whose Semitic names are mentioned above, are also described with terms derived from the Pauline list of powers in Eph 1:21 and Eph 6:12.

97 *Haer*. 1.5.5, *Haer*. 1.24.1, Haer. 1.28.1.

98 *Haer*. 1.5.4, *Haer*. 1.30.6. *Cf.* Isa 46:9.

99 *Haer*. 1.5.5–6, *Haer*. 1.21.1, *Haer*. 1.24.1–2, and *Haer*. 1.30.1–9.

Fifth and finally, similar to practice of linking terms, the Gnostics use gematria to knit together various texts with equivalent numerological representations. In *Haer*. 1.14.6 Marcus links the "sixth" (*sexta*) day of creation in Gen 1:31 with other uses of the number six in Matt 17:1, Matt 27:45, and John 19:14. Then, in *Haer*. 1.18.1–2, the Marcosians also link together groupings of four, ten, twelve, and thirty found throughout Gen 1:1–27 that represent the various Pleromic cohorts of aeons. There is even a general use of gematria in the Ophite account with the six sons of Jaldabaoth (Jao, Sabaoth, Adoneus, Eloeus, Horeus, Astaphaeus), which borrow from various Hebrew titles for God. This type of reading ignores the immediate context of the passages and the plain sense meaning of a term, preferring instead to focus upon the numbers or quantities represented.

In addition to Irenaeus' summary of Gnostic interpretation, in *Haer*. 1.9.3 and *Haer*. 1.22.1 Irenaeus provides instances of his own intertextuality that begin to characterize his reading of scripture which is developed in subsequent books. Like the Gnostics, he uses linking terms and catchwords to unify passages. In *Haer*. 1.9.3, he links the imagery of "flesh" (*caro*) in John 1:14 with the substance of Adam's formation in Gen 2:7. In this sense, the images do not contradict, but correspond precisely.[100] The substance of Adam's formation is the *same* substance Christ assumed in the incarnation. Similarly, in *Haer*. 1.22.1, the term "all things" (*omnia*) binds together Psalm 32(33):6, John 1:3, Col 1:16, and *Mand* 1.1. He also follows a general-to-particular argument and contrasts the particular creation of humankind in Gen 1:26 and Gen 2:7.[101] Finally, he begins to utilize his prosopological interpretation when he identifies the Creator in Genesis with the Father of Abraham (Exod 3:6) and the Father of Jesus (Eph 1:3), as the same Creator and Father who created all things by means of the Word (John 1:3). Along these same lines, his prosopological reading is reserved to only three divine persons acting in this text: Father, Son, and Spirit.[102] He rejects any angelic mediation in creation (Col 1:16), but instead made all things by means of the Son and the Spirit. For Irenaeus it is not possible to imagine the presence of any other divine actor in the creation accounts. This style of intertextual networking becomes more prevalent in subsequent books as Irenaeus develops his own reading of Gen 1–3.

---

100 *Haer*. 1.5.5–6; *Haer*. 1.18.2.

101 For comparison of a similar type of argumentation in Justin see: W.A. Shotwell, *The Biblical Exegesis of Justin Martyr* (London: SPCK, 1965), 32–33.

102 I have argued this point elsewhere. Presley, "Irenaeus and the Exegetical Roots," 169–71. See also *Haer*. 3.6.1–5.

Therefore, Irenaeus and the Gnostics both rely heavily upon the creation accounts for the explanation of their theological framework. They approach Gen 1–3, however, from distinctive theological perspectives and demonstrate dissimilar views on the integrity and authority of the Mosaic account. Whereas the Gnostics amend and correct the Mosaic account, Irenaeus appeals to the authority of this revelation. This distinction will become clearer in the next chapter when Irenaeus appeals to the authority of Moses as the basis for his theology of creation. Even though they have competing theologies, they actually apply very similar methods, with the exception of the practice of gematria. But even when they apply similar methods, the theological perspectives informing their methods compel them to fashion distinctive theological relationships. These contrasting intertextual readings will become more pronounced as Irenaeus' begins to develop his own intertextual reading in the remaining books.

CHAPTER 3

Refuting Gnostic Creation: The Intertextual Reception of Genesis 1–3 in Book 2 of *Adversus Haereses*

3.1 Introduction

Whereas *Haer*. 1 was concerned with exposing the theological systems of the Valentinians and various other Gnostics schools, *Haer*. 2 aims to refute them on key points doctrine.[1] Given the Gnostic preference for secrecy and obscurity, Irenaeus suggests it is impossible to address every point of contention, so he only considers those that, in his view, are particularly damaging to the Gnostic myth. Irenaeus believes this rhetorical strategy will reveal a variety of inconsistencies and contradictions in the foundations cosmological speculations that ultimately will cause their whole system to collapse. Unlike *Haer*. 1, however, Irenaeus never cites the Gnostics reading of Gen 1–3 directly in *Haer*. 2, though he does distinguish their competing views on the authority of the Mosaic accounts. Instead, his philosophical and theological argumentation begins to reveal his own hermeneutical approach to Gen 1–3 that will be developed in the other books.

The majority of the book, *Haer*. 2.1–30, focuses on the refutation of the Valentinians, while the last few chapters, *Haer*. 2.31–35, turn to the refutation of other select Gnostic sects. Within this broad structure, the argument of *Haer*. 2 is divisible into five sections: *Haer*. 2.1–11, *Haer*. 2.12–19, *Haer*. 2.20–28, *Haer*. 2.29–30, and *Haer*. 2.31–35.[2] The first section, *Haer*. 2.1–11, evaluates the Valentinian distinction between the Creator-God and the Pleroma. He refutes any notion of a Pleroma existing above God, and draws on concepts of divine aseity to affirm God's sufficiency in creation. Then in *Haer*. 2.12–19, he comments on the nature of the spiritual emissions of the aeons and the salvation of the pneumatic seed. Drawing on the pre-Socratic philosophers Xenophanes and Antiphanes, he questions how ignorance could have arisen from perfection. In *Haer*. 2.20–28, he returns to issues of hermeneutics, and addresses the problems with gametria, or numerology, in Gnostic exegesis. The next brief section, *Haer*. 2.29–30, appraises the Valentinian consummation and the

1 *Haer*. 2.pf.2.

2 *SC* 293: 119–20.

© KONINKLIJKE BRILL NV, LEIDEN, 2015 | DOI 10.1163/9789004294523_004

Demiurge, and he refutes the belief that the spiritual Gnostics ascend higher than their Creator. Finally, in *Haer*. 2.31–35, he responds to those who have followed the Valentinian traditions including among others: Saturninus, Basilides, and Carpocrates. He rehearses many of the previous arguments against these schools of Gnosticism, but develops some new thoughts concerning ethics and the transmigration of souls. He concludes *Haer*. 2 with a final reference to the unity and harmony of the scriptures that testify to the existence of one true God.

Within this structure the uses of Gen 1–3 are reserved to one opening section (*Haer*. 2.2.5) and three latter sections (*Haer*. 2.26.1, *Haer*. 2.30.7, 9, and *Haer*. 2.34.4). It is not surprising that we find allusions to Gen 1–3 in the opening and closing sections; Irenaeus has a tendency to frame his work with allusions to Gen 1–3.[3] The overall infrequency of his use of Gen 1–3 in *Haer*. 2, does not detract from the importance of these references. In *Haer*. 2.2.5, for example, he defends the authority and trustworthiness of the Mosaic account of creation as a whole. This clearly delineates a point Irenaeus inferred throughout *Haer*. 1 when he argued that the Gnostics adapt and amend Gen 1–3 according to their system.[4] Irenaeus assumes the work of God in creation is an epistemological grounding for his theological framework and argumentation, which should be understood in continuity with rest of apostolic testimony. His use of Gen 1–3 in his other philosophical arguments develops the other aspects of his intertextual hermeneutic as well. He continues his use of verbal connections, as well as prosopological exegesis. But he also applies a narratival reading, and uses collections of texts for illustrative purposes.

3.2 Reading Moses with the Apostles: *Haer*. 2.2.5 (Gen 1:1, Gen 1:3)[5]

In the opening lines of *Haer*. 2.1.1, Irenaeus states his basic argument, or first principle, that there is one God who created all things. This theology of creation is the basis for Irenaeus' theology of revelation in general and theology of scripture in particular. The Gnostic Pleromic emanations that oppose this

3 References to Gen 1–2 are found in *Epid*. 11 and 97 and the closing paragraph of *Haer*. 5.36.3.

4 *Haer*. 1.8.1.

5 This is a general allusion to God "speaking" (εἰπεν) creation into existence found in Gen 1:3, 6, 9, etc. In *Haer*. 4.32.1, Irenaeus explicitly cites Gen 1:3 for the same purpose. Steenberg, states that *Haer*. 4.32.1 is the "only quotation" of Gen 1:3, which technically is correct. However, the present section alludes to this passage generally and the purpose of citing Gen 1:3 here and *Haer*. 4.32.1 is the same. Steenberg, *Irenaeus*, 70.

basic confession about creation are subject to the problem of infinite regress. This argument for the existence of one Creator God leads to his second point that the Creator required no assistance or mediation in creation. God is completely self-sufficient and capable of accomplishing all creative acts.[6] In his previous book, Irenaeus has already described how Gnostics imagine that angels, or some other kind of spiritual being, contributed to the formation of the world and humankind.[7]

In contrast, Irenaeus remarks that God needed no "other instruments" (*aliis organis*) for the creation of all things.[8] His own Word was a "suitable and sufficient" (*idoneus . . . et sufficiens*) means to accomplish creation. He supports this claim with reference to John 1:3: "through him [the Word] all things were made, and without him nothing was made" (*Omnia per ipsum facta sunt, et sine ipso factum est nihil*). His reading interprets the preposition "through" (*per*) in an instrumental sense and emphasizes the inclusiveness of "all things" (*omnia*). The created world must be contained, Irenaeus argues, within the sphere of "all things," which necessitates that the world too was created by means of the Word. To defend the notion that God created the world by means of his Word, he appeals to imagery of God speaking creation into existence saying, "Scripture tells us in Genesis; he made all things around us by his Word" (*Scriptura Geneseos dicit omnia quae sunt secundum nos fecisse Deum per Verbum suum*). This syllogistic reasoning begins with the general premise that God created all things by means of his Word (John 1:3), then he observes that the earth is a subset of "all things," and finally he concludes that God created the earth by means of his Word (Gen 1:3ff). This general appeal to the creation by means of the Word in Gen 1 focuses on the various uses of "said" (*dicit* or εἶπεν) repeated throughout the first chapter (Gen 1:3, 6, 9, 11, 14, 20, 24, 26). This gloss reads the verbs in a personal sense that records the activity of the Word of God, rather than mere anthropomorphic imagery.

---

6 God's unmediated creation of all things is a theme to which Irenaeus frequently returns: *Haer*. 1.22.1, *Haer*. 2.2.1–5; *Haer*. 4.7.4; *Haer*. 4.41.1. MacKenzie, *Irenaeus's Demonstration*, 81–99. Steenberg frames Irenaeus' arguments against angelic mediation into three categories, all of which are present in *Haer*. 2.2.1–5: angelic mediation suggests angels may act in opposition of God's will, God creates angels and establishes their function, and God needs no aid in creation given the presence of the Son and the Spirit. Steenberg, *Irenaeus*, 76 n. 46.

7 *Haer*. 1.24.1, *Haer*. 1.30.6.

8 *Haer*. 2.2.1, 5. There is also the related issue of the developing Jewish apocalypticism that emphasized angelically mediated creation exemplified in Philo. Bilde, "Gnosticism, Jewish Apocalypticism, and Early Christianity," *in the last days: On Jewish and Christian Apocalyptic and its period*, eds. Jeppesen, et al., (Aarhus: Arhus University Press, 1994): 9–32, 22.

In order to strengthen this logic, Irenaeus combines this intertextual reading of Gen 1:3 and John 1:3 with Psalm 32(33):9 that also describes God speaking creation into existence.[9] All three texts are united by the common imagery of God speaking (*dicit*) or creating all things though his Word. At the same time, he also unites the testimonies of Moses, David, and the apostle John. They all share the same testimony that God created all things by means of the Word. The continuity between the Law, Prophets, and Apostles supports Irenaeus point that all scripture is unified in the common confession of one God who created all things by means of the Word, and that God required no angelic mediation in creation.[10] For Irenaeus, it is the Gnostics intent to dissociate and disconnect the creation accounts as it suits the revelation of their system, while Irenaeus aims to unify them with the apostolic witness in a continuous narrative of divine creation and revelation.

Given these testimonies of God's activity in creation, Irenaeus recognizes that his argument rests upon the authority and integrity of the Mosaic account as it is presented in Genesis 1–2. He believes that Moses' literary account of creation is a true and coherent record of the origin of all things. He contrasts the incoherence of the Gnostics with the authority Moses and the coherence between Moses and the apostolic teaching saying:

> Whom, then, will we believe more in regard to the making of the world—the heretics we mentioned above, who babble about foolish and incoherent things, or the disciples of the Lord, and Moses, God's faithful servant and prophet? [Num 12:7, Heb 3:5]. He it was who first narrated the origin of the world when he said: 'In the beginning God created the heaven and earth,' [Gen 1:1] and after that all the rest.[11]

Irenaeus' opening rhetorical question implies that Moses accurately recorded the creation of all things by means of the Word in Gen 1–2.[12] Not only this, but in terms of creation, Moses and the apostolic teaching are in one accord. Following the words of Num 12:7 and Heb 3:5, he describes Moses as a faithful servant and prophet of God who recorded God's narrative of creation, while

9 See also Psalm 148:5.

10 *Haer*. 1.10.1, *Haer*. 1.22.1, *and Haer*. 2.25.4.

11 *Haer*. 2.2.5.

12 With the use of *primo*, there may be a subtle argument for the antiquity of Moses' account. Irenaeus and the other second century fathers were known to argue that the biblical prophets pre-date (and therefore are superior to) the Greek philosophical tradition. For example see Justin's arguments in *1 Apol.* 23, 44, and 59.

the Gnostics teaching is incoherent. In other words, the authoritative account of creation is the ordered narratival account recorded beginning in Gen 1:1 that is congruent with the apostolic testimony. At the outset of his philosophical arguments in *Haer*. 2, Irenaeus clearly contrasts these two systems of interpretation and two readings of creation, and observes that the Mosaic account of creation, not the Pleromic system of the Gnostics, is harmonious with the teaching of the apostles.

3.3 The Knowledge of God and the Growth of Humankind in Creation: *Haer*. 2.26.1 and *Haer*. 2.28.1

Following his appeal to the authority of Moses and the apostles, Irenaeus does not mention Gen 1–3 again until the latter chapters of the book in *Haer* 2.26–28. This section has been part of a debate on Irenaeus' theological method and his relationship to the philosophical traditions of his day. The issue at stake is the question of the epistemological limitations and theological speculation. Building upon the work of Robert Grant and W.C. van Unnik, William Schoedel suggests that Irenaeus drew from discussions of Empiric medicine and Skepticism as he formulated his argument that humankind should be satisfied with the revelation of God that is clear and obvious.[13] The Gnostics, on the other hand, are consumed with endless cosmological speculations that are not discussed in scripture.[14] According to Schoedel, Irenaeus claims that they are not content with knowing *that* God created all things, but concern themselves with limitless theories on *why* God created.[15] Irenaeus' reading of Gen 1–3 pervades this whole argument, because he assumes the Mosaic account of creation is plain revelation that establishes the Creator-creature relationship. He describes these creative events in a narratival fashion, and uses them as examples of clear and obvious revelation about protological matters.

13 William R. Schoedel, "Theological Method in Irenaeus (*Adversus haereses* 2.25–28)," *JThS* 35 (1984): 31–49; Robert M. Grant, "Irenaeus and Hellenistic Culture," in *After the New Testament* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1967): 158–64; W.C. van Unnik, "Theological Speculation and its Limits," In *Early Christian Literature and the Classical Tradition, In Honorem Robert M. Grant*, Théologie historique 53 (Paris: Beauchesne, 1979): 33–43.

14 This general discussion runs through *Haer*. 26–28, but for his specific claims see especially: *Haer*. 2.26.3, *Haer*. 2.27.1, and *Haer*. 2.28.2–3.

15 Schoedel, "Theological Method in Irenaeus," 31–2.

3.3.1 *The Humility of the Creaturely Formation*: Haer. *2.26.1* (*Gen 1:26–7, 2:7*)

In the opening lines of *Haer*. 2.26.1, Irenaeus discusses the knowledge of God and its limits appealing to 1 Cor 8:1, "Knowledge puffs up but love edifies" (*Scientia inflat caritas autem aedificat*).[16] This ethical aspect of knowledge frames the discussion as a whole, and he alludes to this passage again in opening lines of *Haer*. 2.28.6. He asserts it is better to be simple and be close to God than learned and found among the Gnostics. Paul, Irenaeus remarks, did not believe that knowledge of God was injurious, but simply false knowledge of God that denies a love for God and esteems the individual as perfect.[17] This false knowledge is contrary to the fundamental nature of the Creator-creature relationship established in creation of humankind in Gen 2:7.[18] Commenting on 1 Cor 8:1, Irenaeus writes: "there is no greater conceit [*c.f.* 1Cor 8:1] than to think that one is better and more perfect than he who created and formed us [Ps 118(119):73, *cf.* Job 10:8, Gen 1:27, and Gen 2:7], and gave us the breath of life [Gen 2:7], and bestowed existence."[19] In this sense the passivity and humility of the creature formed from the dust of the earth in Ps 118(119):73 and Gen 2:7 *exemplifies* the nature of the Creator-creature distinction that should elicit the creature's affection toward the Creator who has bestowed existence. It is possible that the parallel catchwords "created and formed" (*fecerit et plasmauerit*), could be general allusions to Gen 1:26 and Gen 2:7, but this parallel also appears in Ps 118(119):73 (ἔπλασαν . . . συνέτισον).[20] Finally, Irenaeus is greatly troubled by the Gnostics claims of spiritual superiority and the assumption that they are wiser and ascend higher than the Creator in Genesis.

3.3.2 *The Progressive Nature of Creaturely Formation*: Haer. *2.28.1* (*Gen 1:1, Gen 2:7, Gen 1:28*)

This section continues the same line of reasoning begun in *Haer*. 2.26.1, but begins with the assertion that the church possesses both the rule of truth and the scriptures that give solid and true knowledge of God. The Gnostics, Irenaeus continues, seek our answers to speculative cosmological questions

16 *Haer*. 2.26.1.

17 *Haer*. 2.26.1.

18 *Haer*. 2.26.1.

19 *Haer*. 2.26.1.

20 This same passage uses the anthropomorphic language of God's hands creating and forming humankind, which is part of scriptural imagery for Irenaues' "two hands" description of the "Trinitarian" view of creation. For a discussion of the "hands" imagery with a list of all relevant citations see Fantino, *Théologie d' Irénée*, 306–9.

that are unattainable and unknowable. Instead of seeking out answers to obscure questions, humankind should content themselves with the revelation of God that is "clearly" (*aperto*) proclaimed.[21] While Schoedel observes the background in Skepticism and the methods of Empirical medicine in this assertion, at least in terms of the apprehension of pursuing causal explanations, Irenaeus also describes the contents of scripture that characterize this "clear" revelation. His summary of the clear revelation in scripture includes a set of interlocking allusions and echoes depicting a narrative summary of God's creative activity including: Gen 1:1, Gen 2:7, Gen 1:28, and Heb 7:7. This arrangement is united with the imagery in Job 3:16 and Matt 3:12 that *illustrates* a progressive view of sanctification of the faithful.[22]

His economic report describes God as the Creator of the world (Gen 1:1), the Creator of humankind (Gen 2:7), and humankind as infused with the "faculty of increase" (*donauit incrementum*), echoing Gen 1:28 characterizing the progressive sanctification of God's creature.[23] He supports this view with an echo of Heb 7:7, depicting a movement from a lesser to a greater advancement toward the divine likeness. The context of the Heb 7:7 is the story of Melchizedek's blessing over Abraham in Gen 14:18–20. The author of Hebrews argues that Christ is from the priestly line of Melchizedek rather than the Levitical priesthood. The uniqueness and greatness of Melchizedek is confirmed when he blesses Abraham, which allows the author of Hebrews to make the general assertion that the "lesser" (Abraham) is blessed by the "greater" (Melchizedek). Drawing on this imagery, Irenaeus applies this logic to the growth and sanctification of the human person generally. The lesser creature (Adam) is blessed by the greater Creator (God), which entails growth and increase (Gen 1:28) toward God.

In order to *illustrate* this theme of growth and increase in sanctification (Heb 7:7, Gen 1:28), he also utilizes the images of childbirth drawn from Job 3:16 and wheat harvesting from Matt 3:12. The former describes the divine work of Job's formation in the womb and subsequent birth and Irenaeus applies the imagery generally to argue that God brings the infant who is conceived in the womb out into the light of day (Job 3:16). The movement from the darkness of the womb to the birth in the full light of the sun, *illustrates* the transition from Adam's birth (Gen 2:7) to his growth toward divine perfection (Gen 1:28). The intertextual link between these texts is the *imagery* of creation and increase,

21 See also *Haer*. 2.27.2 and *Haer*. 2.28.3.

22 *Haer*. 2.28.1.

23 *Haer*. 2.28.1.

as well as the connection between "womb" (*uulua*) and "light" (*lumen*).[24] In a similar way, the wheat crop, when it has matured, is harvested and taken into the barn (Matt 3:12), which is the conclusion to John the Baptist's messianic declaration. Irenaeus' reading of this passage develops the imagery of "grow and multiply" from Gen 1:28, saying: "the same Lord brought forth the stem, made the wheat grow and multiply [Gen 1:28] and prepared the granary [Matt 3:12] (*idem Dominus qui et stipulam eduxit et triticum augens multiplicauit et horreum praeparauit*).[25] Like the womb/sun imagery, the wheat harvesting imagery is connected to Irenaeus' concept of human growth and sanctification prepared in Gen 1:28. In this way, the passages of Gen 1:1, Gen 2:7 and Gen 1:28 are linked through a progressive framework from the creation and advancement of toward divine perfection, which is also illustrated in Job 3:16 and Heb 7:7, and ultimately in Matt 3:12.

3.4 Refuting Valentinian Anthropology: *Haer*. 2.30.7 and *Haer*. 2.30.9

The larger section of *Haer*. 2.29–30 completes Irenaeus extended critique of the Valentinians (*Haer*. 2.1–30) and concerns the nature of salvation in Valentinian thought. In doing so, it summarizes the eternal destiny of the three substances: hylics, psychics, and pneumatics. The hylics remain below and are destroyed, the psychics ascend only to the intermediary place, and the pneumatics ascend to the Pleroma. Logically Irenaeus argues if pneumatics are saved by their nature, the notion of a Savior is superfluous. The description of Paul's ascension to the third heaven in 2 Cor 12:4 is central to the Valentinian account of salvation, but Irenaeus demonstrates how Paul's ascension is not incongruous with the salvation of the body. There is a close association in Irenaeus' thought between this Pauline text and a narrative summary of salvation history beginning with Genesis. He also closes this section with a description of his trinitarian understanding of God's work in creation.

3.4.1 *The Works of God in Creation and Paul's Rapture to Paradise*: Haer. *2.30.7* (*Gen 1:1, Gen 2:7, Gen 2:15*)

The section of *Haer*. 2.30.7 is part of a larger discussion of Gnostic anthropology. In essence the Gnostics claim that they ascend higher than the Creator since they are truly spiritual. Irenaeus responds with the basic assertion, "one who is superior is to be revealed by his works (*qui enim melior est, ex operibus*

24 *Haer*. 2.28.1.

25 *Haer*. 2.28.1.

ostenditur)"[26] These works of God are what Paul witnessed in his rapture to the third heaven in 2 Cor 12:4. It is evident that Irenaeus has encountered the Valentinian exegesis of this text previously, and he challenges their interpretation of Paul's ascension by observing that Paul only ascended to the third heaven. Since the Pleroma extends beyond the third heaven, the Gnostics cannot claim to ascend higher than the apostle. He also observes that Paul's physical body in 2 Cor 12:2–3 did not hinder his ability to witness spiritual visions. In his analysis of Paul's rapture in 2 Cor 12:4, Irenaeus describes the "spiritual mysteries" (*sacramenta . . . spiritalia*) that Paul witnessed as the "operations of God" (*Dei operationes*) and those who reach the height of perfection, such as Paul, may also witness the works of God. These are the deeds of God that prove the divine being is superior to the Gnostics and, indeed, all created things. He illustrates these spiritual mysteries or "operations of God" with a series of allusions to Gen 1–2 that recount how God "made the heavens and the earth [Gen 1:1], and formed man [Gen 2:7], and placed him in paradise [Gen 2:15]" (*fecit cealos et terram et plasmauit hominem et posuit in paradiso*).[27] The language of "paradise" (*paradisus*) links Gen 2:15 and 2 Cor 12:2–4, but Irenaeus also extends this connection with a narratival summary of the creation and Adam's placement in paradise (Gen 2:15).[28] This theological connection also strengthens the continuity between the apostle and Mosaic writings.[29] So Irenaeus interprets the language of "paradise" in 2 Cor 12:4 as a synecdoche that implies the larger framework of God's work in ordering and arrangement creation itself. While in paradise, Adam became a spectator of these works of God, but his disobedience resulted in his expulsion from the presence of God. Now, however, those who come to exceed in their love of God will, like Paul, invert Adam's expulsion from Paradise and become spectators of God in paradise, beholding the divine activity revealed there. Therefore, what Paul observed in paradise was the true knowledge of God as Creator of all things.

3.4.2 *Creation by the Word and Wisdom*: Haer. *2.30.9* (*Gen 1:1, Gen 2:7, Gen 2:8*)

In *Haer*. 2.30.9 Irenaeus continues the same argument that the "spiritual" Valentinians are not superior to the Creator. This chapter concludes Irenaeus' discussion of the Valentinians and contains an extended reflection on the nature of God and God's economic activity including: Gen 1:1, Gen 2:7, Gen 2:8,

26 *Haer*. 2.30.2, 5. *Cf. Haer*. 3.12.11. This same phrase appears in Justin in *1 Apol*. 22.4.

27 *Haer*. 2.30.7. *cf*. Gen 2:8.

28 There is an implied use of Gen 3:8 in the description of the Lord walking in the garden.

29 *Haer*. 2.2.5.

Eph 1:21, Matt 11:27, Heb 1:3, and *Mand*. 1.[30] There is a creedal sense to the language that is reminiscent of his other descriptions of the *regula*.[31] His account of the work of God includes general references to God as the creator of all things who is omnipotent, incomprehensible, and exalted above every other Principality and Power (Eph 1:21).

Near the conclusion of his paragraph he summarizes the titles, and, once again, announces that there is only one God who is called "Father," "God", "Creator," "Maker," "Builder" (*Pater, Deus, Condictor, Factor, Fabricator*) and he made all things by his "Word" (*Verbum*) and "Wisdom" (*Sapientiam*).[32] Just a few lines earlier he stated his basic premise that God created all things by the "Word of His power" (*Verbo uirtutis suae*, Heb 1:3), so here he conflates Heb 1:3 with Hermas *Mand*. 1 in order to unify the "Word" (*Verbo*) and the "Wisdom" (*Sapientia*) in the creative process.[33] Irenaeus believes the Will and Wisdom of God form all things from his own substance.[34] These texts depict the Word as the instrument of the Father or, in Steenberg's more formal definition, the "formative actualization of the Father's creative will."[35] While these discussions often precipitate in the context of Gen 1:26. The conflation of Heb 1:3 and *Mand*. 1 is set against the notion of a mediated creation.

Within this description of the nature of God and the creative process involving the Word and Wisdom, Irenaeus frames the activity of God with narrative of salvation history saying:

> He it is who fashioned man [Gen 2:7], planted paradise [Gen 2:8], made the world [Gen 1:1–2:4], and brought on the flood that saved Noah [Gen 7–8]. He is the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, the God of Jacob, the God . . . of the living [Matt 22:32], whom the Law announces, whom

30 *Haer*. 2.30.9. He makes a general echo of Gen 1:1 in the language "heavenly" (*caelestia*) and the "earthly" (*terrena*), and also mentioned an assortment of other general scriptural titles or terminology such as "heaven and earth, and the seas, and all things that are in them" (Exod 20:11, Psalm 145(146):6, Acts 4:24, 14, 15, and Matt 22:32) and "Father of our Lord Jesus" which is a standard Pauline introductory formula (2 Cor 1:3, 11:31, Eph 1:3, 3:14, Col 1:3, and 1 Pet 1:3). Many of the statement are general scriptural images and titles mingled together with allusions to other scriptural texts and descriptions of God.

31 See also: *Haer*. 1.10.1 and *Haer*. 1.22.1.

32 *Haer*. 2.30.9.

33 *Haer*. 2.30.9.

34 Fantino, *La Théologie*, 311–12; *cf. Haer*. 2.10.4, 2.14.4.

35 Steenberg, *Irenaeus*, 79–80. Steenberg's language of "actualization" may be problematic if he implies the Word as the end product of God's creative will rather than the means. Orbe, "San Ireneo y la Creación de la material," *Greg* 59 (1978): 71–127, 74–75.

> the Prophets herald, whom Christ reveals, whom the apostles hand down, whom the church believes.[36]

The purpose of this summary is to identify God as administrating over each of these events collectively. In terms of the events themselves, there is an anthropological focus in the summary with the chronological inversion of the creation of Adam and the creation of the world. The simple description of the creation of the "world" must be a general reference to Gen 1:1–2:4, given the narratival context of the passage as a whole. Irenaeus mentions the creation of the world *after* the formation of Adam and Paradise, which suggests that, for Irenaeus, the formation of humankind is the central point of creation. This summary of Gen 1–2 is also set in context with the reference to the Noah in Gen 7–8, and a reference to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob (Matt 22:32) that summarize the remaining narrative in Genesis. The allusion to the titles is drawn from Matt 22:32, which is evident in the final allusion to the "God of the living" (*Deus uiuorum*).[37] His allusion to this passage, however, is the arrangement of the names of the key individuals as a summary of God's work in salvation history. This is obvious when he also mentions the Law, Prophets, Christ, and the church.[38] This narratival arrangement communicates the importance of Gen 1–3 for orienting the decisive episodes of God's work in redemption.

3.5 Creation of the Body and Soul: *Haer*. 2.34.3–4 (Gen 2:1, Gen 2:7)

In the closing chapters of his second book (*Haer*. 2.31–35), Irenaeus addresses a few remaining issues with some other streams of Gnosticism that share similar views with the Valentinians including: Marcion, Simon, Menander, Saturninus, Basilides, and Carpocrates. In *Haer*. 2.33–34, he addresses Plato's view on the transmigration of souls that is assumed by many of these schools of Gnosticism. His response details a theology of the relationship of the soul to the body, which draws extensively from the imagery of creation in Gen 2:7.[39] Irenaeus denies the transmigration of the soul and argues that souls are immortal, even

36 *Haer*. 2.30.9.

37 This title is found throughout the Old Testament, especially Exodus and Deuteronomy.

38 This summary functions as an *inclusio* with *Haer*. 2.2.5 in order to tie together the whole argument against the Valentinians (*Haer*. 2.1–2.30) and communicate that the same God was at work throughout salvation history beginning in Genesis.

39 *Cf. Epid* 15. Justin, *Dial* 5.

though they had a beginning.[40] The Gnostics, on the other hand, argue that if God created the soul it necessarily would be subject to death and decay like the rest of creation. That is why Irenaeus goes on to argue that God creates souls and then continues to sustain them throughout their existence.[41] For the Bishop of Lyons, God the immortal and eternal Creator sustains and preserves all creation from beginning to end, including the soul.

Irenaeus develops this point in *Haer*. 2.34.2–4 with a series of passages that *illustrate* how creation is subjected to the will of the Creator including: Gen 2:1, Gen 2:7, Psalm 32(33):9,[42] Psalm 20:5(21:4), and Luke 16:10. In the opening lines of *Haer*. 2.34.3, Irenaeus alludes to the completion of creation in Gen 2:1 and argues that just as the creation has existed for a long duration of time, so also the soul. He mentions the creation of the firmament, the sun, moon, and stars, and all their "ornaments" that did not exist beforehand, but had been made. This creation, though, has continued to exist by the will of God. He connects this example with Psalm 32(33):9, where he finds the qualitative description that God has created all things to exist "forever" (*in saeculum*).[43] The same point is made in reference to humankind in Psalm 20:5(21:4). The "life" (*vitae*) God bestowed upon humanity through salvation prepares the faithful to exist "forever" (*in saeculum*).[44] He also links these texts with a passage from the parable of the unrighteous steward, when Christ commends the one who is faithful with a little and will be faithful with more. This tension illustrates, for Irenaeus, how the one who is not faithful with the short temporal life, will not be granted the greater life that is to come and the eternal existence. Therefore, his intertextual reading is created through the catchword "forever" that connects the descriptions in Psalm 32(33):9 and Psalm 20:5(21:4), which is also united with the *illustrations* of the continual existence of the creation formed in Gen 2:1 and the imagery of the tension between the short temporal life and the greater eternal life that is to come (Luke 16:10).

Irenaeus continues a similar assertion in the next paragraph, only in this instance he is arguing that the soul only partakes of life as long as God wills.

---

40 Ibid., 92.

41 *Haer*. 2.34.2.

42 *Cf*. Psalm 148:5–6.

43 *Haer*. 2.34.3.

44 *Haer*. 2.34.3. Rousseau interprets "life" (*vitae*) in Psalm 20:5(21:4) as the "life in the Spirit" Adam enjoyed prior to his disobedience, but Behr rightly notes that "life" is this section must be life in the body. Behr, *Asceticism*, 94–6. *SC* 293.345–6. Rousseau's position was also criticized heavily by Lassiat. Lassiat, "L' Anthropologie d'Irénée," *NRT* 100 (1978): 399–417, 405.

This paragraph includes a citation of Gen 2:7 and a short exegetical treatment of the specific phrase, he became a "living being" (*animam vivam*). He reads this text prosopologically, saying directly that the "prophetic word *said* to the first-formed Man that he became a living being" (*propheticus sermo de protoplasto ait: Factus est in animam uiuam*).[45] What is more, in the next sentence Irenaeus identifies with this instruction given to Adam, and says that by this phrase the prophetic word taught that "the soul became living by sharing in life" (*participationem uitae uiuens facta est anima*). Irenaeus dramatizes the narrative and imagines that what happened in Adam is specifically instructive for the people of God concerning the relationship of the body and soul. For Irenaeus, the soul is also distinct from "life," which is given as a gift from God.[46] Under the provision of the divine will, God bestowed life upon the soul and gave it both "life and perpetual duration" (*uitam et perpetuam perseuerantiam*).[47]

3.6 Conclusion: Irenaeus' Intertextual Reading of Gen 1–3 in *Haer*. 2

In conclusion, the nature of Irenaeus' textual networking in *Haer*. 2 extends the intertextual reading strategies that he employed in *Haer*. 1. Although these allusions to Gen 1–3 are embedded in polemical arguments, they continue to provide insight into the intertextual logic he applies to Gen 1–3. These include the way he relates texts narratively and chronologically, links passages with catchwords and linking terms, utilizes texts for illustrative purposes, and dramatizes passages with a prosopological reading. However, in terms of his reading of Gen 1–3, the most unique feature of *Haer*. 2 is his explicit defense of the authority and integrity of the Mosaic account of creation (*Haer*. 2.2.5).

In *Haer*. 2.2.5, Irenaeus interjects his defense of the reliability of Gen 1–3 account in light of the Gnostic revision of the creation material. He asserts that Moses is a more trusted authority (Heb 3:5) on creation than the Gnostic thinkers who amend Genesis in accordance with their own theological perspective. The reliability of Moses is also confirmed through its *continuity* with the apostolic teaching.[48] Contrary to the Gnostics, the teaching of Moses and the apostles is harmonious. This general intertextual assumption directs Irenaeus' hermeneutic as it is applied to Gen 1–3, and the specific ways that Irenaeus reads creation alongside the rest of divine revelation. Though Irenaeus and the

45 *Haer*. 2.34.4.

46 *Haer*. 2.34.3. *Cf. Haer*. 1.18.1–2, *Haer*. 3.21.10, *Haer*. 5.12.2–6.

47 *Haer*. 2.34.4.

48 See also *Haer*. 2.30.6.

Gnostics are using similar methods, their competing theological perspectives develop distinctive intertextual relationships.

Considering the specific reading strategies in *Haer*. 2, he continues to frame Gen 1–3 in narratival or chronological arrangements. In *Haer*. 2.28.1 he summarizes the creation narrative with allusions to Gen 1:1, Gen 2:7, and Gen 1:28. The inverted order is important, because Gen 1:28 communicates the growth and progression of the one created in Gen 2:7 toward the divine likeness. In *Haer*. 2.30.7, Irenaeus interprets the spiritual mysteries that Paul witnessed while raptured to Paradise in 2 Cor 12:4 as the operations of God. He defines these operations as the creative acts of God in Gen 1:1, Gen 2:7, and Gen 2:15. Similarly, in *Haer*. 2.30.9 Irenaeus continues his discussion of the nature of God and God's economic activity using Gen 2:7 and Gen 2:8 to frame certain events of salvation history and allusions to Noah, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, the Law, Prophets, and Christ.

He also continues to bind texts together through linking terms and catchwords. In *Haer*. 2.2.5 the imagery of God "speaking" (εἶπεν) creation into existence in Gen 1:3,[49] corresponds with God speaking in Psalm 32(33):9,[50] and God creating my means of the Word in John 1:3. The parallel catchwords "created and formed" (*fecerit et plasmauerit*) link Psalm 118(119):73 and Gen 2:7 in *Haer*. 2.26.1. In *Haer*. 2.30.7, the language of "paradise" (*paradisus*) links 2 Cor 12:4 with God placing Adam in paradise in Gen 2:15. While Adam was expelled from Paradise for his disobedience, Paul is raptured to paradise. In *Haer*. 2.34.3–4, the language of "life" (*vitae*) and "forever" (*saeculum*) links Gen 2:7, Psalm 32(33):9, Psalm 20:5(21:4), and Luke 16:10.

In addition to narratival arrangements, and catchwords, Irenaeus also uses texts from Gen 1–3 as *illustrations* or examples for other passages. In *Haer*. 2.26.1, he claims his opponents assume they are superior to their Creator due to knowledge (1 Cor 8:1), but for Irenaeus the Creator-creature relationship established in Gen 1–2 *exemplifies* the natural humility of humankind. Not only this but humankind was endowed with the capacity for growth and increase (Gen 1:28), which he *illustrates* with the imagery of the greater blessing the lesser in Heb 7:7, the birth imagery in Job 3:16, and the wheat harvesting imagery in Matt 3:12.[51] In addition to the narratival structure of Gen 1:1, Gen 2:7, and Gen 2:15, these creative acts also illustrate the work of God that Paul witnessed in his rapture to paradise in 2 Cor 12:4. Lastly, in *Haer*. 2.34.2–4 he unites a series of passages that *illustrate* how creation is subjected to the

49 Gen 1:3, 6, 9, etc.

50 Psalm 148:5.

51 *Haer*. 2.28.1.

will of the Creator including: Gen 2:1, Gen 2:7, Psalm 32(33):9, Psalm 20:5(21:4), and Luke 16:10.

Finally, there are prosopological readings of Gen 1–3 where Irenaeus identifies the divine persons active in the creation accounts. In these readings, he dramatizes the passages and emphasizes the performative and dialogical elements of the texts. In *Haer*. 2.2.5 Irenaeus assumes the act of creation involves not only the Father, but also the Word of God (John 1:3). Then, in *Haer*. 2.30.9 he conflates a reference to Word of God (Heb 1:3) with the Wisdom of God in *Mand* 1 to prove the activity of the Word and Wisdom in the act of creation. In *Haer*. 2.34.3–4 Irenaeus reads Gen 2:7 prosopologically and argues that the prophetic word announced to Adam that he would become a living being.[52]

Throughout Irenaeus' argumentation, he thinks in terms of textual networking, and every reading of Gen 1–3, in various ways, relies upon his reading of theologically and hermeneutically related passages united through a variety of reading strategies. These intertextual strategies become even more prevalent in *Haer*. 3–5. In these books, Irenaeus moves from exposing and refuting the Gnostic theological system to expounding his own theological perspective. Throughout these arguments, Irenaeus applies his intertextual logic to a great diversity of scriptural passages that are shown to be consonant with the creation accounts.

52 *Haer*. 2.34.4.

CHAPTER 4

Reading Genesis from Creation to Incarnation: The Intertextual Reception of Genesis 1–3 in Book 3 of *Adversus Haereses*

4.1 Introduction

Having examined the use of Gen 1–3 in *Haer*. 1–2, Irenaeus' third book presents a pivotal turning point in his overall refutation of the Gnostics. He shifts his polemical tactics from exposing and refuting doctrines of the Gnostics in *Haer*. 1–2 to defending and explaining the apostolic faith in light of scripture and tradition in *Haer*. 3–5. *Haer*. 3 makes a case for the continuity of the activity of one God from creation to incarnation, and the general thrust of the book discusses the uniqueness of God the Father, Creator of the heaven and earth, and the person and work of Christ, the Son of God.[1] These claims impose a theological pressure upon Irenaeus' interpretation of scripture and contribute to the performance of Gen 1–3 in the context of his intertextual exegesis.

The contents of the book comprise four major sections: *Haer*. 3.1–5, *Haer*. 3.6–15, *Haer*. 3.16–23, and *Haer*. 3.24–25.[2] In *Haer*. 3.1–5 he contrasts the teaching of the heretics with the authoritative teaching of the apostles, which is supported by a theory of apostolic succession in the church. In *Haer*. 3.6–15 he argues for the existence of one God, who is both Creator of all things and Father of Jesus Christ. In *Haer*. 3.16–23 he contends, against the Valentinians, Ebionites, and Tatian, that there is only one incarnate Son of God who recapitulates all things. Finally, in *Haer*. 3.24–25 he closes the book with a plea for the heretics to return to the teaching of the church, which is the true locus of the Spirit.

Within this structure only a few references to Gen 1–3 surface in the early part of the work, while the latter chapters contain a high concentration of echoes, allusions, and citations of Gen 1–3.[3] This is not surprising given the emphasis on incarnation and recapitulation is related to a Pauline Adam-Christ typology

1 *Haer*. 3.1.2.

2 *SC* 210: 171–205.

3 The sections that contain an echo or allusion to Gen 1–3 include: *Haer*. 3.3.3, *Haer*. 3.11.5, 8, *Haer*. 3.18.1, 7, *Haer*. 3.19.3, *Haer*. 3.20.1, *Haer*. 3.21.10, *Haer*. 3.22.1–4, *Haer*. 3.23.1–8, and *Haer*. 3.24.1–2. There are several allusions listed in *BP* that I could not confirm including: Gen 1:1 in

© KONINKLIJKE BRILL NV, LEIDEN, 2015 | DOI 10.1163/9789004294523_005

in the concluding portion of the *Haer*. 3. These Christological references are found within networks of texts that support the activity of one God and Father administering creation by means of the Son. While Irenaeus uses several chiasms in the second part of his work, his argumentation culminates in *Haer*. 3.23.1–8 that is a highly organized chiasm arranged around the contents of Gen 3 and related intertexts. His exegesis continues to use a variety of intertextual strategies including: narratival and structural arrangements, catchwords or verbal connections, typological relationships, prosopological interpretations, and illustrative application of texts. In each case, Irenaeus reads the creation texts in continuity with the rest of the scriptural witness and, in varying ways, exhibits the theological continuity between creation and the Christ event.

4.2 Creation and the Narrative of the Apostolic Tradition: *Haer*. 3.3.3: (Gen 1:1, Gen 2:7)

His first allusion to Gen 1–3 surfaces in *Haer*. 3.3.2–3, where Irenaeus mentions a letter written by Clement from the church at Rome to the church at Corinth. The contents of this section have been highly scrutinized because it contains an early succession list.[4] Irenaeus appeals to this letter from Clement, commonly known as *1Clement*, because it predates the teaching proliferated by the Gnostic teachers. In contrast to the Gnostic teaching, Irenaeus reports this letter urged the church at Corinth to declare the tradition received from the apostles. His summary of the contents of the letter is a condensation of the apostolic tradition with a telescoped summary of the narrative of the divine history focused on the nature and acts of God the Father including: creation of the world, creation of humankind, the Flood, the Exodus, the giving of the law, the prophets and the judgment of Satan.[5] These events correspond to a set

Haer. 3.15.3, Gen 2:16–17, Gen 3:6, Gen 3:15 and Gen 3:19 in *Haer*. 3.20.2, and Gen 3:22 in *Haer*. 3.21.4. All of these echoes were too vague for any meaningful analysis.

4 *Haer*. 3.3.3. For a discussion of this succession list see: Allen Brent, "How Irenaeus Has Misled the Archaeologists," in *Irenaeus: Life, Scripture, Legacy*, ed. P. Foster and S. Parvis (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2012), 35–52. Antonio M Javierre, "In ecclesia": Ireneo, *Adv haer* 3, 3, 2," in *Comunione interecclesiale collegialité—primato ecumenismo* (Rome: LAS: 1972) 221–317; L. Abramowski, "Irenaeus, Adv Haer III 3,2: ecclesia Romana and omnis ecclesia; and ibid. 3,3: Anacletus of Rome." *JTS* 28: (1977), 101–104; P. Nautin, "Irénée, Adv haer, III 3,2: Eglise de Rome ou église universelle?," *RHR* (1957) 151: 37–78.

5 This account of salvation history is related to his rule of faith that is found in various forms throughout *Haer*. 3 including: *Haer*. 3.4.2, *Haer*. 3.15.3 and *Haer*. 3.16.6. The narratival character

of observable scriptural allusions and echoes including: Gen 1:1, Gen 2:7, Gen 6:17, Gen 12:1, Exod 3:10, Exod 3:4, Ex 20:1, Isa 6:8, Matt 25:41.[6] The chart below delineates these references so that the intertextual narratival arrangement is apparent:

One God almighty	Unum Deum omnipotentem	
Maker of heaven and earth	Factorem caeli et terrae	Gen 1:1
Fashioner of man	Plasmatorem hominis	Gen 2:7
who brought on the flood and called Abraham	qui induxerit cataclysmum et aduocauerit Abraham	Gen 6:17, Gen 12:1
who led the people out of the land of Egypt	qui eduxerit populum de terra Aegypti	Ex 3:10
who conversed with Moses	qui coloctus sit Moysi	Ex 3:4
who gave the law and sent the prophets	qui legem disposuerit et prophetas miserit	Ex 20:1, Isa 6:8, Jer 1:7, Ezek 2:3[7]
who prepared the fire for the devil and his angels	qui ignem praeparauerit diabolo et angelis eius	Matt 25:41

This narratival arrangement draws predominately from the Old Testament, and the references to God as the Creator of the world and Adam serve as the initial sequences to introduce the divine activity in the later events.[8] In his arrangement the verbs in Gen 1:1 and Gen 2:7, unlike the rest of the summary, function as gerunds, or verbal nouns or titles, that identify the nature of God as "Maker" (*Factorem*) of all things, and "Fashioner" (*Plasmatorem*) of man. This is distinct from the indirect summaries in the other instances that use the relative qualifier "who" (*qui*) to begin a new line describing the successive acts of God the Father throughout salvation history. Rather than identifying the nature of God, they generally summarize God's acts in history with particular

---

of the *regula*, however, is debated. See: Paul Blowers, "The *Regula Fidei* and the Narrative Character of Early Christian Faith," *ProE* 6.2 (1997): 199–228; Nathan MacDonald, "Israel and the Old Testament Story in Irenaeus' Presentation of the Rule of Faith," *JTI* 3.2 (2009): 281–98.

6 *Haer*. 3.3.3.

7 The reference to the calling of the prophets could refer back to Deut 18, but the general examples of God calling the prophets are found throughout the narratives of the Major and Minor Prophets.

8 Wingren, *Man and the Incarnation*, 7.

attention given to the covenants. The last portion of the arrangement makes a dramatic transition from the prophets to the eschatological judgment of Satan in Matt 25:41. This emphasizes the nature and activity of God the Father who administers creation throughout the unfolding of the divine economy from its conception to the eschatological fulfillment. Thus, the intertextual marker that threads these passages is the narrative element that binds these texts through a common referent to God the Father.

The absence of any mention of Christ is noteworthy, given that Irenaeus has already discussed the *regula* in several instances with the careful integration of the work of Christ and the Spirit.[9] This implies that Irenaeus may be adhering closely to the text of *1 Clement* in his summary. The nature and structure of this synopsis is what Irenaeus terms the "hypothesis" of *1 Clement*, and the focus is clearly directed toward the Gnostics who reject the Demiurge in Genesis.[10] The dualistic and polytheistic views of the Gnostics introduce discontinuity between the God of the Old Testament and the preaching of the church represented in *1 Clement*.[11] In this case, Irenaeus' summary of God's nature and activity in Gen 1:1 and Gen 2:7 is a theological one that identifies the nature of God, introduces the creedal narrative of the acts of God, and proves the continuity of salvation history from creation to judgment in the apostolic tradition represented in *1 Clement*.[12]

4.3 Son of God in Creation and Covenant: *Haer*. 3.11.5, 8

Following the initial reference to Genesis, his next allusions to these creation texts follows Irenaeus' interpretation of the infancy narratives in the synoptic Gospels in *Haer*. 3.9.1–3.10.6. Beginning in *Haer*. 3.11.1–6 he transitions from

9 *Haer*. 1.10.1, *Haer*. 1.22.1.

10 This summary of salvation history is Irenaeus' "hypothesis" of *1 Clement*, implying that Irenaeus is not just summarizing salvation history, but the content of *1 Clement*. This explains why there is no portion of *1 Clement* that mirrors his synopsis. Rousseau located each of these episodes of salvation history in *1 Clement* generally with the exception of the fires of hell in Matt 25:41. The absence of the Matt 25:41 from *1 Clement* is an enigma. Rousseau mentions the work of B. Botte, who observes that the fires of hell are mentioned five times in *2 Clement*. Irenaeus, if he was even aware of the existence of *2 Clement* (the earliest references to *2 Clement* are found in Origen), may have assumed it was a continuation of *1 Clement*. *SC* 210.236–7.

11 Farkasfalvy, "Theology of Scripture," 321.

12 Kannengiesser, "The 'Speaking God'," 350.

discussing the synoptics to the Gospel of John, and he even suggests the motivation for John's Gospel was the refutation of Cerinthus, a Gnostic working in Asia Minor. This is the earliest reference to the authorial intent of the Gospel and certainly a point Irenaeus would have received from Polycarp. These last three sections of *Haer*. 3.11.7–9 defend the four-fold Gospel canon through a symbolic reading of the four living creatures in Rev 4:7.[13] The intertestamental links between the incarnate Son of God and God the Father continue to pervade these sections, and with them so also the allusions to Gen 1–3. His reading applies verbal connections with the creation imagery and narratival summary of the covenants beginning with Adam.

4.3.1 *Creation and Blessing of the Son*: Haer. *3.11.5* (*Gen 1:1, Gen 1:9, Gen 1:11, Gen 2:6*)

Using a variety of verbal and conceptual associations, Irenaeus reads the miracle at the wedding feast at Cana in continuity with the creation accounts. He alludes to John 2:1 and 2:6 that frame Christ's first miracle with texts depicting God's creation of flora and water (Gen 1:1, Gen 1:11, Gen 1:9, and Gen 2:6) in order to reveal Christ's identity as the Creator in Gen 1–2.[14] The God who made the earth in Gen 1:1, commanded it to bring forth fruit in Gen 1:11, also created the waters in Gen 1:9 and the "springs" (*fontes*) that water the earth in Gen 2:6 (*c.f.* Gen 2:10). The Son of God was with the Father in Genesis creating vegetation and water, this same person is found in the Gospels exercising authority over food and drink. While the Johannine passage involves a miracle with drink, Irenaeus also weaves this together with a miracle involving food through an allusion to the feeding of the 5000 with the loaves and fishes in John 6:11.

The imagery of creation in Gen 1 and the miracles in John are linked through the terms and concepts of "wine" (*vinum*), "water" (*aqua*), "earth" (*terra*), "fruit" (*fructus*), "good" (*bonus*), "food" (*esca*) and "drink" (*potus*). Irenaeus makes the substantival connections explicit saying:

> He [Christ] showed that the God who made the earth [Gen 1:1] and commanded it to bear fruit [Gen 1:11], and who established the waters [Gen 1:9] and produced springs [Gen 2:6], this same [God] bestows upon

13 *Cf.* Ezek 1:6, 10.

14 While Irenaeus is speaking about the miracle of the wedding feast at Cana in John 2, the language *inuitati errant ad nuptias* is closer to the parable of the wedding feast in Matt 22:3. Mutschler, *Das Corpus Johanneum*, 222–39. *cf.* Rev 19:9.

> the human race the blessing of food [John 6:11] and the favor of drink [John 2:1, 6] through His Son in these last times.[15]

The conceptual imagery of "earth" and "fruit" are connected with the blessing of "food," and the imagery of "waters" and "springs" are linked with the blessing of "drink." The inversion of the arrangement of the allusions to Gen 1:9 and Gen 1:11 enhance the intertextual connections, because this chronological inversion of the narrative in Gen 1–3 clarifies that the controlling images are the miracles of "food" and "drink" described in John. The primary text in view is John 2:1–6 and Irenaeus conflates this passage with the Genesis imagery in order to identify the divine nature of Jesus.

Irenaeus also observes that the first wine served at the wedding was created by God through the natural processes of the vineyard. This wine is "good" (John 2:10), which echoes the qualitative descriptions of creation throughout Gen 1 (Gen 1:4, 10, 12, etc . . .) and clearly the guests at the wedding offer no complaints about the first wine. But the wine created by the Son from the water is better. In this sense he uses the succession of the good wine and the better wine in John 2:10 to illustrate the progressive nature of sanctification. Thus, even though the Son of God had the power to create *ex nihilo* as he did in Gen 1–2, he chose to improve the substance of creation in the Johannine narrative.[16] This associates the substance of creation and the identity of God the Father working though Son in both Genesis and John. To make this identity explicit, he offers a final allusion to John 1:18 that describes the preexistence of the Son "in the bosom of the Father" (*in sinu Patris*). Now, through his miracles of food and drink, the Son has revealed the invisible God by means of the visible incarnation.[17] The instrumental medium for this revelation is not merely the substance of creation, but the Son who became incarnate, and worked miracles with the same substance created in Gen 1–2.

4.3.2 *The Covenant in Creation*: Haer. *3.11.8* (*Gen 2:16–17*)

A few paragraphs later, Irenaeus makes similar connections in the economic activities of the Father though the Son in *Haer*. 3.11.7. He argues that the first "principles" (*principia*) of the Gospel are the existence of one God, who administered over salvation history from creation to the coming of the Son. For Irenaeus, the four Gospels (Matthew, Mark, Luke and John) are unified in these

15 *Haer*. 3.11.5.

16 *sc* 210.282.

17 *Cf. Haer*. 3.16.6; *Haer*. 4.20.5; *Haer*. 5.16.2.

principles. In this sense, there are not *four Gospels*, but *one Gospel in four forms*, because all four Gospels are held together by one Spirit.[18] The Gnostics, on the other hand, neglect the unity of the principles of the Gospel, and instead preference one Gospel over the others.[19] Irenaeus claims, though, the very fact that they utilize these texts confirms of their authority. As a result, he concludes that these Gospels and no others are the authentic forms of the one Gospel.

Irenaeus supports this argument by citing aspects of the nature of the divine economy that contain a "fourfold" design, or a single composite entity contained in four elements or forms. His reasoning is also based on a theological argument of the fitness and proportion of creation derived from one God, Father and Creator of all things.[20] He is not applying a Gnostic gematria that interprets passages symbolically through their ability to represent the number four, but looking for entities that are "fourfold" (*quadriforma*) in nature. Arguing from natural revelation, he remarks generally that the earth is comprised of four zones, and contains four directional winds. Within scripture, there is also the four living creatures of Rev 4:7, which he also connects this text with the description of the Cherubim in Psalm 79(80):2. He states the gospels "harmonize" (*consonantia*) with nature of the creatures around Christ's throne and then identifies each face with its respective Gospel: Human-Matthew, Eagle-Mark, Ox-Luke, and Lion-John. Each one of these faces also symbolizes the different dispensations of the Son of God. The Lion (John) symbolizes his kingly nature, the Ox (Luke)his priestly role, the man (Matthew) his humanity, and the eagle (Mark) the gift of the Spirit that he gives to the church. He also explains each of these images by appealing to the opening lines of each Gospel.

Irenaeus uses this fourfold aspect of Christ's ministry to conclude that the economy of the Lord is fourfold. Then, Irenaeus frames the divine economy as a whole into "four covenants" (*quattuor . . . testamenta*) including: the Adamic Covenant, the Noahic Covenant, the Mosaic Covenant, and the New Covenant. These dispensations parallel the economic functions of the Son of God. In the times of the patriarchs, the Son of God ministered by virtue of his divinity and glory. Under the dispensation of the Law, he ministered by means of his

18 *Haer*. 3.11.8. Irenaeus' view of the four-fold Gospel canon, though, does not depend upon these correspondences. He has already defended the apostolicity of these and other writings in *Haer*. 3.1.1–3.11.6.

19 The Ebionites use only Matthew, Marcion relies on Luke, those who maintain a dualistic Christology use Mark, and the Valentinians prefer only John.

20 *Haer*. 3.11.9. I have already mentioned the philosophical notion of "fitness" (*to prepon*) in the classical tradition in chapter 1.

priestly function. Then in the time of the New Covenant, he became incarnate and sent the gift of the Holy Spirit. In this case, the Adamic Covenant naturally echoes God's command in Gen 2:16–17, though even this command cannot be divorced from the rest of the events in Gen 1–3. Adam is free to eat from any tree in the Garden except the tree of the knowledge of good and evil. Although in this instance, he gives little indication of his views on the relationships of these covenants, he does distinguish the first two covenants by their relationship to the flood in Gen 6.[21] The Adamic covenant is before the flood, and the Noahic covenant is after the flood. This is likely focused on the connections of origins of humanity reaching back to a covenant made with a singular person or family in each instance.[22]

In Irenaeus' thinking, however, the nature of the relationship that God and Adam enjoyed in paradise is more important than the command. The New Covenant is the focal point of the progressive covenantal structure. The blessings of the relationship enjoyed in the Adamic covenant are extended in the Noahic Covenant in Gen 9:8–16 and the Mosaic Covenant in Exod 19–20, but ultimately they culminate in the New Covenant that sums up all things in Christ (Eph 1:10). In her analysis of the covenants in Irenaeus, Susan Graham argues that they are arranged for the growth and progress of the faithful toward God, and serve as "forerunners and exemplars" of the kind of communion that God and humanity will ultimately enjoy.[23] She refers to the relationship in the paradise as the "benchmark for all divine-human relationships," because vision of the Lord walking and conversing with Adam prefigures the New Covenant that renews this paradisiacal relationship between God and humanity through the work of Christ.[24] The four-fold covenant structure, beginning with Adam forms a progressive trajectory that prepares the faithful for the communion with God that Adam and Eve enjoyed in paradise.

---

21 Irenaeus gives special attention to the covenants in *Epid* 8–29, but he discusses aspects of each covenant elsewhere in *Adversus Haeresus*. Cf. *Haer*. 2.24.3, *Haer*. 3.12.11–12, *Haer*. 4.16.1–2.

22 *Epid* 19–22 places special emphasis on the Noahic covenant for the way it prefigures the New Covenant.

23 Susan L. Graham, "Irenaeus and the Covenants: 'Immortal Diamond,'" *StuPat* 40 (2006): 393–98, 394.

24 Ibid., 394. Cf. *Epid* 44, 92. She also argues that the early part of Irenaeus' *Epideixis* follows a covenantal framework. Graham, "Structure and Purpose of Irenaeus' *Epideixis*," *StuPat* 36 (2001): 210–21.

4.4 Salvation from Creation to Incarnation: *Haer.* 3.18.1,7

The second part of *Haer*. 3 is a protracted reflection on the incarnation, and in the present chapter, the soteriological implications are a particular point of emphasis. Donovan identifies a chiastic structure in *Haer*. 3.18.1–7 centering on a discussion of martyrdom in *Haer*. 3.18.5.[25] The bookends (*Haer*. 3.18.1–2 and *Haer*. 3.18.7) are structurally linked contain common allusions to the work of God in Gen 1–2. In both cases, an Adam-Christ typology informs his intertextual allusions, and both summarize the soteriological implications of the incarnation. In *Haer*. 3.18.1–2 he combines John 1:14, Eph 1:10, and Gen 1:26, while in *Haer*. 3.18.7 he conflates Gen 2:5 and Rom 5–6. These intertextual relationships are fashioned through a variety of verbal associations that work in harmony with a prevailing Adam-Christ typology.

4.4.1 *The Preexistence of the Son*: Haer. *3.18.1* (*Gen 1:26*)

The initial section of *Haer*. 3.18.1, begins with a reference to the work of Christ in John 1:2–3, John 1:10, and John 1:14 in attempts to prove the preexistence of the Son with the Father and his continued administration of creation through time.[26] He unites the preexistence and incarnation of the Son that affects the recovery of the original creative form fashioned in the image and likeness of God. Specifically, his language reflects the binding of the imagery of John 1:14, Eph 1:10, and Gen 1:26 in a successive soteriological summary of the effects of the incarnation. Irenaeus argues that the Word became incarnate and was

25 Donovan's chiastic structure is identified as follows: A. Necessity of incarnation (*Haer*. III.18.1–2); B. Paul on the reality of Christ's redemptive suffering, death, and resurrection (*Haer*. III.18.2–3); C. Christ's teaching on his suffering and that of his disciples (*Haer*. III.18.4); D. If Christ did not suffer but flew away from Jesus, by what right did he exhort disciples to follow him? (*Haer*. III.18.5); E. Suffering of the Martyr's: differing views (*Haer*. III.18.5); D′. If Christ's suffering was not real, by what right did he exhort disciples to follow him? (*Haer*. III.18.6); C′. Paul teaches that Christ was a man who by his obedience redeemed human disobedience (*Haer*. III.18.6); B′. Christ teaches that he claimed the strong man, freed the weak and gave salvation to the work of his hands destroying sin (*Haer*. III.18.6); A′. Necessity of incarnation (*Haer*. III.18.7). Donovan, *One Right Reading*, 83. Donovan does not explicitly combine *Haer*. 3.18.1–2, as I have here, but the themes and content are parallel and they should be understood as a structural unit.

26 There may be an echo of the original creation of Adam in Gen 2:7 in the reference to the Word of God becoming "united to his own formation" (*unitum suo plasmati*), but it is not clear enough for discussion. This phrase is, however, particularly common and parallel examples are found throughout *Haer. 3 see: Haer*. 3.10.4, *Haer*. 3.16.6, *Haer*. 3.18.1, 6–7, *Haer*. 3.19.3, and *Haer*. 3.21.9–10.

made man (John 1:14) and, as a result, he recapitulated humanity in himself (Eph 1:10) as a summary of salvation. The effect of the Son's incarnation (John 1:14) and recapitulation (Eph 1:10) is accomplishing salvation and recovering of what was lost in Adam: "to be according to the image and likeness of God" (*id est secundum imaginem et similitudinem esse Dei*, Gen 1:26).[27] Gen 1:26, in this instance, is interpreted anthropologically and eschatologically as the logical soteriological conclusion of Christ's incarnation and recapitulation. The intention of God to make humanity in the image and likeness of God is finally realized in and through the incarnation. There is an obvious echo of the fall in Gen 3:1–6, which Grant suggests expresses the loss of both the image of God in Adam's disobedience, but Behr is right that the image is never lost.[28] The echo is allusive, and the passage is focused on the eschatological implications of Gen 1:26 pointing toward the recovery of both the image *and likeness* in Christ. Thus, an Adam-Christ typology, which gives attention to the anthropological and soteriological implications of the work of Christ, unites the imagery of these passages. These texts do not contain parallel catchwords, but their imagery is understood in a progressive relationship according to the work of Christ.

4.4.2 *Salvation and the Obedience of Christ*: Haer. *3.18.7* (*Gen 2:5*)

The discussion of Gen 1–3 and the incarnation resurfaces in *Haer*. 3.18.7, where Irenaeus concludes the whole chiastic structure of *Haer*. 3.18.1–7. He argues that Christ, who was both God and man, could have vanquished the enemy and possessed salvation securely.[29] The Bishop of Lyons remarks that unless humanity is joined to God, humankind could never partake of incorruptibility.[30] While there are a number of texts cited in this section, he specifically harmonizes Gen 2:5 with Rom 5:12 and Rom 5:19 to argue that the destruction of sin and death could only be accomplished through God assuming the same substance formed from the dust in Gen 2:5.

Irenaeus uses the same "as . . . so" (ὥσπερ . . . οὕτως) framework as Paul in Rom 5:12 and 5:19, but extends the asymmetrical relationship with positive symmetry connecting the parallel births of Adam and Christ. Following

27 *Haer*. 3.18.1.

28 Grant, *Irenaeus*, 52; Behr, *Anthropology*, 90. See discussion of Image and Likeness in *Haer*. 5.16.2.

29 It is still worth noting that this emphasis on obedience, observed by Wingren, acknowledges the union of the physical and ethical aspects of salvation. Wingren, *Man and the Incarnation*, 27–8.

30 There is a close relationship between the use of Gen 2:5 and related intertexts in this section with *Epid* 30–34a and *Haer*. 3.21.10.

Rom 5:12, Irenaeus remarks that death came to all humanity through the disobedience of Adam, who was "first fashioned from virgin earth" (*primus de terra rudis plasmatus*, Gen 2:5). The reference to "first" is positional and chronological in terms of Adam's relationship to humanity, while the "virgin earth" soil *exemplifies* the pristine nature of the untilled soil prior to God sending rain in Gen 2:6 or *tilling* the earth to form Adam in Gen 2:7. The parallel phrase refers to Christ who was "born first of the Virgin" (*primus ex Virgine natus*), and was obedient thereby accomplishing salvation to the faithful.[31] The allusion to Gen 2:5 in this section demonstrates the way Irenaeus *extends* Paul's logic with his own harmonization.[32] The semantic structure in Rom 5 as demonstrative of the "asymmetrical analogy" between Adam and Christ in Paul's thought.[33] Whereas Paul's comparison is primarily contrastive, Irenaeus utilizes both contrastive and corresponding elements.[34] This typological imagery shows that Irenaeus' is pouring over the verbal details of the descriptions of the creation of Adam and Christ's incarnation to enhance and clarify the anthropological symmetry between both.[35]

4.5 Creation, Incarnation, and Resurrection: *Haer.* 3.19.3–20.1

Like the previous section, Donovan also identifies another chiastic structure in *Haer*. 3.19.1–21.9 directed at the Ebionites, a Jewish-Christian sect, who rejected the divinity of Jesus.[36] In this section Irenaeus provides an extended reflection

31 *Haer*. 3.18.7. *cf*. Luke 1:27, 2:7.

32 Orbe, *La antropología*, 280. In the context, Irenaeus explains the tension between sin and death and the law that develops from the intertextual linking of Rom 5:14, Rom 7:7, Rom 7:11–13. *cf*. Ibid., 297.

33 Francis Watson, "Is there a Story in these Texts?," in *Narrative dynamics in Paul: a critical assessment*, ed. Bruce Longenecker (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox, 2002): 231–39, 237.

34 Orbe distinguishes between the functions of Rom 5:12 and 5:19 for Irenaeus' anthropology. The former differentiates between the obedience and disobedience of Adam, while the latter, links the sin and death. Orbe, *Antropologia*, 284.

35 Behr, *Asceticism*, 63.

36 Donovan's structure is as follows: A: To consider Jesus human only misinterprets Emmanuel (*Haer*. 3.19.1), B: Jesus God and human (*Haer*. 3.19.2), C: Because humans could not imagine it, the sign of Emmanuel was given (*Haer*. 3.19.3), D: Sign of Jonah: God's plan (*Haer*. 3.20.1), E: Glory of human: God. Receptacle of God's action: the human (*Haer*. 3.20.2), D′: God became Savior, carrying out the plan (*Haer*. 3.20.3–4), C′: Sign of Emmanuel badly translated (*Haer*. 3.21.1–3), B′: Emmanuel sign means Jesus God and

on the 1 Cor 2:9 and the relationship between the weakness of the flesh and the power of God. He reasons that God permitted evil for the sake of his own glory and to display his goodness. The central piece of the chiastic structure, *Haer*. 3.20.3, contains the well-known Irenaean summary of the divine-human relationship: "The glory of the human being is God; in truth, the receptacle of the operation of God and of all God's wisdom and power is the human being" (*Gloria enim hominis Deus, operationis uero Dei et omnis sapientiae eius et virtutis receptaculum homo*).[37] The entire chiastic structure is also oriented by the interpretation of Isa 7:14, and both *Haer*. 3.19.3 and *Haer*. 3.20.1 are positioned in the first half, or parts C-D of the chiasm. The corresponding section (*Haer*. 3.21.1–3) critiques the Ebionite preference for the translation "young woman," rather than "virgin," (παρθένος) as cited in Matt 1:23. Undoubtedly, Irenaeus must be familiar with Justin's detailed argument on this point.[38] He frames human nature, created from the dust in Gen 2:7, as the substance (*plasma*) that Christ retrieves and restores back to life. His intertextual reading of these texts continues to develop the typological and verbal associative strategies seen in previous sections, though there is also careful attention given to the precise mode of Adam's formation.

4.5.1 *Adam's Formation and Salvation*: Haer. *3.19.3* (*Gen 2:7*)

Irenaeus begins *Haer*. 3.19.3 with the logical argument that God gave humankind the sign of the virgin birth in Isa 7:14 because *they would not expect it*. He appeals to Ahaz's refusal to test the Lord and ask for the sign in Isa 7:12, because, in Irenaeus' reading, Ahaz would never expect a virgin could conceive. For this reason, the sign of virgin birth in Isa 7:14 is an *unexpected* sign. Not only this, but the imagery of "descending" (*descendere*) to the depths and the "ascending" (*ascendere*) to the highest in Isa 7:11 also conditions the nature of this sign and his interpretation uses Gen 2:7 as an intricate piece in his exegetical puzzle.[39] I have framed the elaborate textual networking of *Haer*. 3.19.3 in the following chart:[40]

---

human (*Haer*. 3.21.3–4), A′: Extended interpretation of Emmanuel, with other texts supporting this interpretation (*Haer*. 3.21.5–9). Donovan, *One Right Reading?*, 84–5.

37 *Haer*. 3.20.3.

38 *Cf. Dial* 43.8; *Dial* 67.1; *Dial* 70.3; *Dial* 84.3.

39 *Haer*. 3.19.3.

40 *Haer*. 3.19.3. I adapted this chart from the notes in Steenberg's translation of *Haer*. 3. Steenberg, *Irenaeus of Lyons*, 181n27.

Propter hoc et ipse Dominus dedit nobis signum in profundum, in altitudinem susum	For this reason the Lord himself gave us a sign in the depths below and in the heights above.	Isa 7:14, Isa 7:11
Quod non postulavit homo [Ahaz], quia nec speravit	Man [Ahaz] did not ask for that [sign], because he did not hope	Isa 7:12
Virginem pragnantem fiery posse quae erat virgo	that a virgin, as a virgin, could become pregnant,	Isa 7:14a
et parere filium,	and that she [could] also give birth to a son,	Isa 7:14b
et hunc partum Deum esse nobiscum,	and that this child [could] be "God with us,"	Isa 7:14c
et descendere in ea quae sunt deorsum terrae, quaerentem ovem quae perierat (quod quidem erat proprium ipsius plasma),	and that He [could] descend into the lower parts of the earth, searching for the sheep that was lost—which really was His own handiwork—	Eph 4:9, Luke 15:5–6, Gen 2:7
et ascendere in altitudinem, offerentem et commendantem Patri eum hominem qui fuerat inuentus, primitias resurrectionis hominis in semetipso faciens	and ascend to the heights above, there offering and recommending to the Father humanity who was found. Thus he. In himself, offered the first fruits of the resurrection of humankind.	Eph 4:10, Luke 15:24, 32, 1 Cor 15:20

In this complex textual latticework, he conflates Gen 2:7, Luke 15:4, and Eph 4:9 through the verbal associations of "handiwork" (*plasma*), "sheep" (*ouem*), and the "earth" (*terra*). Each of these scriptural images represent the physical objects of salvation. The things of the "earth" (*terra*) in Eph 4:9 are compared with the "sheep" (*ouem*) of Luke 15:4 and which was God's own peculiar "handiwork" (*plasma*) of Gen 2:7. Alongside these catchwords, there are conceptual patterns of descent and ascent in each passage. The "descending" (*descendere*) imagery refers to the Incarnation and brings together Isa 7:11a, Gen 2:7, Luke 15:4, and Eph 4:9. The "ascending" (*ascendere*) imagery unites Isa 7:11b, Gen 2:7, Luke 15:5–6, and Eph 4:10 and completes the Christological act of salvation. Together these texts form a sophisticated Christological summary of incarnation and ascension with the object of Christ's descent and ascent as the recovery and restoration of human nature formed in Gen 2:7. The reference to the "human" (*hominem*) (or human nature) found in the allusion to Luke 15:4–5

refers back to the substance (*plasma*) formed in Gen 2:7 as the object of salvation. The subsequent allusion to 1 Cor 15:20 completes the thought of this intertextual linking with Gen 2:7. The result of Christ's descending and ascending is that he becomes the first fruits of the resurrection. Human nature was found through the resurrection of Christ "creating in his own person" (*in semetipso faciens*) a restored humanity. After Christ restores human nature in himself he ascends and entrusts his humanity to the Father. The nature of Adam's forming is now seen in light of his forming, or more appropriately re-forming, in Christ.

The remaining portion of *Haer*. 3.19.3 depicts the resurrection of the body through a network of other texts including: Eph 1:22/Col 1:18, Phil 3:9, 1 Cor 15:23, Col 2:19, Eph 4:16, John 14:2, Rom 12:4/1 Cor 12:12, 20.[41] Together they serve to reinforce the same point as 1 Cor 15:20, so there is a sense in which I could include these texts in the same kind of intertextual relationship. Each of these texts touches upon some aspect of the restoration and resurrection of the human nature created in Gen 2:7. For example, he alludes to the resurrection imagery of Eph 4:16 and identifies Christ as the "head" (*caput*) who was first resurrected following by the remaining parts of the body. In the resurrection, the various bodily parts consisting of "joints" (*compagines*) and "bonds" (*coiunctiones*) shall blend together and reunite so that the body is properly fitted together and sustained by the "increase of God" (*augmento Dei, cf.* Gen 1:28).[42] This is the same substance of the flesh created from the dust in Adam, tainted through disobedience and inherited by all succeeding generations. This casts the eschatological resurrection of the flesh as a reenactment of the formation from the dust in Gen 2:7.

4.5.2 *The Disobedience of Adam and Jonah*: Haer. *3.20.1* (*Gen 3:1–8*)

Following his intertextual reading of Gen 2:7, Irenaeus continues in the next section discussing Gen 3:1–8 and argues that the repercussions of Adam's sin did not frustrate God nor impede divine providence in any way. God remained patient because Adam dwelt within a divinely constructed economy oriented toward the advent of the Son. From a divine perspective, humankind remained the object and instrument of God's work. The special relationship is typified, for Irenaeus, in parallels with the Jonah narrative. He reads the disobedience of Adam and Eve and their response in Gen 3:1–8 with explicit allusions to Jonah 1:9, 17, Jonah 2:1–2, Jonah 3:1 and Jonah 3:8–9. Like Jonah, all the faithful shall receive an unexpected salvation and resurrection from the dead depicted in the "sign of Jonah" (Matt 12:39–40).

41 *Haer*. 3.19.3.

42 *Haer*. 3.19.3.

He begins by comparing the disobedience in Eden with the disobedience of Jonah.[43] Just as God allowed Jonah to be swallowed up by the whale (Jonah 1:17) so that he might bring about the unexpected conversion of the Ninevites (Jonah 3:8–9), so also in the beginning God permitted humankind to be swallowed up by the "great whale" (*magno ceto*), who became the author of sin (John 8:44). The "great whale" (*magno ceto*) is, of course, Satan, who deceived the first couple in paradise by means of the serpent in Gen 3:1–5. Naturally while the snake and whale are distinctive species, no doubt Irenaeus is thinking of the conceptual connections between Satan's use of an animal in Gen 3 and the presence of the animal in the story of Jonah. Like Jonah, humanity's captivity to sin would not last because God arranged a plan of salvation through the "sign of Jonah" (Matt 12:39–40). Despite Satan's continual activity of defection, revolt, and apostasy, by means of the Word, God ushered in salvation and the resurrection from the dead.

Irenaeus extends the Adam-Jonah typology by contrasting Jonah's humility in his prayer to God with Adam's pride in his disobedience (Gen 3:5), and the hope of the resurrection for the faithful. Like Jonah, the faithful will receive an "unexpected" (*insperabilem*) salvation and rising from the dead and praise God in the same manner of Jonah saying, "I cried by reason of mine affliction to the Lord my God, and He heard me out of the belly of hell" (*Clamaui ad Dominum Deum meum in tribulatione mea et exaudiuit me de ventre inferni*).[44] The nature of salvation as unexpected and the emphasis on glorifying God for resurrection are expressed with an allusion to 1 Cor 1:29 that, "all flesh should not glory in the Lord's presence" (*non glorietur in conspectus Domini omnis caro*).[45] Irenaeus wishes to ensure that no one assumes salvation is inherited naturally or derived from human work. Therefore, in conjunction with Jonah 1:9, 2:2, and 1 Cor 1:29, he returns again to an allusion to Gen 3:5. Alluding to the words of Satan's deception, Irenaeus argues that the serpent deceived Adam and Eve by persuading them that they would "become like God" (*similes esset Deo*).[46] Adam and Eve became ungrateful towards God and considered themselves equal to God. In this sense, the theme of humility in each passage influences these connections. In light of these attitudes, humankind should praise God all

43 For a discussion of the pre-lapsarian and post-lapsarian conditions of Adam and Eve in this section see: Behr, *Asceticism*, 49.

44 *Haer*. 3.20.1. He cites both Jonah 1:9 and Jonah 2:2, though he exchanges the "belly of the fish" (ἐκ τῆς κοιλιάς του κητους), for "belly of hell" (*de ventre inferni*).

45 *Haer*. 3.20.1.

46 *Haer*. 3.20.1; *cf. Epid* 32–33.

the more when they receive an unexpected salvation and indeed "become like God" (*similis esset Deo*) in the resurrection.

4.6 Adam, Christ, and Recapitulation: *Haer.* 3.21.10 (Gen 1:26, Gen 2:5, Gen 2:7)

Irenaeus has already discussed recapitulation in *Haer*. 3.16.6 and *Haer*. 3.18.7, but the present context (*Haer*. 3.21.10–3.23.8) offers the most developed explanation of this theology of recapitulation. Similar to the previous sections, this passage also follows a chiastic argument on the nature and character of the incarnation. The incarnation unifies the trajectory of the economy manifested in the typology of Adam and Christ. The basis for recapitulation is the "similitude" (*similitudinem*) between Christ and Adam, not only in terms of their formal substances, but also in their actions. This notion of similitude is predicated upon a theological reading of the creation of Adam in Gen 1:26.

Describing the similitude between Adam and Christ, he begins with the summary statement of Christ's recapitulation of the ancient substance of Adam's formation.[47] This Pauline imagery introduces a network of texts including: Gen 2:5, Gen 2:7, John 1:3, Rom 5:12, 19, and Eph 1:10.[48] The passage reads:

> He has recapitulated in Himself even the ancient first-formed man [Eph 1:10]. To explain, just as by one man's disobedience sin came and death through sin reigned, so by one man's obedience, justice was brought and produces the fruit of life for those who in times past were dead [Rom 5:12,19]. First, just as the first-fashioned Adam got his substance from untilled and as yet virgin soil—for God had not yet caused it to rain . . . and man had not tilled the ground [Gen 2:5]—and was formed by God's hand, that is, the Word of God—for all things were made through Him [John 1:3]—and the Lord took mud from the earth and fashioned man [Gen 2:7].[49]

While Irenaeus' reflection on this text continues, this correspondence between Eph 1:10, Rom 5:12, 19, Gen 2:5,7, and John 1:3 reveals the intricate tissue of texts in Irenaeus' theology of recapitulation. These passages are united through an

47 *Haer*. 3.21.9.

48 The final clause of *Haer*. 3.21.9 is actually the introduction to *Haer*. 3.21.10, see: *SC* 211:426.215.

49 *Haer*. 3.21.10.

explicit Adam-Christ typology in Rom 5:12, 19, the creation imagery in John 1:3, and the act of the formation of Adam in Gen 2:7. In this instance his focus is on the understanding the recapitulation of all things in himself in Eph 1:10 with the concept of "humanity" in Rom 5:12 and 5:19. Again, he interprets the condition of the soil prior to the creation of Adam in Gen 2:5 as "untilled and yet virgin" (*rudi terra et de adhuc uirgine*) because there was no rain to agitate the soil and no one to till the ground.[50] Steenberg presses the ontology of Irenaeus' image, suggesting his reading of Gen 2:5 communicates both "divine and material in the constitution of the human person."[51] But Irenaeus theology of recapitulation is under the provision of a divine economy oriented toward the incarnation, so the focus extends beyond the original human constitution. In other words, Adam is fashioned from the untilled soil precisely because Christ would be born from a virgin.

Irenaeus also reminds his readers that the Word of God, through whom all things were made (John 1:3), forms the *plasma* of Adam from the earth; the same substance assumed in the Incarnation of the Word. This textual arrangement puts Irenaeus' logic of recapitulation on display and parallels the generation of Adam and Christ by means of explicit intertextual connections. In fact, the effectiveness of recapitulation hangs on the "likeness" (*similitudinem*) of Christ and Adam. Here again, Irenaeus *extends* Paul's typology by inserting explicit references to particular texts in Gen 1–2, as well as other New Testament references. Nielson's study of Adam-Christ typology argues that Paul is concerned exclusively with the salvific arrangement of Adam and Christ, while Irenaeus' is concerned with their corresponding physical constitution. Nielson's evaluation, however, does not consider the intertextual networks Irenaeus creates with the Pauline imagery or the way that Irenaeus' applies the Pauline typological method. Irenaeus is not merely concerned with Paul's observations in Rom 5:12, 19 apart from the rest of scripture, but applying the Paul typology to establish even more developed correspondence between Adam and Christ.[52] In doing so, his emphasis on the substance of Adam's flesh is an extension of the Pauline analogy that connects Rom 5:12, and Rom 5:19 with Gen 2:5, Gen 2:7, and John 1:3.

---

50 *Haer*. 3.21.10. He has the same emphasis on the "virgin" soil in *Haer*. 3.18.7, *Epid*. 32, and *Haer*. 3.21.10; and *Haer*. 3.23.2.

51 Steenberg, *Irenaeus*, 110.

52 Ibid., 68. For example, in next section (*Haer*. 3.22.3) he will comment on the Adam-Christ connections in Luke's genealogy.

Following the argument from Genesis, Paul, and John, Irenaeus continues communicating the theological and exegetical logic of recapitulation. He provides several rational arguments for the continuity and consistency between Adam and Christ. First, he uses the dialectical imagery 1 Cor 15:45–47 and the imagery of Adam's formation in Gen 2:7 in a simple counterfactual conditional statement. He reasons that if the first Adam (1 Cor 15:45) had a man for his father and was born of a "male seed" (*semine viri*), then it would be right to argue that the second Adam (1 Cor 15:47) was born of Joseph.[53] This clause mixes the condition of simple past tense with the perfect "had" (*habuit*) in the protasis and a present subjunctive "might say" (*discerent*) in the apodosis. With this change in modality, Irenaeus is conceding that if Adam had a natural birth then one certainly could say that Christ received his birth from Joseph.[54] However, given this is a counterfactual condition, the thrust of the argument is that Adam did not have a natural birth from a "male seed" (*semine viri*) and, therefore Christ could not have a natural birth from Joseph.

To extend his first statement, Irenaeus provides a second conditional clause. He states that if the first Adam was formed from the dust (Gen 2:7) by the Word of God, then it is proper that the Word himself when recapitulating Adam within himself ought to have an analogous birth. In this case the protasis and apodosis are presented in the perfect (*plamsatus est*) and imperfect (*oportebat*) tenses respectively, which makes this statement in Irenaeus' view a simple fact. In other words, Adam was *certainly* created from the dust; therefore, Christ was *certainly* formed in the likeness of Adam. This emphasis communicates how important the creation from the dust in Gen 2:7 is for Irenaeus' Christology as the very nature of Christ's humanity hinges upon the correspondence between the virgin birth and Adam's formation from the dust.

Given the crucial similitude between that of the Adam-Christ, Irenaeus anticipates a question that logically follows: "Why, then, did God not again take up the dust, but designed that the formation [Christ] should be made of Mary? (*Quare igitur non iterum sumpsit limum Deus, sed Maria operatus est plasmationem fieri?*)."[55] In other words, if the similitude between Adam and Christ is so essential, as Irenaeus understands Paul to argue in Rom 5:12, 19 and 1 Cor 15:45, 47, why are their specific modes of creation not identical? Irenaeus answers this objection with the logical remark that a second formation from the dust would produce a second race that is an altogether separate formation

53 *Haer*. 3.21.10. The emphasis on "male seed" (*semine viri*) is directed at the Ebionites, who were already addressed in *Haer*. 3.19.1ff.

54 See also *Haer*. 3.21.9; *Haer*. 3.22.1.

55 *Haer*. 3.21.10.

(*alia plasmatio*), which would also require a separate means of salvation.[56] By different formation, he implies a distinct human race fashioned from the same fleshy substance, but not in the physical line of Adam. As Paul expresses Adam unifies all humanity in himself and through his disobedience death spreads to all humanity. Likewise, Christ comprises all humanity in his obedience, thus reversing the effects of Adam and reviving human nature. Irenaeus' theological and exegetical reflection is guided by the conviction that Christ must be analogous to Adam in order to convey salvation to the same flesh of Adam that was formed from the dust.

4.7 Adam's Formation and Christ's Incarnation: *Haer.* 3.22.1–4

In this section, Irenaeus continues the discussion of recapitulation from *Haer*. 3.21.10, but in this case Irenaeus' polemic is set against the Valentinians, rather than the Ebionites who deny the virgin birth. For the Bishop of Lyons, those who reject Christ's human nature also reject the "similitude" (*similitudinem*) between Adam and Christ. As I argued, Irenaeus' concern is the analogy between Adam and Christ, which he extends through a range of textual connections. His argumentation continues the scriptural correlation between the first and second Adam, beginning with the closing line of *Haer*. 3.21.10 and lasting through *Haer*. 3.22.1–4. Within this section Irenaeus links Gen 2:7, Matt 5:5, Gal 4:4, and Rom 1:3–4 in order to demonstrate that the meekness of the flesh derived from the earth is the same flesh Christ assumed. He also points to a number of passages that communicate the weakness of Christ's body in the Gospel accounts where he required food, grew tired, grieved, sweat blood, and was pierced revealing blood and water. In the final two sections he develops the Adam-Christ typology with the discussion of the Eve-Mary typology that links Gen 2:24, Gen 3:6, Deut 22:23–24, Matt 19:6, Matt 19:30/20:16, Psalm 44:17(45:16), and Col 1:18. These passages are fashioned through verbal and conceptual connections, especially focused on Adam's bodily substance and nature.

4.7.1 *Christ and the Blessed Meekness of the Flesh*: Haer. *3.22.1* (*Gen 1:26, Gen 2:7*)

He begins his polemic with another conditional clause that entertains the converse idea of the second conditional clause mentioned above in *Haer*. 3.21.10. The consistency of God's economy is dependent upon his concepts

56 *Haer*. 3.21.10.

of image and likeness found in Gen 1:26 and linked with John 1:3, Matt 5:5, Rom 1:3–4, and Gal 4:4. He argues that if Adam was formed from the hand of God (Gen 2:7), but not Christ, then he would not preserve a likeness to Adam who was made in the image and likeness of Christ (Gen 1:26). God would be an "inconsistent Artist" (*inconstans Artifex*) and unable to manage his own creation.[57] The term "Artist" (*Artifex*), as Osborn notes, emphasizes the aesthetic notions of coherence and proportion.[58] Since Adam was made in the image and likeness of Christ then the divine Artist would preserve the likeness of Adam in Christ.[59]

The demand for similitude between the formations of Adam and Christ prompts Irenaeus to correlate the substance of Adam's flesh formed in Gen 2:7 with Christ's humanity. Echoing Gen 2:7, he makes the general anthropological statement that humankind is formed from a body taken from the earth and a soul imparted by the Spirit of God. When the Word of God recapitulated himself in the form of his own handiwork, he received a body from Mary that connected him to the substance of Adam's body fashioned from the "earth" (*terra*). The earthly substance that was used to fashion Adam is characteristically ignoble or "meek" (*mites*), but when the Word assumes flesh he "blesses the meek, because they shall inherit the earth" (*beatificat mites, quoniam ipsi hereitabunt terram*).[60] For Irenaeus, the meek who inherit the "earth" (*terra*) in Matt 5:5 are those who receive the same flesh fashioned from the "earth" (*terra*) in Gen 2:7. In other words, assuming flesh in his incarnation, the Son of Man "blesses" (*beatificat*) the weak flesh that is inherited by all those born in line of Adam. He also unites these texts with Gal 4:4 and Rom 1:3–4, but he offers virtually no commentary on these passages. Instead, bound by their verbal and conceptual connections, Gal 4:4 and Rom 1:3–4 are themselves commentary on the nature of the Incarnation and the relationship between Gen 2:7 and Matt 5:5. In Gal 4:4 Irenaeus notes that Paul expresses the humanity of Christ "plainly" (*manifeste*) saying "God sent His Son made of a woman" (*misit Deus Filium suum, factum de muliere*) and he adds that the same point is made in Rom 1:3–4, "but His Son, who was made of the seed of David according to the flesh" (*De ilio autem, inquit, euis, qui factus est ex semine David secundum carnem*).[61] The emphasis on the notion of being "made" (*facio*) combined

57 *Haer*. 3.22.1.

58 Osborn, *Irenaeus*, 18–20.

59 *Haer*. 3.22.1.

60 The use of the title Son of man suggests Irenaeus is drawing upon the Lukan account of the beatitudes.

61 *Haer*. 3.22.1.

with the concept of being born of a woman and the seed of David corresponds to the "earth" imagery in Matt 5:5 and the same concepts in Gen 1:26, and Gen 2:7. Taken together, this network of texts forms a paradigmatic link between the body that is fashioned from the dust in Gen 2:7 and flesh of the incarnate Christ.

4.7.2 *The Incarnation and the Substance of Adam's Formation*: Haer. *3.22.2–3* (*Gen 2:7*)

In *Haer*. 3.22.2, Irenaeus continues the same discussion, on the nature of Christ's incarnate flesh. To characterize the nature of the body from the earth (Gen 2:7), he alludes to a number of passages that describe how Christ required food, grew tired, was wounded, grieved, sweat blood, and was pierced, revealing blood and water (Matt 4:2, John 4:6, Psalm 68:27(69:26), John 11:35, Luke 22:44, Matt 26:38, and John 19:34). The networking of these texts is dependent upon their verbal and conceptual connections to Christ's experience in the body. Together the echoes and allusions form an extended anthropological commentary upon the nature and weakness of the flesh formed from the dust in Gen 2:7. After citing these passages in succession, Irenaeus remarks they all express "signs of the flesh" (*signa carnis*) formed from the earth.[62]

Discussion of the Adam-Christ typology continues in *Haer*. 3.22.3 and reinforces the observations of *Haer*. 3.22.1–2. The central allusion is Luke's genealogical account that, as Irenaeus notes, is written backwards beginning with Christ in Luke 3:23 and concluding with Adam in Luke 3:38. He interprets the genealogy theologically, as indicating Christ had recapitulated in himself all previous generations. Thus, the very structure of the genealogical list reflects the recapitulating acts of Christ and his reversal of Adam's sin. From this arrangement Irenaeus draws the conclusion that the Word of God existed logically prior to Adam and ultimately "prefigures" (*praeformauerat*) his incarnation in Adam.[63] In the same context Irenaeus cites Rom 5:14, where Adam is said to be a "type of Him that was to come" (*typus futuri*).[64] Adam's physical form was a type of Christ in whose image Adam was originally formed. This is also supported by an allusion to 1 Cor 15:46: "God predestined the first man should be of an animal nature, in order that he might be saved by the spiritual" (*praedestinante Deo primum animalem hominem uidelicet uti ab spiritali*

62 *Haer*. 3.22.2.

63 *Haer*. 3.22.3.

64 *Haer*. 3.22.3.

saluaretur).[65] This makes clear Irenaeus' understanding of *typus* is highly literal and physical, even as it is linked with the chronological structure of the divine economy.[66] Thus, in the flow of Irenaeus' argumentation, these textual allusions in *Haer*. 3.22.3 are related to the discussion and content of *Haer*. 3.22.1–2, all of which depend upon allusions to the formation of Adam in Gen 2:7. The texts of Luke 3:23–38, Rom 5:14, and 1 Cor 15:46 are the theological links connecting the "end" (*finem*) in Christ with the "beginning" (*initio*) in Adam so that Irenaeus envisions the whole of Gen 1–3, and indeed the whole Old Testament, as linked with the New Testament in a "single pattern of salvation history."[67]

4.7.3 *From Adam and Christ to Eve and Mary*: Haer. *3.22.4* (*Gen 1:28, Gen 2:25, Gen 3:6*)

Following this delineation of Adam-Christ typology in *Haer*. 3.22.4, Irenaeus transitions into a description of the Eve-Mary typology. Since Irenaeus is one of the first theologians to comment on the Eve-Mary relationship, his comments have garnered a significant amount of attention.[68] While Irenaeus comments on the Eve-Mary typology and their respective roles elsewhere, the

65 *Haer*. 3.22.3. This argument is interesting because it implies Christ's predisposition to save necessitated something to save, which resulted in the creation of Adam. Steenberg believes this is some form of necessitarianism and one of Irenaeus' more controversial statements. Steenberg, *Irenaeus*, 34. On the nature of this phrase see also Behr, *Anthropology*, 58; Orbe, *Anthropologia*, 491ff; Wingren, *Man and the Incarnation*, 5–7.

66 Behr, *Asceticism*, 58 n. 81.

67 Donovan, *One Right Reading?*, 88.

68 Dunning, "Virgin Earth, Virgin Birth." Studies on Irenaeus' views of Mary include: Tina Beattie, "Mary in Patristic Thought," in *Mary: The Complete Resource*, ed. Sarah Jane Boss, 75–105 (New York: Oxford University Press, 2007), 86–7; Steenberg, "The Role of Mary as Co-recapitulator in St. Irenaeus of Lyon," *VC* 58 (2004): 117–37; Luigi Gambero, *Mary and the Fathers of the Church: The Blessed Virgin Mary in Patristic Thought*, trans. Thomas Buffer (San Francisco: Ignatius, 1999), 56; Jaroslav Pelikan, *Mary Through the Centuries: Her place in the History of Culture* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1996), 42–52; D. Ramos-Lissón, 'Le Role de la femme dans la théologie de saint Irénée," *StuPat* 21 (1989): 163–74; Orbe, "La Virgen María abogada de la virgen Eva; en torna a s. Ireneo adv. haer. v. 19, 1)," *Greg* 63 (1982): 453–506; Jose Antonio de Aldama, *María en la patrística de los siglos I y II* (Madrid: Editorial Catholica, 1970); Jean Plagineux, "La doctrine mariale de saint Irénée," *RSR* 44 (1970): 179–89; Orbe, "El pecado de Eva, signo de divieion', *OCP* 29 (1963): 305–30. Steenberg frames Irenaeus' uses of Eve-Mary typology into three classifications: 1) anti-adoptionist, 2) anti-doectic, and 3) recapitulative. Steenberg, "The Role of Mary," 119.

present section is the most developed explanation.[69] Although many studies focus on gender issues, Steenberg provides a theologically developed understanding of this typology and argues for a subordinate, yet necessary role of Mary as "co-recapitulator" with Christ.[70] He appreciates the inherent "social" role of Eve in relation to Adam, thereby extending Osborn's previous observation of mere aesthetic parallelism between the experiences of Adam and Christ.[71] Within the broader contours of Irenaeus' argument in *Haer*. 3.22.1–4, he places the Eve-Mary typology in continuity with the Adam-Christ typology as another means to unifying both Testaments in a single trajectory spanning the narrative of the divine economy. However, the theological coherence of the Eve-Mary typology continues to guide Irenaeus' intertextual networking in continuity with the textual matrix of the Adam-Christ typology in the preceding sections. Like the Adam-Christ typology, the Eve-Mary typology depends upon several corresponding (or contrasting) characteristics recorded in their respective narratives and expressed through reflection on a network of texts including: Gen 1:28, Gen 2:25, Gen 3:6, Deut 22:23–24, Psalm 44:17(45:16), Matt 19:30, Matt 20:16, Luke 1:38, Luke 3:23–38, Col 1:18, and Heb 5:9.

First, following the same contrastive nature of Adam and Christ, Irenaeus distinguishes the disobedience of Eve from the obedience of Mary. While Eve was disobedient when she ate from the tree of knowledge in Gen 3:6, Mary is obedient when she proclaims to the angel, "Behold your handmaid, Lord, be it unto me according to your word" (*Ecce ancilla tua, Domine, fiat mihi secundum verbum tuum*, Luke 1:38).[72] The disobedience of the former became the "cause of death" (*causa . . . mortis*), while obedience of the latter became the "cause of life" (*causa . . . salutis*).[73] In this sense, Eve and Mary are instrumental in the root causes of death and life respectively, which are effected through the corresponding actions of Adam and Christ. The parallelism between Adam and Christ is also strengthened by the concurrent disobedience of Eve and obedience of Mary, who is shown to be a "necessary and essential" means for the recapitulatory work of Christ.[74]

---

69 *Cf. Epid* 33. *Haer*. 3.16.7, *Haer*. 4.27.1, *Haer*. 4.33.11, and *Haer*. 5.19.1.

70 Steenberg, "The Role of Mary," 118; Dunning, "Virgin Earth," 59–60.

71 Osborn, *Irenaeus*, 51, 75–6, 101. There appears to be another chiasm in *Haer*. 3.21.10–22.4 centered on recapitulation in Luke's genealogy.

72 *Haer*. 3.22.4.

73 *Haer*. 3.22.4. The reference of "Mary the Virgin" most naturally alludes to Luke 1:34 in the immediate context.

74 Steenberg, "The Role of Mary," 118.

Second, similar conceptions of virginity are found in both Eve and Mary. While Mary's virginity is plainly recorded in the Gospels (i.e. Matt 1:23–25, Luke 1:27–34), Irenaeus cites Gen 2:25, "they were both naked in Paradise and were not ashamed" (*utrique nudi in Paradiso et non confundebantur*), to prove Eve's virginity. He interprets this text to mean that Adam and Eve were prepubescent children in paradise who kissed and embraced each other in all holiness and felt no shame in their nakedness because they had no knowledge of procreation.[75] This state of innocence, however, is merely the initial stage in the course of human growth and maturity that includes procreation. This notion of anthropological progression is located in his conflation of Gen 2:25 with Gen 1:28, where he interprets the divine commands "increase and multiply" as sequential stages of human growth and development.[76] The term "increase" (*adolescere*) implies human maturity towards the transition into adulthood, while the term "multiply" (*multiplicari*) suggests human reproduction. For Irenaeus procreation has always been part of God's economy as a means to guide God's creatures toward the divine life.

Third, the virginal correspondence is complemented by their respective betrothals. Irenaeus points to legal nature of betrothal in Deut 22:23–24 to argue that a betrothed virgin is actually considered a wife under Mosaic Law. Therefore Mary, who was "betrothed" (*desponsatus*) to Joseph, could be considered his wife. Rousseau argues that the application of Deut 22:23–24 applies exclusively to the situation of Mary because Irenaeus would recognize that Eve is espoused to Adam and not engaged.[77] For Irenaeus, this logical set of conceptual and textual interconnections, including obedience/disobedience, virginity, and betrothal, signifies a circling back (*recirculationem significans*)

---

75 *Epid* 14; Dunning, "Virgin Earth," 64; Both Behr and Donovan criticize Orbe for pressing the Eve-Mary typology in relation to the role of the Spirit and marital intercourse beyond the evidence in Irenaeus' writings. See Donovan, *One Right Reading?*, 91–2 n. 19. Behr, *Asceticism*, 111 n. 70. The same criticism is warranted for Dunning's attempt to differentiate Irenaeus' notions of "virginity" as a means to critique the inconsistencies in Irenaeus' logic of recapitulation. Like Orbe, Dunning forces Irenaeus to answer questions of gender and sexuality that are not altogether explicit in his writings. As Donovan remarks quite clearly (following the work of Rebecca Lyman): "Absent here [*Haer*. 3.22.4] is any suggestion of the impact of sexuality on either Eve's sin or Mary's obedience." Donovan, *One Right Reading?*, 88. Donovan refers to an unpublished presentation of Lyman entitled "Irenaeus on Eve: The Christological Connection," where Lyman argues that what is clear in Irenaeus is simply that both sexes, male and female, are unified in the resurrected humanity of Christ and fully restored in the eschaton. *cf.* Behr, *Asceticism*, 210.

76 *Haer*. 3.22.4. Behr, *Asceticism*, 112; Dunning, "Virgin Earth," 66.

77 *SC* 210.375–6.

from Mary to Eve reinforcing the social and aesthetic stability of the Adam-Christ typology.[78]

Summarizing their recapitulative roles, or the "circling back" (*recirculationem*) from Mary to Eve, de Aldama argues the disobedience of Adam and Eve is undone through the obedience of Mary and Christ so that she unties the knot that was secured through Eve.[79] This summary, however, leaves open the question of the nature of the "bonds" (*compagines*) that Eve inflicted, which Mary conversely untied. In this context, Irenaeus uses several parallel images to speak of the relationship fashioned between Eve and Adam including: "the binding of the bonds" (*compagines adligationis*), "first union" (*primae conjunctiones*)—or "first bond" (*primam . . . compaginem*)—and "knot" (*nodus*).[80] He also uses the verbs *colligatum* est and *adligauit* to illustrate the act of binding. Interpreting this "bond" between Adam and Eve, Steenberg remarks that this "knot" (*nodus*) refers specifically to the fact that "Eve's disobedience had bound the nature of human relationships into a detrimental state bent on turning men away from the intentions of God."[81] This "knot," therefore is purely a metaphorical (or soteriological) "knot" illustrating the sinful condition of human nature bound to sin through disobedience. It is strange, however, given the context and the discussion on marriage, that no one has observed the echoes of the union of Adam and Eve becoming one flesh in Gen 2:24 (Matt 19:6).[82]

---

78 Given the ascetic harmony between Adam, Eve, Mary, and Christ, I think the simple terminology "Adam-Christ typology" and "Eve-Mary typology" runs the risk of being unhelpful, because it inherently divorces the theological interconnectiveness of these typological images. The notion of "ascetic harmony" on the other hand is not textually (or scripturally) based and does not explain how Irenaeus corresponds the specific characteristics of Gen 1–3 with the Gospels. Given these are the prevailing scholarly terms, I continue to use them even if they are restrictive.

79 de Aldama, *María*, 278–93.

80 *Haer*. 3.24.4.

81 Steenberg, "The Role of Mary," 136.

82 This echo is not observed in *BP* or *SC*. Orbe recognizes all other references in this context, but does not mention Gen 2:24 or Matt 19:6. Orbe, *Anthropologia*, 248–9. See also: Steenberg, "The Role of Mary," 129–30. Rousseau argues that Irenaeus' use of Deut 22:23–24 proves Mary was Joseph's wife even if she was merely betrothed to him could not refer to Adam and Eve, precisely because it would be obvious to Irenaeus that Adam and Eve were espoused. In making this argument he indirectly proves that Irenaeus is thinking in terms of Adam and Eve's union. *SC* 210.375–6. Furthermore, the contextual and linguistic support is overwhelming. Irenaeus cites Gen 2:25 in this section as well as Matt 19:30/20:6 and alludes to marriage imagery which constitutes the themes of Gen 2:24 and Matt 19:6. The imagery, while not identical, is close enough to constitute an allusion to Matt 19:6 in the imagery of "what was bound together could not otherwise be undone . . ."

While the language is only loosely connected, Irenaeus has just concluded that Eve is betrothed to Adam and Mary is betrothed to Joseph (although Joseph is not mentioned by name). He implicitly alludes to the actual union of marriage (Gen 2:24, Matt 19:6), which he applies to illustrate the effects of Eve's disobedience. In other words, the "knot" between Eve and Adam is their nuptial union that Irenaeus applies metaphorically to the binding of humanity to sin and death. This does not imply that Irenaeus disparages marriage, but he recognizes the physical and mystical nuptial union between the first couple (Gen 2:24), though coordinating acts of disobedience, bound humankind to sin and death.

While Irenaeus' typological analysis is praiseworthy and there is great strength in the parallels between Adam, Eve, Joseph, Mary and Christ, this correspondence is certainly not "perfect."[83] The reason the allusions to marriage in Gen 2:24 and Matt 19:6 are not more explicit is because they potentially weaken the strength of Irenaeus' economic parallelism. The nuptial bond of union between Adam and Eve does not mirror the mother-child relationship of Mary and Christ. In a recent article, Dunning argues that "sexual difference" is the breakdown in Irenaeus' recapitulative framework, yet this section reveals a more fundamental struggle for the symmetry of his ascetic parallelism.[84] While there is much that is consistent, the essential inconsistency lies in the familial relationships between Adam, Eve, Joseph, Mary and Christ. Irenaeus is not oblivious of this point, which is why he only names Adam outright in his discussion of their respective betrothals. He refers to Mary as having a husband, but omits mention of Joseph's name precisely because he is the exception to the Adam-Christ and Eve-Mary parallelism.[85] This inconsistency also helps explain the awkward phrasing in this section and the use of the cryptic binding imagery. The references to Mary's reversal of the bonds, therefore, should be understood as Irenaeus' attempt to wrestle with the union imagery

---

(*non aliter quod colligatum est colueretur*). Furthermore, the references to the "first union" (*primae conjunctiones*) or "first bond" (*primam . . . compaginem*) in this context are easily understood as images referring to nuptial union of Eve and Adam in Gen 2:24. The retroversion uses of the language τὸ δεδεμένον, πρῶται συνδέσεις, and πρώτην συναφὴν reflect common New Testament images for binding especially in a prison context, it is conceptually equivalent to the imagery of Matt 19:6 (Mark 10:9): συνέζευξεν. Several of these terms are uniquely concentrated in Paul's body imagery, which suggests that Irenaeus is conflating the marriage imagery with soteriological imagery (*cf.* Eph 4:3,16, Col 2:19, Col 3:14, and *Haer*. 3.19.7).

83 *SC* 210.374. Donovan, *One Right Reading?*, 88.

84 Dunning, "Virgin Earth," 63.

85 *Haer*. 3.22.4.

of Gen 2:24 and Matt 19:6 (alongside Pauline use of body imagery) in relationship to the salvific work of Christ who was born of Mary in light of his economic parallelism.[86] What is clear in his argument is that the second bond (*secunda colligatione*) that overturns or loses the first bond is not a nuptial "bond" between Mary and Christ, but the union of all humanity in the body of Christ. This is why Irenaeus concludes that through Mary, Christ was the "first begotten of the dead," becoming in "himself" (*ipse*) the beginning of those who live contrary to Adam who became the beginning of those who die.

The intertextual references he uses in the context confirm this point and each of these texts is connected by the conceptual idea of "circling back" (*recirculationem*) or reversal of the disobedience in Gen 3:6.[87] He begins with a citation of the Lord's words in Matt 19:30/20:16, "indeed the first shall be last and the last first" (*primos quidem nouissimos futuros et nouissimos primos*). For Irenaeus, Christ himself is the "last" (*nouissimos*) who has been made first in the kingdom, because through Christ all have found life. Likewise he cites Psalm 44:17(45:16), "In place of your fathers will be your sons" (*Pro patribus nati sunt tibi fili*). The son of Adam has taken the place of his father, because the Lord was "born the First-begotten of the dead," (*Primogenitus enim mortuorum natus Dominus*, Col 1:18). Having been resurrected from the dead, he now receives the ancient Fathers into his own bosom (Isa 40:11) and regenerates them back to the life of God.[88] The climax of this theology of reversal is the recapitulation of all things *in Christ*. He again mentions the reverse chronology of Luke's genealogy and remarks that just as Adam became the beginning of those who die (though his union with Eve's disobedience), so also has Christ become the beginning of those who find life (by means of Mary's obedience). In general the conceptual imagery of these texts supports Irenaeus' theology of reversal and the overturning of the effects of Adam and Eve's disobedience in paradise. In this way, the Eve-Mary typology is understood in immediate connection to the Adam and Christ typology. The Eve-Mary typology, like all other intertextual relationships, participates in Irenaeus' broader intertextual connections.

---

86 This is also strengthened by the fact that Irenaeus envisions the rite of marriage to cease in the eschatological state. While he uses the marriage imagery for linking salvation history, his ultimate concern is soteriological. Behr, *Asceticism*, 113, *Haer*. 2.33.5.

87 Behr, *Asceticism*, 64 n. 96. *Haer*. 3.22.4. See also *Dial*. 132.

88 *Haer*. 3.22.4. Although, several passages may be in view, Isa 40:11 is likely due to the language of "his bosom" (*sinum suum*) combined with the use of "lambs" (*ouem*) at the start of the subsequent chapter.

4.8 The Serpent's Deception and the Hope of Adam's Salvation: *Haer.* 3.23.1–8

At this point in his work, Irenaeus has built the structure of his theology of recapitulation through a series of chiasms.[89] Beginning in *Haer.* 3.18.2–3.18.7 he outlines the necessity of the incarnation against the Valentinians. Then, in *Haer.* 3.19.1–21.9 he argues for the complete divinity and humanity of Christ against the Ebionites. These two chiasms build up to the final chiasm in *Haer.* 3: *Haer.* 3.23.1–8.[90] The recognition that the incarnation was necessary (*Haer.* 3.18.2–3.18.7) coupled with the conviction that Christ was both fully human and divine (*Haer.* 3.19.1-*Haer.* 3.21.9) results in the logical conclusion that humanity, which is recapitulated in the person of Christ, finally participates in salvation, thereby overturning the effects of Adam's disobedience (*Haer.* 3.23.1–8). Moreover, while *Haer.* 3.22.1–4 concerns the Pauline analogy between Adam as the formation from the dust and Christ's virgin birth, *Haer.* 3.23.1–8 is oriented around the contrary nature of Adam's disobedience and Christ's obedience. The chiasm in *Haer.* 3.23.1–8 is the natural theological and structural climax of Irenaeus' theology of recapitulation and polemical argument in *Haer.* 3.

The centerpiece of the chiasm is Adam's contrition before God in relation to Cain's insolence, which becomes a convenient paradigm for Irenaeus' distinction between the soteriological standing of the faithful and his opponents. Alluding to this section in particular, Steenberg suggests that if recapitulation is understood as a "coherent doctrine," it was necessary that the Word of God, the image after whom Adam was formed, become physical.[91] However, in Irenaeus' doctrine of recapitulation it was also necessary, as this chiasm demonstrates, that the work of Christ overturn the effects of Adam's disobedience and destroy sin, death, and the devil. From beginning to end, this chiasm is a cleverly constructed tapestry of texts that reveals the real sophistication of Irenaeus' intertextuality. He applies several different reading strategies including various typological relationships, illustrative application, and verbal associations.

---

89 A eariler version of this section was published separately as Stephen O. Presley, "The Lost Sheep who is Found: Irenaeus' Intertextual Reading of Genesis 3 in *Adversus Haereses* 3.23.1–8," *StuPat* 51 (2011): 47–59.

90 Donovan identifies the previous two chiasms (*Haer.* 3.18.2–3.18.7 and *Haer.* 3.19.1–21.9), but not the one located here in *Haer.* 3.23.1–8. Donovan, *One Right Reading?*, 83–5.

91 Steenberg, *Irenaeus*, 136.

4.8.1 *Gen 1–3 in the Chiasm of* Haer. *3.23.1–8*

Turning to the chiasm itself, *Haer*. 3.23.1–8 contains a web of textual allusions oriented by the events of Gen 3 and, in particular, the disobedience of Adam and Eve in Gen 3:5. Although Irenaeus is clearly interpreting the whole narrative of Gen 3, he does not cite every text and his reading intentionally alters the flow of the original. He also links a variety of other scripture references with his reading of Gen 3 as he reinterprets these passages in light of his theological polemic. Below is an overview of the main themes in each segment of the chiasm, along with the scriptural allusions present in each paragraph:

A. *Haer*. 3.23.1: The Serpent's deception and the hope of Adam's salvation (Gen 1:26, Gen 3:5, Matt 12:29, Luke 15:4–7,[92] Luke 19:10, Ac 1:7, 1 Cor 15:47, Eph 1:5, 9, 2 Tim 1:10)
    B. *Haer*. 3.23.2: Adam requires salvation (Gen 1:26; Matt 12:29)[93]
        C. *Haer*. 3.23.3: God curses Adam, Eve, and the Serpent (Gen 3:14, Gen 3:16, Gen 3:17–19, Matt 25:41)
            D. *Haer*. 3.23.4: Cain's insolence (Gen 4:7–8, Gen 4:9, Gen 4:11, Matt 23:35)
            D′. *Haer*. 3.23.5: Adam's humility (Gen 3:8, Gen 3:7, Gen 3:10, Gen 3:21, Gen 3:13, Prov 1:7)[94]
        C′. *Haer*. 3.23.6: God's compassion in Adam's expulsion: Gen 3:23–24, Rom 6:2, 10)
    B′. *Haer*. 3.23.7: The *protoevangelium* fulfilled in Christ (Gen 3:15, Psalm 90(91):13, Luke 10:19, Rom 5:12, 17, 1 Cor 15:26, 1 Cor 15:54–55, Gal 3:16, Gal 3:19, Rev 20:2/12:9)
A′. *Haer*. 3.23.8: Tatian and the continuation of the Serpent's deception (Gen 3:5, Luke 15:4–7, 1 Cor 15:22, Rom 5:20)

Every paragraph contains allusions to Gen 3 (or Gen 4 in the case of *Haer*. 3.23.4) and, although certain texts are rearranged in an unconventional manner, there is an obvious appreciation for the general chronological structure of the events alongside a Christological and typological reinterpretation of the whole narrative of Adam and Eve's disobedience and expulsion from paradise. Having established the Christological basis for recapitulation in the previous section (*Haer*. 3.19.1-*Haer*. 3.22.4) the arrangement takes on a more anthropological turn. He begins with deception of the serpent (Gen 3:5), followed by a

92 *Cf*. Matt 18:12–14.

93 *Cf*. Luke 11:21–22.

94 *Cf*. Prov 9:10 and Psalm 110(111):10.

discussion of the need for salvation for the one created in the image and likeness of God (Gen 1:26). Then he discusses the curses (Gen 3:14,16–19), Cain's response (Gen 4:7–11), Adam's response (Gen 3:7–13,21), the preparation for salvation in the expulsion (Gen 3:23–24), the prophesy of salvation in the *protoevangelium* (Gen 3:15), and the ongoing deception of the serpent in the form of Tatian and his disciples (Gen 3:5).

Summarizing the relationship between the corresponding sections, parallel allusions to Gen 3:5 in A and A′, frame the chiasm as a whole. Not only does this passage reflect Satan's deception in paradise, but also the teaching of Tatian, a contemporary to Irenaeus that was a disciple of Justin until his death. Afterwards Tatian is said to have defected from the church and adopted elements of the Gnostic myth. The sections of B and B′ describe the means of salvation for the one created in the image and likeness of God in Gen 1:26, which is predicted in the *protoevangelium* of Gen 3:15 cited in B′. This structural connection between B and B′ theologically unites the passages of Gen 1:26 and Gen 3:15 in Irenaeus' concept of salvation and ultimate triumph over the activity of Satan. Adam received the prophecy of salvation in Gen 3:15, so although the one created in the image and likeness of God is now destined to death, he has the promise that he will be vivified once again when the Son of God destroys death and restores the *imago Dei*. The sections of C and C′ concern the cursing of Adam, Eve, and the serpent in Gen 3:14, Gen 3:16, and Gen 3:17–19 and Adam and Eve's expulsion from paradise in Gen 3:23–24. Irenaeus notes that the curse was not against Adam personally but against the ground. Instead the fullness of the curse fell upon the serpent.[95] This is why Irenaeus comments on the curses in reverse order. He begins with Adam in Gen 3:17–19, then Eve, and then the serpent in Gen 3:14. He also believes that God acted compassionately when he drove Adam out of paradise so that he might receive salvation. The centerpiece of the chiasm is the comparison of Cain and Adam in D and D′, which casts the murderous actions of Cain in Gen 4:7–8, Gen 4:9, and Gen 4:11 as the inversion of Adam's humbling actions in Gen 3:8, Gen 3:7, Gen 3:10, Gen 3:21, and Gen 3:13. This section reflects the focal point of Irenaeus' argument and his reading of Gen 3:5. Irenaeus implores the faithful to withstand the deceptions of the heretics, who are obstinate like Cain, and instead choose to humble themselves before God as Adam and Eve in paradise. In doing so, the faithful will find salvation from Christ who overcomes the power of the serpent. This imagery of conquering the serpent in the opening and concluding paragraphs of the chiasm utilizes the imagery of lost sheep in Luke 15:47 alongside Gen 3:5 to illustrate how the work of Christ overturns the deception of the

95 *Cf. Epid* 16.

serpent and restores the lost humanity back to God. This summary, however, only scratches the surface of the more subtle nuances of Irenaeus' intertextual reading of Gen 3. Below we provide a closer evaluation of each individual section and the textual and theological interrelationships he fashions throughout *Haer*. 3.23.1–8.

4.8.2 *The Serpent's Deception and the Hope of Adam's Salvation* (*A*): Haer. *3.23.1* (*Gen 1:26, Gen 3:5*)

Irenaeus begins with the assertion that in order for humankind to have salvation, God must redeem Adam, who was the original creation from the dust. His argument, therefore, demonstrates a theological clustering of texts that are bound by common vocabulary and the imagery of Christ's restoration and recapitulation of Adam's disobedience.[96] The bookends of the chiasm (A and A′) allude to the activity of the serpent that deceived Adam and Eve in paradise (Gen 3:5). The Bishop of Lyons reminds the reader that this one who was deceived is the same one who was created in the image and likeness of God (Gen 1:26), but through the tantalizing propositions of serpent, Adam became a "vessel in his [Satan's] possession" (*enim possessionis eius vas, cf*. Matt 12:29). The humanity lost in Adam is, for Irenaeus, the lost sheep of Luke 15:4–7. Responding to Adam's predicament, the Lord has come to seek out and save lost humanity (Luke 19:10). He separates out the two verbs of Luke 19:10 (*requirentem*, ἀναζητῶυντα; *saluare*, σῶσαι) and replaces the imagery of "that which was lost" (τὸ ἀπολωλός) with the language of God's "handiwork" (*plasma*) that is fashioned in the image and likeness of God (Gen 1:26). However, this soteriological recovery was not the work of the Lord *alone*. The power (Acts 1:7) and will (Eph 1:5, 9) of God the Father so precisely arranged the divine economy to ensure the Word of God would successfully reverse the effects of Adam's disobedience. Irenaeus even draws the logical conclusion that if humankind, who had been created by God to live, were not restored to life then Satan would have prevailed over the will of God. Like the imagery of the lost sheep, the strong man is Satan who has captured the "vessel" (*uasa*) of humankind and subjected them to the power of death (Matt 12:29). There is no question that God was patient in the recovery of Adam, but recapitulation of Adam was fully realized when at last the "second man" (*secundum hominem*, 1 Cor 15:47) bound up the strong man who had ensnared Adam and spoiled his goods (Matt 12:29). He even parallels the spoiling of goods with the "emptying of death" (*euacuauit mortem*, κατήργήσε τὸν θάνατον) in 2 Tim 1:10. Although the first Adam (1Cor 15:47) became a vessel in the possession of Satan when the serpent deceived

96 *Haer*. 3.19.3 also combines Gen 2:7, Luke 15:4, and Eph 4:9 to draw a similar conclusion.

the first couple under the pretext of becoming gods (Gen 3:5), the second Adam bound up Satan and restored the humankind to life.

4.8.3 *Adam Requires Salvation* (*B*): Haer. *3.23.2* (*Gen 1:26*)

Given that Adam is the first-formed human person created in the image and likeness of God (Gen 1:26), by logical extension all humanity derives its form and substance from Adam's formation. Although he does not name Tatian in this context, his polemic against him is evident. Since Adam is God's original creation, it is only fitting and just that the extant of the Lord's salvific work, contra Tatian, should extend all the way back to the beginning. Irenaeus rejects the notion that some of Adam's progeny would find salvation, but not Adam himself. As an illustration he uses the example of a subjugating, hostile force, borrowing from Matt 12:29. It would be simply unjust, Irenaeus reasons, if the liberators freed only the children from captivity and not their fathers who were first enslaved. In the same way God, who is neither powerless nor unjust, would not release the children of Adam and not Adam himself.[97] Therefore, Adam and all his posterity require salvation.

4.8.4 *God Curses Adam, Eve and the Serpent* (*C*): Haer. *3.23.3* (*Gen 2:7, Gen 3:5, Gen 3:14, Gen 3:16, Gen 3:17–19*)

The third section of the chiasm concerns the cursing of Adam, Eve, and the serpent. Even though Adam transgressed the commands of God (Gen 3:5), Irenaeus points out that technically God did not curse Adam personally (Gen 3:17–19), but the earth that God had used to form Adam (Gen 2:7). For the reason, Adam must work the ground and ultimately return to the substance from which he was formed (Gen 3:19). Implicit in this allusion to Adam's curse is the penalty of death for Adam's disobedience against God's command in Gen 2:16–17. He also mentions Eve in passing who receives punishment for her disobedience (Gen 3:16). However, his primary purpose is to convey that Satan will receive the full measure of God's retribution when he is cast into the eternal fire (Matt 25:41). By reversing the literary pattern of the curses, he accentuates that the fullness of the curse fell upon the serpent. In addition, the common language of "accursed" (κατηραμενοι) links Gen 3:14 and Matt 25:41.[98] Alluding to this intertextual relationship, Irenaeus even concludes the curse of Gen 3:14 indicates the eternal fire was not originally prepared for Adam, but for the one who led him astray and those who follow him.[99]

97 *Haer*. 3.23.2.

98 *Haer*. 3.23.3.

99 *Haer*. 3.23.3.

4.8.5 *Cain's Insolence* (*D*): Haer. *3.23.4* (*Gen 3:1–5, Gen 4:7–8, Gen 4:9, Gen 4:11*)

The centerpiece of the chiasm (D and D′) is the typological contrast of the murderous actions of Cain in Gen 4:7–9 and Gen 4:11, with the humbling actions of Adam in Gen 3:7–8, Gen 3:10, Gen 3:21, and Gen 3:13. Satan's condemnation in the conclusion of Haer. 3.23.3 is liked with the discussion of Cain who, according to Irenaeus, did not make "an equitable division" (*recte diuisisset*) of his sacrifice, but instead was controlled by envy and malice believing "he could domineer over him" (*posse dominari eius*). Irenaeus links Cain's desire to "domineer" (*dominari*) over his brother Abel with the serpent deception in paradise (Gen 3:1–5). The actions of Cain are a manifestation of his state of mind that escalates into his contemptuous response to God, saying, "am I my brother's keeper?" (*numquid custos fratris mei sum ego?*, Gen 4:9). His retort is both "insolent" (*audaciter*) and "irreverent" (*irreuerenter*) and exposes the height of Cain's arrogance. He actually believes, Irenaeus infers, that he could "refute" (*frustrari*) the God who created all things. He views the act of insolence toward God an even greater sin than the murder of Abel, because it manifests Cain's arrogant state of mind. Therefore, Irenaeus envisions Cain as a type of the serpent whose actions manifest the motivations of the serpent.[100]

4.8.6 *Adam's Humility* (*D′*): Haer. *3.23.5* (*Gen 3:7–8, Gen 3:9–11, Gen 3:21*)

Whereas Cain was murderous and insolent, Adam's actions were "in every way contrary" (*omnia in contrarium*). Adam, Irenaeus comments, was seized by fear in Gen 3:7–8 and felt unworthy to appear before God in the midst of his disobedience. While Cain (and the serpent) believed he could challenge God, Adam was overcome with the fear of God (Prov 1:7). He concealed himself in shame and refused to speak with God (Gen 3:8). Moreover, while Cain was obstinate, Adam showed himself repentant when he girded himself with the fig leave in Gen 3:7. Irenaeus suggests that Adam specifically chose this leaf because the irritation of the plant reflects the gravity of his offense.[101] Kugel and Greer suggest that Irenaeus reads Adam's shame as a "necessary stage in the human education and growth."[102] Adam loses his "child-like" state and cultivates a "lustful

100 In a general sense, this parallelism points to the centrality of martyrdom in Irenaeus' thought and his emphasis on the martyr as the perfected Christian. See: Real Tremblay, "*Le martyre selon saint Irénée de Lyon*," *StudMor* 16 (1978): 167–189, 177; Behr, *Asceticism*, 78–9.

101 *Haer*. 3.23.5.

102 Kugel and Greer, *Early Biblical Interpretation*, 167–68.

propensity of the flesh."[103] However, the reference to Prov 1:7 and the act of covering themselves with fig leaves, as Behr suggests, is a self-imposed penitential act whereby Adam denied himself God's gift of growth and increase. Steenberg goes so far as to characterize the nature of the post-transgression economy as oriented toward repentance.[104] The comparison with Cain and the broader chiastic framework enhances Steenberg's thesis by linking the opposing actions of Cain and Adam to behaviors of the heretics. Irenaeus reads Adam's contrition in relationship to the rebellion of Cain (and the serpent's).

Whereas God curses Cain and the serpent, according to Irenaeus, God responds to Adam's humility with mercy by removing the fig leaves and covering him with "garments of skins" (*tunicas pellicias*, Gen 3:21).[105] The Valentinians, as Irenaeus has shown, use this text to illustrate the final stage of human formation as the sensible element of the human form.[106] Behr argues that the garments of skin simply refer to the life of Adam and Eve in apostasy, so for Irenaeus there is no special allegorical meaning in the garments.[107] Irenaeus also avoids any extended reflection upon this passage and does not mention it elsewhere. Thus, Irenaeus responds the Valentinian interpretation of this passage by merely reading the text within the narratival context of Adam's disobedience.[108] Irenaeus also points out that though God sought after and interrogated Adam and Eve (Gen 3:9–11), there was no need to interrogate the serpent because God already knew he was the primary instigator of the ordeal.[109] God detested the serpent for his actions and, for this reason, the full retribution of God fell upon him. On the other hand, God showed a propensity for compassion toward Adam.[110]

4.8.7 *God's Compassion in Adam's Expulsion* (*C′*): Haer. *3.23.6* (*Gen 2:9, Gen 3:19, Gen 3:23–24*)

In *Haer*. 3.23.6, Irenaeus continues his discussion of God's mercy upon Adam and characterizes his expulsion from paradise in Gen 3:23–24 and his dissolution of the flesh in Gen 3:19 as an act of compassion. He rejects the Gnostic suggestion that this expulsion was related to the knowledge Adam gained from

103 *Haer*. 3.23.5. Behr, *Asceticism*, 119.
104 Steenberg, *Irenaeus*, 180.
105 *Haer*. 3.23.5.
106 *Haer*. 1.5.5.
107 Behr, *Asceticism*, 119.
108 *Haer*. 1.5.5. *Cf. Haer*. 1.18.2.
109 *Haer*. 3.23.5.
110 *Haer*. 3.23.5.

eating of the tree. The tree of life, not the tree of knowledge of Good and Evil, garners Irenaeus attention. God removed him from the tree of life because God desired that humankind not remain forever in a state of sin. He links the "tree of life" (*lignum uitae*, Gen 2:9) and the one who "lives to God" (*uiuere Deo*, Rom 6:10) to argue that to be in the presence of the tree of life is to have life. God removes the first couple from the tree of life and erects a boundary to sin in death, because sin is destroyed in death when the flesh dissolves back into the earth (Gen 3:19) and sin ceases (Rom 6:7).[111] Behr notes here the "pedagogical aspect" of death in Irenaeus' thought that casts Adam's subjection to death as an act of mercy.[112] While the positive evaluation of death is found in other patristic writers, the pedagogical aspect of death is peculiar to Irenaeus. In the framework of the chiasm, even though God curses the first couple in Gen 3:14–16 and they are expelled from paradise and subject to death, all of these acts mercifully prepare Adam and Eve to receive life once again.

4.8.8 *The Protoevangelium Fulfilled in Christ* (*B′*): Haer. *3.23.7* (*Gen 3:15*)

Before God mercifully expelled Adam and Eve from paradise, God supplied them with the prophecy of salvation in Gen 3:15. The description of enmity between the serpent and the seed characterizes the nature of the postlapsarian economy. The opening lines of *Haer*. 3.23.7 convey intertextual relationships between Gen 3:15, Luke 10:19, and Gal 3:16,19 united by the language of "serpent," (*serpentem*) "enemy," (*inimici*) "seed," (*semen*) and the verb "tread upon" (*calcare*).[113] Irenaeus' allusion to Gen 3:15a is a simplified version of the initial two parallel statements in the Septuagint, and he converts the future tense "will put" (θήσω) into a perfect tense "has put" (*posuit*).[114] For Irenaeus, the prophecy of Gen 3:15 has been fulfilled, in part, though the first advent of Christ. The parallel clauses of Gen 3:15b: "He will bruise your head and you will strike his heel" (LXX: αὐτος σὺ τηρὴσει κεφαλὴν, καὶ σὺ τηρήσεις αύτου πτέρναν) in Irenaeus' reading are infused with the Christological imagery of Luke 10:19 and Gal 3:16,19. Referring to Christ, he converts the future tense of "he/you will bruise" (τηρὴσει, τηρήσεις) in Gen 3:15b LXX to the present passive "he is bitten" (*mordetur*) and "he has the power to tread upon" (*potente calcare*). This is the influence of Luke 10:19 that connects the authority of Christ over the power of Satan through the parallel imagery of "serpent" (*serpentem*) and "enemy" (*inimici*). The economic poles of the struggles between the seed and the

111 *Haer*. 3.23.6. *Cf*. Theophilus, *Ad. Auto* 2.26.

112 Behr, *Asceticism*, 52.

113 *Haer*. 3.23.7.

114 *Haer*. 3.23.7.

serpent in Gen 3:15 and Luke 10:19 suggests, for Irenaeus, the struggle has persisted throughout salvation history. He speaks of the serpent's activity as "impeding the steps of humankind" (*interpediente ingressus hominis*) which offers a theological interpretation of "bruising his heel" (τηρήσεις αύτου πτέρναν) in Gen 3:15. The deception of the serpent that began in paradise continues to inhibit the progression of salvation history and aims to make God's creatures disobedient toward their Creator.[115]

The mutual enmity between the serpent and the seed lasts until the appointed seed comes who has the power to overcome the enemy (Gal 3:16). This interpretation envisions Gal 3:19 and an implied allusion to Gal 3:16 as the fulfillment of the second clause of Gen 3:15b. For Irenaeus, the seed of Gal 3:19 is, alluding to prophecy of Gen 3:15, "predestined to tread upon his head" (*praedestinatum calcare caput eius*) which also links the infinitive ' "to tread upon" (*calcare*) drawn from Luke 10:19.[116] The added allusion to Gen 3:16 also identifies the parallels between prophecy given to Eve and the child who was "born of Mary" (*fuit partus Mariae*).[117] Therefore, the way Irenaeus weaves Gen 3:15, Luke 10:19, Gal 3:19, and Gal 3:16, exposes the conflation of texts through his theological hermeneutic. We have seen in *Haer*. 3.23.2 that Adam, who was created in the image and likeness of God, requires salvation and Irenaeus balances this assertion with the fulfillment of Satan's demise in Gen 3:15.

Finally, the concluding portion of *Haer*. 3.23.7 presents a string of theological, narratival, and linguistic intertextual connections to confirm the fulfillment of Gen 3:15 in Christ. This series of intertextual allusions includes: Psalm 90(91):13, Rom 5:12, 17, Rev 12:9/20:2, Luke 10:19–20, 1 Cor 15:26 and 1 Cor 15:54–55. This network of scriptures are textual buttresses for Irenaeus' theological connections between the *protoevangelium* and the Christ event. First, he depicts sin's activity in anthropomorphic imagery as overpowering and subjecting humankind to death (Rom 5:12,17). In relation to this imagery, he interprets the prophecy of Psalm 90(91):13, "you will tread upon the asp and basilisk" (*Super aspidem er basiliscum ambulabis*), as the destruction of the sin and death inflicted by the serpent in paradise. He makes this connection explicit when he links the "dragon" (*draconem*) in Psalm 90(91):13 with the Antichrist, or "dragon that old serpent" (*draconem illum serpentem uetustum*)

115 A similar concept is expressed in *Haer*. 3.23.6, where God is said to have compassion "gradually" (*sensim*) upon humankind. This impeding the growth must be an echo of the growth and increase of humanity in Gen 1:28.

116 *Haer*. 3.23.7.

117 Although other passages may be influencing this title the connections to Gal 3:19 and Gen 3:15 support this allusion to Gal 3:16. *cf*. Matt 1:16, 20; Luke 2:5.

of Rev 12:9/20:2. Though the fulfillment of Gen 3:15 and Psalm 90(91):13, the Antichrist-dragon-serpent that originally inflicted sin and death upon Adam is finally subject to the "power of humankind" (*subiciens potestati hominis*) in the person of Christ and "trodden down" (*adligans*, Luke 10:19). This act of treading upon the serpent's head in Gen 3:15, Psalm 90(91):13, and Luke 10:19 is fully realized in Rev 12:9/20:2, where the serpent of old is put down and cast away. The implication of Christ's work is that death has been destroyed and humankind has been liberated from the power of the serpent that subdued Adam and Eve in the Garden (1 Cor 15:26, 54–55). The destruction of death in 1 Cor 15:26, 54–55 is the consummative fulfillment of Gen 3:15 and the essential description of the salvation of humankind. For Irenaeus, Adam's "salvation is death's destruction" (*enim salus euacuatio est mortis*). This section brings resolution to the human need for salvation mentioned in the corresponding section of the chiasm and the exposes the complexities of his intertextual reading of Gen 3. The whole section is contingent upon Gen 3:15, which according to Irenaeus lays the groundwork for the understanding of the work of Christ and the overcoming of sin, death, and the devil.

4.8.9 *Tatian and the Continuation of the Serpent's Deception* (*A′*): Haer. *3.23.8* (*Gen 3:1–6, Gen 3:15*)

In his closing section, Irenaeus returns again to his polemical argument. According to Irenaeus, Tatian is promoting the teaching that Adam himself is excluded from salvation. Summarizing Tatian's views, Petersen writes, "The key to Tatian's system is gnosis, 'knowledge' " . . . although Adam *had* knowledge of God, he—through freewill—rejected it.'[118] As a result, Adam chose to reject the knowledge of God and is excluded from salvation, but those who desire to grasp the true knowledge of God may find salvation in Gnosis. Irenaeus responds to this train of thought by arguing that if Adam is not saved then all of Adam's posterity remains in a state of perdition. For Irenaeus, on the other hand, the lost sheep of humanity who had sinned through disobedience are found in the person of Christ (Luke 15:4–7). Irenaeus' response to Tatian is not merely a competing interpretations of Gen 3, but a competing system of interpretation built upon various intertextual connections. Through his intricate web of allusions, Irenaeus demonstrates how the power of God has prevailed over the serpent (Rom 5:20).

The closing lines of *Haer*. 3.23.8 contain a final allusion to Gen 3:5, which knits together the whole structure of the chiasm (A and A′) and parallels the activity of the serpent with the activity of Tatian and his disciples. Irenaeus

118 Petersen, "Tatian the Assyrian," 151.

identifies those who promote the doctrines of Tatian as contemporary manifestations of the serpent's deceptive activity. As the serpent led Adam and Eve astray by means of deception and falsehood, Tatian and his disciples reveal themselves as "patrons of the serpent and of death" (*aduocatos se serpentis et mortis ostendunt*).[119] However, just as the serpent "accomplished nothing" (*nihil profecit*) when he persuaded Adam and Eve to sin in Gen 3:5, Tatian and his disciples accomplish nothing in their exclusion of Adam's salvation.[120] In this reading, Irenaeus dramatizes the text in a way that reapplies the narrative of Adam's disobedience in Gen 3:1–6 to the struggles of his own community. Just as Adam and Eve stood beneath the tree in paradise and gave way to the temptations the serpent, so also do the faithful stand before the doctrines of Tatian and must choose to endure the intellectual enticements. For Irenaeus, the true knowledge of God is found in the work of Christ who has fulfilled the prophecy of Gen 3:15 and enabled the salvation of humankind. The faithful should also learn from Adam's mistake and, rather than becoming obstinate like Cain (who also manifests the attitude of the serpent) model Adam's contrition before God.[121]

4.8.10 *Summary of Irenaeus' Reading of Gen 1–3 in* Haer. *3.23.1–8*

In conclusion, this section is one of the most developed examples of Irenaeus' intertextual reading of Gen 1–3. The chiasm of *Haer*. 3.23.1–8 centers on his reading of the events in Gen 3 and functions as the climax of Irenaeus' recapitulation argument spanning *Haer*. 3.18.2–3.22.4. The Incarnation and recapitulation of all things in Christ affects the salvation of humankind and the destruction of sin, death, and the devil. Irenaeus' reading of Gen 3 alters the chronology of the original narrative in order to demonstrate his theological and Christological application of the events. The entire chiasm is framed with the activity of the serpent in the narrative of Gen 3:1–5 and the corresponding teachings in the doctrines of Tatian (A and A′).[122] Following Adam's disobedience, both he and his posterity require salvation. This is prophesied in Gen 3:15 and fulfilled in the person of Christ (B and B′).[123] Though Adam, Eve, and the serpent were subject to God's curses, the full measure of his retribution fell upon the serpent and Adam and Eve were expelled from paradise in

119 *Haer*. 3.28.8.
120 *Haer*. 3.28.8.
121 *Haer*. 3.23.4–5.
122 *Haer*. 3.23.1,8.
123 *Haer*. 3.23.2, 7.

Gen 3:23–24 to prepare them for salvation (C and C′).[124] Throughout the course of the divine economy, the serpent has been striving to impede the progression of salvation for God's people (Gen 3:15). In the climax of the chiasm, Irenaeus compares the antithetical actions of Cain and Adam in response to God (D and D′).[125] When God questioned Cain, he was obstinate (Gen 4:9), but Adam's humbling actions were in every way contrary (Gen 3:7–8). In the same way, Irenaeus implores the faithful not to be obstinate before God like Cain, but humble as Adam. In doing so, he argues, the faithful will find salvation from the one who has trampled upon the serpent's head and restored the lost sheep of humanity to the fold of life.

For Irenaeus, Gen 3 could only be properly read within carefully constructed scriptural networks of interrelated texts. These networks include theological arrangements of the narrative in Gen 3, as well as tissues of texts spanning both testaments. These networks are bound together by the common imagery of Christ's recapitulation of Adam's disobedience. This includes the terms that correspond to Adam's formation such as the terms "first Adam" (1 Cor 15:47), "vessel" (Matt 12:29), and "sheep" (Luke 15:4–7), as well as the eschatological use of the language "image" and "likeness." The discussion of Adam's disobedience draws together other terms such as: "life" (Rom 6:10), "serpent," (Luke 10:19, Ps 90(91):13), "enemy" (Luke 10:19), "dragon" (Rev 12:9/20:2), and "seed" (Gen 3:15, Gal 3:16, 19), Irenaeus will also reorder the events in the text, such as the curses in Gen 3:14–19, in order to emphasize a particular theological point. He also utilizes typological relationships when he frames an Adam-Cain typology. The relationship is primarily contrastive as Adam's actions are in every way dissimilar to Cain. Finally, Irenaeus readily applies the narrative of Adam's disobedience to the polemical context of his own community, and the theological challenges of his opponents.

4.9 The Church, the Spirit, and the Knowledge of God: *Haer.* 3.24.1–2

In the closing chapters of *Haer*. 3, Irenaeus is confident he has exposed the errors of his opposition and defended nature of God as Creator, Christ as fully divine and human, and the comprehensive salvific work of Christ epitomized in the preaching of the church. He also believes he has done so from the whole testimony of the apostles and prophets in the scriptures including the

124 *Haer*. 3.23.3, 6.

125 *Haer*. 3.23.4–5.

"beginning, the middle and the end" (*per initia et medietates et finem*).[126] The Bishop of Lyons identifies the content of the apostolic testimony as the unfolding of the redemptive history, which he describes as a perfect process that guides the faithful towards salvation. This imagery leads to an illustrative application of Gen 2:7 to the work of the Spirit in the church. Conflating Gen 1:26, Gen 1:28, and Gen 2:7, he also characterizes the knowledge of God as Creator as the fundamental feature of the preaching of the church.

4.9.1 *The Church, the Body and the Spirit*: Haer. *3.24.1* (*Gen 2:7*)

In the closing chapters, Irenaeus adds the pneumatological conclusion to Christ's recapitulative work. Christ unites God to the human formation in himself and then imparts the Spirit as the means to vivify the mortal flesh of all the faithful in the church.[127] He imagines the human person as a "vessel" (*vaso*, Matt 12:29) containing the "precious deposit" (*eximium . . . depositum*) of the faith of the church.[128] The change of the inflection in the participles from perfect passive to present active signifies the tension in Irenaeus' thinking between the faith of the church that has been entrusted and the Holy Spirit that has been deposited with the people of God who are receiving them. By means of the Holy Spirit, the faith of the church continually renews the life of the vessel preserving the youthful nature of the vessel itself. Conflating the language of the "gift of God" (*Dei munus*) from Eph 2:8 with the creation scene of Gen 2:7, Irenaeus imagines the impartation of the breath of God in Gen 2:7 as the same manner of the gift of the Holy Spirit being imparted to the church.[129] Just as the breath of God enlivened the formation of Adam in Gen 2:7, the gift of faith entrusted to the church enlivens the faithful.[130] This life is also sustained through the operations of the Spirit in 1 Cor 12:11, who are the apostles, prophets and teachers mentioned in 1 Cor 12:28. Those who remain outside the church, again echoing the imagery of Gen 2:7, "defraud themselves of life" (*fraudant a uita*).[131]

---

126 *Haer*. 3.24.1. In the context the "beginning middle and end" appear to be the Old Testament, the Apostolic writings and the Church.

127 Behr, *Asceticism*, 66.

128 The term "vessal" *uaso* is a common Irenaean image*: Haer*. 3.8.2, *Haer*. 3.18.6, *Haer*. 3.23.1, *Haer*. 4.33.4, and *Haer*. 5.22.1.

129 *Haer*. 3.24.1.

130 In the remaining portion of *Haer*. 3.24.1 continues to describe the deposit (*deposita est*) of the Holy Spirit into the church. He characterizes the work of the Spirit with three aspects drawn from other texts: "pledge of incorruption" (*arrha incorruptelae*) in Eph 1:14, "confirmation" (*confirmatio*) in Col 2:7, and "ladder of ascent" (*scala ascensionis*) in Gen 28:12.

131 *Haer*. 3.24.2.

4.9.2 *The Knowledge of the Creator*: Haer. *3.24.2* (*Gen 1:26, Gen 1:28, Gen 2:7*)

Finally, the last allusion to Gen 1–3 comes in *Haer*. 3.24.2, where Irenaeus makes one last critique of his opponents by suggesting the Gnostics reject *a priori* any conception of God within grasp of human knowledge. According to Irenaeus, the fundamental knowledge of God accessible to the human mind is the understanding of God as Creator. In making this assertion, Irenaeus implies his Gnostics opponents reject the basic premise of all reality, the knowledge of the God revealed in the formation of humankind, which Behr terms the "pedagogy of the economy."[132] In the midst of this polemic, Irenaeus draws together a network of passages that insist the knowledge of God accessible to all is the knowledge of the God, "who created [Gen 1:26] and formed [Gen 2:7a] and breathed into us the breath of life [Gen 2:7b] and nurtures us through creation [Gen 1:28], strengthening us by His Word [Psalm 32(33):6], and binding all things together in His Wisdom [Prov 8:30], this is who is the one true God" (*qui fecit et plasmauit et insufflationem uitae insufflauit in eis et per conditionem nutrit nos, Verbo suo confirmans et Sapientia compingens omnis, hic est qui est solus uerus Deus*).[133] For Irenaeus, the concern is the connection between the Creator and the creature and the knowledge of God's act of creation, not necessarily God's "greatness" (*magnitudinem*) or even God's "nature" (*substantiam*).[134] Instead, this narratival arrangement of creation texts is bound up with the identity of God and the nature of God's relationship to humanity. The movement from Gen 1:26, Gen 2:7, Gen 1:28, Psalm 32(33):6, and Prov 8:30 is not an unusual cluster of texts for Irenaeus.[135] The verb *fecit* refers to the act of creation in the image and likeness of God (Gen 1:26), while *plasmauit* depicts the act of forming Adam from the dust (Gen 2:7). The remaining portion of Gen 2:7b is cited in the reference to the breathing in of the breath of life. The phrase "nurtures us through creation" (*et per conditionem nutrit nos*) is an echo of Gen 1:28 that describes the growth and maturity of humankind in and through what is created.[136] This connection points to the creation texts Psalm 32(33):6 and Prov 8:30 and described the "strengthening" (*confirmans*) of the Word and the

132 Behr, *Asceticism*, 67.

133 *Haer*. 3.24.2.

134 *Haer*. 3.24.2.

135 *Cf. Haer*. 2.28.1; *Haer*. 3.3.3.

136 The retroversion parallels the terms "nourish" τρέφοντα and "increase" αὔξοντα the latter of which is the same term used in Gen 1:28 LXX. *cf. Epid* 11, 14; *Haer*. 3.10.3; *Haer*. 3.22.4; *Haer*. 4.11.1.

"binding all things together" (*compingens omnia*) in Wisdom.[137] The notions of strengthening and binding are economic actions of the Son and the Spirit that progress humanity toward their appointed salvation. This is why Irenaeus considers Gnostics to produce errant aberrations of the text, because they reject the very basic knowledge of God as Creator.

4.10 Conclusion: Irenaeus' Intertextual Reading of Gen 1–3 in *Haer.* 3

With the close of *Haer*. 3, Irenaeus has completed the first summary of his own theological system in response to the heretics. The contribution of Gen 1–3 serves to support the activity of God among his creatures from creation to glorification. The use of Gen 1–3, however, is intricately connected to a multitude of other passages that are carefully crafted into varying intertextual relationships through a host of reading strategies. These include narratival arrangement of the creation events in particular or salvation history in general, structural markers that arrange his argument, key terms and concepts unite texts through verbal associations, typological relationships that compare and contrast elements of Gen 1–3 with other figures in subsequent revelation, and finally illustrative application of texts. Irenaeus never offers isolated exegetical treatments of texts, but instead incorporates Gen 1–3 into networks of passages that communicate his theological framework. Below I summarize each of the readings strategies that Irenaeus utilizes in *Haer*. 3 and the way they contribute to Irenaeus' theological polemic.

First, Irenaeus continues to coordinate texts in a narratival relationship both among the texts of Gen 1–3 and externally with the rest of scripture. Gen 1–3 grounds or initiates the chronological development of the divine economy. This includes, first of all, framing Gen 1–2 in a single coherent narrative of creation. For example, in *Haer*. 3.24.2 he conflates brief allusions to Gen 1:26, Gen 2:7, and Gen 1:28 (in that order) to depict the basic narrative of the formation of Adam. Adam was created, received the breath of life, and nurtured by means of creation. Moreover, he also provides more general telescoped summaries of key events within the divine economy. In *Haer*. 3.3.3 his synopsis of work of God includes allusions to creation, the flood, Abraham, Exodus, Moses, Law, and Prophets. His allusions to Gen 1:1 and Gen 2:7 transform the verbs into titles for God as the "Maker" of heaven and earth and "Fashioner"

137 Although he is not explicit, the connection of these texts with the creation passages is reminiscent of the use of the hands imagery where the "Word" and the "Wisdom" are active in the formation and ordering of creation.

of humankind. The Maker and Fashioner is the main character administering over the other events of salvation history. He also frames the economy of God into a fourfold dispensation including the Adamic covenant, Noahic covenant, Mosaic Covenant, and New Covenant.[138] The fourfold nature of the covenants also correspond to the economy of the Son of God including his work in creation, appearance to the patriarchs, giving the law, and recapitulating all things in himself. The Adamic covenant, in particular, establishes the relationship with God, and corresponds closely to the New Covenant. In this strategy, Irenaeus provides little or no substantive commentary on these texts, but simply arranges them in a narrative framework to depict the continuity of the events of the divine economy under the administration of God. For Irenaeus, Gen 1–3 sets the stage of the divine drama of salvation, and all the turning points of redemption connect back to what happened in the opening scene.

Second, Irenaeus' intertextual reading of Gen 1–3 uses these passages to order and structure his work. In doing so, these texts can serve as structural markers, that hold together his arguments and, in doing so, communicate the importance of these passages amid his polemical debates. The organizational function of these texts is most evident in a series of chiasms that develop in later portion of the book. The texts of Gen 2:5 and Gen 2:7 frame the chiasm in *Haer*. 3.18.1 and *Haer*. 3.18.7, and Gen 2:7 and Gen 3:1–8 contribute to the first part of the chiasm in *Haer*. 3.19.3 and *Haer*. 3.20.1. His third chiasm in *Haer*. 3.23.1–8 is the most developed organizational function of Gen 1–3 and the climax of his recapitulative argument. Gen 3:5 frames this chiasm as a whole, but the intervening sections of the chiasm draw from an array of Genesis texts including: Gen 1:26, Gen 3:7–8, Gen 3:10, Gen 3:13, Gen 3:14, Gen 3:15, Gen 3:16, Gen 3:17–19, Gen 3:21, and Gen 3:23–24. In addition, Irenaeus uses a host of intertexts to interpret these passages including: Gen 4:7–8, Gen 4:9, Gen 4:11, Matt 12:29, Matt 25:41, Psalm 90(91):13, Prov 1:7, Luke 10:19, Rom 5:12, 17, Rom 6:2, 10, 1 Cor 15:26, 54–55, Gal 3:16, and Rev 20:2. The whole arrangement completes Irenaeus' theology of recapitulation, and reveals the Christological fulfillment of the prophecy of Gen 3:15. Outside of *Epid*. 11–16, this is the most developed and coherent reading of the events surrounding Adam's disobedience in Gen 3 in all of Irenaeus' extant work.

Third, a common means of coordinating passages is the use of terms or catchwords that make philological connections between texts. These connections can serve to define terms used in other passages of divine revelation or explain the theological connections between key textual images. In many cases these are explanatory in nature and qualify or define the key terms or themes

138 *Haer*. 3.11.8.

in Gen 1–3. The linking terms are also not necessarily identical words or even cognates, but often more general conceptual correspondence. For example, in *Haer*. 3.11.5 he links the miracle of the wedding feast at Cana with the creation of flora (Gen 1:11) and water (Gen 1:9). A particularly common linking term is the substance of Adam's flesh or "formation" (*plasma*) and the related terminology, which connects with the substance of *plasma*. This is not surprising given his overarching anti-Gnostic polemic. In *Haer*. 3.18.1, the language of "formation" (*plasma*) and "human being" (*hominem*) links Gen 2:7, John 1:14, and Eph 1:10. Similar imagery is located in *Haer*. 3.18.7, but he adds the allusion to the "virgin soil" (*terra rudis*) in Gen 2:5, which corresponds to the virgin birth of Christ and their subsequent contrastive acts of disobedience and obedience (Rom 5:12, 19). In *Haer*. 3.19.3 he relates Adam's "formation" (*plasma*) with the lost "sheep" (*ouem*) of Luke 15:4, and the "earth" (*terra*) of Eph 4:9. Similarly, in *Haer*. 3.21.10 he connects Adam's "formation" (*plasma*) that is drawn from the "untilled earth" (*rudi terra*) of Gen 2:5 with the Word of God who forms all things (John 1:3) and the Adam-Christ typology of Rom 5:12, 19. Then, in *Haer*. 3.22.1 Irenaeus describes the "meek" (*mites*) nature of the flesh that is fashioned from the "earth" (*terra*, Matt 5:5, Gen 2:7). The three concluding sections of the chiasm in *Haer*. 3.23.6–8, contain the imagery of "life" (*vitae*, Gen 2:9, Rom 6:10), "serpent" (*serpentem*, Gen 3:15, Psalm 90(91):13, Rev 12:9/20:2), "seed" (*semen*, Gen 3:15, Gal 3:16,19), and "to tread upon" (*calcare*, Gen 3:15, Luke 10:19). These provide intricate linguistic or verbal connections between Gen 3:15 and the person and work of Christ.

Fourth, there are also general typological connections that unite figures and other specific elements in Gen 1–3 with other persons or events in subsequent revelation. In most cases these connections are crafted through his theological perspective, and often closely related to a particular aspect of the work of Christ. The relationship between these texts is theologically symbiotic in the sense that each person or image supports, extends, or demarcates the interpretation of other persons or images in scripture. In other words, Gen 1–3 interprets other passages and other passages interpret Genesis. As I mentioned above in *Haer*. 3.11.5, the connections between Gen 1–2 and John 2 are ordered by a perspective that links that identity and work of the Creator with the identity and activity of Christ. A general Adam-Christ typology in *Haer*. 3.18.1 binds together Gen 2:7 and John 1:14, and these theological connections are supported by Deut 32:4 and Eph 1:10. The same theological perspective harmonizes Gen 2:5 with Rom 5:12,19, where Irenaeus' typological connections extend the logic of Paul's Adam-Christ typology. The "descending" (*descendere*) and "ascending" (*ascendere*) imagery in *Haer*. 3.19.3 binds the incarnation and the ascension though linking Isa 7:11, Luke 15:4–6, and Eph 4:9–10. The object

of salvation in each case is man formed from the dust of the earth (Gen 2:7). In *Haer*. 3.20.1, Irenaeus follows an Adam-Jonah typology and reads the account of Jonah in light of the events of the Garden alongside Matt 12:39–40 and 1 Cor 1:29. The "sign of Jonah" in Matt 12:39–40 is the controlling text, which serves to coordinate Jonah 1:9, Jonah 2:1–2, and Jonah 3:1, 8–9, with an allusion to the disobedience of Adam and Eve in Gen 3:5–8. In this reading, the "great whale" (*magna ceto*) is Satan, who deceives the first couple in the Garden, but Adam, like Jonah, received an unexpected salvation from the captivity of this "whale." In yet another typological relationship, Irenaeus reads the actions of Eve in correspondence to those of Mary in *Haer*. 3.22.1. Whereas Eve becomes the cause of death in Gen 3:6, Mary is the cause of salvation and resurrection in Luke 1:38, Heb 5:9, and Eph 4:16/Col 2:19. Finally, the chiasm of *Haer*. 3.23.1–8 and the closing sections abound with conceptual and theological connections, and there is also a general connection between creation in the image of God.

Fifth, he conflates texts using a method of prosopological interpretation where he identifies the divine persons functioning in Gen 1–3 and other related passages. Often times he will use an echo or allusion from a specific scripture text to identify the person functioning in Gen 1–3. For example, in *Haer*. 3.21.10 he identifies the Word of God creating all things in John 1:3 as the same person creating Adam in Gen 2:7, thereby conflating the identities of the Logos in both instances. Then, in the closing section of *Haer*. 3.24.2, he connects the activity of God in creation by reading the "Word" of Psalm 32(33):6 and the "Wisdom" of Prov 8:30 in continuity with Gen 1:26, Gen 1:28, and Gen 2:7. The Word and Wisdom are the hands of God overseeing the creative processes. This type of reading strategy becomes more prominent in *Haer*. 4–5.

Sixth, Irenaeus also demonstrates an illustrative application of texts, where he uses elements within a passage to exemplify a theological argument. In the case of Gen 1–3, first of all, this frequently takes the form of illustrating the nature of a particular aspect of the creative process or function of a particular person in the narrative. For example, when Irenaeus wants to connect the nature and character of the flesh formed from the dust in Gen 2:7 with Christ's experience in the body, he links the creation texts with a host of illustrative texts including: Matt 4:2, John 4:6, Psalm 68:27(69:26), John 11:35, Luke 22:44, Matt 26:38, and John 19:34.[139] Then in *Haer*. 3.19.3, Irenaeus cites a collection of passages that depict the resurrection of the flesh formed from the dust in Gen 2:7 including: 1 Cor 15:20, Eph 1:22/Col 1:18, Phil 3:9, 1 Cor 15:23, Col 2:19, Eph 4:16, John 14:2, Rom 12:4/1 Cor 12:12, 20. All of these passages illustrate the resurrection of the same body formed in Adam. Second, he also uses specific

139 *Haer*. 3.22.2.

images in Gen 1–3 as analogies or visual descriptions of a particular aspect of theology. In a similar way, he can apply a text to individuals or entities in his own context, as a way to illustrate their beliefs or behaviors. In *Haer*. 3.23.8, for example, he portrays the Gnostics as contemporary manifestations of the serpent, who, like the serpent, attempt to deceive the people of God and lead them into acts of disobedience. Then, in *Haer*. 3.24.1 he compares the breath of God that is imparted to Adam in Gen 2:7 with the church as the vessel of Matt 12:29 that has received the precious deposit of the Spirit. This kind of reading communicates that Irenaeus is not content with mere objective analysis, but views his own context as a continuation of the divine economy established in creation. The same substance and theology of creation, along with the same enemies that seek to destroy and dismember it are also manifested in his day among his congregation.

From beginning to end all of these reading strategies guide his intertextual reading of Gen 1–3 as he crafts his theological polemic against the Gnostics. For the Bishop of Lyons, the events of creation participate in the broader contours of his theological framework. He constantly mingles Gen 1–3 with other scriptural revelation with a series of reading strategies as he attempts to respond to his theological opponents. The complexities of these strategies continue to develop in *Haer*. 4–5 as he advances his Christological and anthropological perspectives.

CHAPTER 5

Genesis, the Creation, and the Divine Economy: The Intertextual Reception of Genesis 1–3 in Book 4 of *Adversus Haereses*

5.1 Introduction

Having analyzed the performance of Gen 1–3 in the first three books, the manner and style of Irenaeus intertextual scripture reading is beginning to take shape. The Bishop of Lyons is not so concerned with the isolated and individual meaning of any singular Genesis text, but the theological integration of Genesis with the rest of divine revelation. For Irenaeus, the meaning of Gen 1–3 is bound up in the correspondence of texts as he organizes his theological polemic through a variety of reading strategies. Each new volume of *Adversus haereses* offers fresh aspects of Irenaeus' intertextuality that continue to reveal the resourcefulness of his textual integration.

In *Haer*. 4 his exegetical focus shifts from the writings of the apostles in the previous book to the "words of the Lord."[1] His purpose is to prove the existence of one God who is active throughout all salvation history, which also builds upon the Christological defense he offered in *Haer*. 3. In general, the contents of *Haer*. 4 are organized into four larger sections. Following a short introduction, *Haer*. 4.1–19 argues there is one God who is both Creator and Administrator throughout both testaments as expressed in the words of the Lord. *Haer*. 4.20–35 anticipates the prophecy of the Old Testament in the New and some writers in the post-apostolic age. Finally, in *Haer*. 4.36–41 he concentrates on the proof of one God who is active throughout salvation history, as evidenced in the parables of Christ. The closing section, *Haer*. 4.41.4, contains a short conclusion summarizing the unity of God in the Lord's words and previews the argument for the resurrection of the body in *Haer*. 5. This general theological structure and focus on the words of the Lord continues to expand the various aspects of Irenaeus' textual integration.

1 Bacq argues convincingly that the "words of the Lord" give unity and coherence to *Haer*. 4 that was heretofore unrecognized. Bacq, *De l'ancienne*. While he does not achieve the magnitude of his work on *Haer*. 5, Antonio Orbe's translation and commentary on *Haer*. 4 is a pivotal for understanding the nature of this book. Orbe, *Teología IV*.

© KONINKLIJKE BRILL NV, LEIDEN, 2015 | DOI 10.1163/9789004294523_006

Within this arrangement, several chapters contain meaningful intertextual uses of Gen 1–3.[2] Many of these reading strategies are represented in previous books, but in most instances the specific nature of his textual integration is unique. The particular reading strategies that are applied to Gen 1–3 in *Haer*. 4 include: narratival arrangements, verbal connections, a close literary reading, typological connections, prosopological interpretations, illustrative application of texts, general-to-particular argumentation, and specific canonical arrangements of texts that coordinate texts from the Prophets, Gospels, and apostolic writings. These intertextual connections formed with Gen 1–3 continue to reveal the pivotal nature of Gen 1–3 in the thought of the Bishop of Lyons, and his intertextual reading of scripture.

5.2 The Heretics and Gen 1–3: *Haer*. 4.pf.3–4 (Gen 1:26, Gen 2:7, Gen 3:1–5)

The preface to *Haer*. 4 reminds the reader of Irenaeus' overall purpose, which is the detection and refutation of Gnosis by way of exposing the fallacies of their doctrinal systems. Irenaeus is most concerned with the representation of the Creator as defective and ignorant. In contrast to the heretics, he appeals to the authority of the apostles as eye-witnesses of the Lord's work and argues that they petitioned their disciples to reject the contentious opinions of the heretics because the "weak-minded" (*simpliciores*, 2 Tim 2:23) might be led astray.[3] In the spirit of the apostles, Irenaeus also envisions his own work as protecting the simple from the exploitation of the heretics. He goes so far as to cast the deceptive teaching of his opponents as manifestations of the seductions of the serpent in Gen 3:1–5. This connection links this preface with a similar depiction in the closing lines of *Haer*. 3.[4] For Irenaeus, those who claim to have "superior knowledge and ineffable mysteries" (*majorem agnitionem et mysteria inenarrabilia*, 2 Cor 11:3) carry out the same deception as the

2 *BP* notes several sections that include references to Gen 1–3, but the following were too general to make any meaningful contribution: Gen 3:1–6 in *Haer*. 4.2.7 and *Haer*. 4.24.1 (*cf*. Num 21:4–9), Gen 1:27 in *Haer*. 4.15.2 (*cf*. Matt 19:7–8), Gen 2:7 in *Haer*. 4.31.2 and *Haer*. 4.41.4, Gen 3:8 in *Haer*. 4.11.1, and Gen 1:26 in *Haer*. 4.37.7 (*cf*. Rom 8:29). In each of these instances there is no clear echo of Gen 1–3 and in most cases Irenaeus has another passage in mind (even if these text are not always distinguishable from his use of Gen 1–3).

3 *Haer*. 4.pf.3. Irenaeus identifies himself as one of these disciples with the first-person plural pronoun "us" (nobis). This means that, in a certain sense, Irenaeus views his refutation against the Gnostics as following the commission of the apostles themselves.

4 *Cf. Haer*. 3.23.8.

serpent.[5] Like Adam, the weak-minded are those who are deceived by the heretics become apostate from the church and subject to death. In this way, Irenaeus uses Gen 3:1–5 as *illustration* that exemplifies how the faithful should heed the words of the apostles and reject the teaching of the Gnostics.

Irenaeus recognizes that for all their differences the various Gnostic sects are unified in the general rejection of the Creator God in Genesis, which he believes necessarily disparages salvation. Echoing the imagery of Gen 2:7, he describes the composition of humanity as a "mixed organization of soul and flesh" (*temperatio animae et carnis*).[6] The union of the soul and the flesh is reflective of the fashioning of the body and the impartation of the breath/soul derived from Gen 2:7, where God, taking dust from the earth molds the man and breathes into him the breath of life. He conflates Gen 1:26 with his description of a bipartite formation where humankind "was formed after the likeness of God, and molded by His hands, that is, by the Son and Holy Spirit, to whom also He said, 'Let Us make man' " (*secundum similitudinem Dei formatus est et per manus ejus plasmatus est, hoc est per Filium et Spiritum, quibus et dixit: Faciamus hominem*).[7] The emphasis on the first-person plural subjunctive verb, "Let Us make" (*Faciamus*) most naturally applies to the activity of the Son and the Spirit, which exemplifies his prosopological reading of texts.[8] He works from the pronouns and the imagery of God forming Adam to imagine a triune God harmoniously ordering creation.

The Valentinians and other Gnostics also applied a Gnostic prosopological reading and identified a variety of angelic beings and powers working in these passages. Irenaeus has directly mentioned the function of angels in his summaries of Valentinus, Menander, Saturninus, Basilides, and Carpocrates.[9] Those who have departed from the notion of God as Creator have rejected the "salvation of God's workmanship, which is the flesh."[10] Salvation, as Irenaeus will make explicit a few lines later, is the restoration of the whole person that is body and soul. This reading views Gen 1–2 as one creation in two aspects, where Gen 1:26 and Gen 2:7 each contributes something to the formation of humanity. Gen 2:7 describes the constitution of the human person, including body and soul, while Gen 1:26 describes how this human person is made in the

5 *Haer*. 4.pf.4.

6 *Haer*. 4.pf.4.

7 *Haer*. 4.pf.4.

8 Steenberg, *Irenaeus*, 74. The same manner of interpretation is found in *Epid* 55, *Haer*. 4.20.1, *Haer*. 5.1.3, and *Haer*. 5.15.4.

9 See: *Haer*. 1.23.5; *Haer*. 1.24.1–4; *Haer*. 1.25.1.

10 *Haer*. 4.pf.4. contradicant saluti plasmatis Dei, quod quidem est caro.

image and likeness of God. The rejection of the salvation of the whole person is the link between 2 Cor 11:3 and the activity of Satan in the Garden, and the promulgation of the Gnostic teaching. Just as the serpent deceived Adam and Eve and led them to death, so now the Gnostics are deceiving the faithful and turning them away from the church.

5.3 The Framer, Maker, and Nourisher of Creation: *Haer*. 4.6.2 (Gen 1:26, Gen 1:28, Gen 2:7)

After the preface, the next allusion to Gen 1–3 surfaces in *Haer*. 4.6.2. This chapter is crucial for determining Irenaeus' dependence upon Justin. Focusing upon this section, Michael Slusser summarized the various positions and argued persuasively that Irenaeus studied under Justin and learned "all that Justin had to teach him."[11] This is the only instance where Irenaeus cites a portion of Justin's lost work against Marcion and the citation of Justin is part of a broader evaluation of the Valentinian reading of Matt 11:27.[12] This section is also important because it reveals that Irenaeus' intertextual networking is not completely novel.[13] His intertextual connections are inculcated from others who instructed him in the faith. Irenaeus' reports that, in light of his own polemic against Marcion, Justin argues for the continuity between the Creator and the Son of God.

The citation of Justin in *Haer*. 4.6.2 begins with an echo of Christ's words in John 5:31, but he reinterprets the language to say, "I [Justin] would not have believed even the Lord Himself, if He had announced any other than He who is our Framer, Maker and Nourisher" (*Ipsi quoque Domino non credidissem*

11 Slusser, "How Much," 520. One of the more significant disagreements is the length of his citation of Justin. The last clause refers to Christ's work of recapitulation, which, if original, may suggest that Irenaeus derived his doctrine of recapitulation from Justin. Among other arguments, scholars who opt for the shorter reading point to the parallel citation in Eusebius who omits the final clause. Slusser, "How Much." 518, Eusebius *H.E.* 4.18.9. See also Steenberg, *Irenaeus*, 17–18; Grant, *Irenaeus*, 39.

12 Slusser, "How Much," 519. Eusebius mentions this work, as well as Photius. See *EH* 4.18.9. Orbe has an extensive treatment of this chapter evaluating the competing Irenaean and Valentinian readings of Matt 11:27 (along with Origen). Orbe, "La Revelacion Del Hijo Por el Padre Segun San Ireneo (*Adv. Haer*. IV,6): Para la exegesis precivena de Matt 11,27," in *Teología De San Ireneo IV: Traducción y Comentario del Libro IV del 'Adversus haereses'* (Madrid: Biblioteca de Autores Cristianos, 1996): 50–103, originally published in *Greg* 51 (1970): 5–83.

13 See also discussion of Presbyter in *Haer*. 4.32.1.

alterum Deum annuntianti praeter Fabricatorem et Factorem et Nutritorem).[14] For Justin (and Irenaeus), contra Marcion, the relationship between the Father and the Creator and the Son is so essential that he would not believe the incarnate Son if he denied his relationship to the Creator.[15] Only the Creator, who is revealed in Christ, is able to form, nourish, and bring humanity to the appointed consummation.[16] The three titles "Framer" (*Fabricatorem*), "Maker" (*Factorem*) and "Nourisher" (*Nutritorem*) are echoes of the creation of humanity in Gen 1–2. Although the verbs are not exactly parallel, the three-fold allusion mirrors the three prominent creation texts: Gen 1:26, Gen 2:7, and Gen 1:28 (in that order). Irenaeus uses a variety of verbal cognates to describe the creation and preservation of Adam.[17] These are not incremental or progressive in relationship —that is the interpretation of the Gnostics—but the three-fold use of the verbal titles indicates his harmonious reading of Gen 1–2, where all the titles refer to the same divine being.[18] The prosopological style of reading is clear in the transformation of the key verbs into titles for God in order to identify God as the one and only divine being creating humankind in Genesis.[19]

The prosopological reading of creation texts in Gen 1–2 is also supported with echoes of Gen 1–2 that refer to the Son of God who "made this world" (*mundum fecit*), "formed" (*plasmavit*) humanity and "administers" (*administrat*) all things. The administration over creation also anticipates the Incarnation, where he "recapitulates his own handiwork in himself" (*suum plasma in semetipsum recapitulans*, Eph 1:10).[20] The language of *plasma* is a common reference to the substance of Adam's formation in Gen 2:7 that unites this text with Eph 1:10. For Justin (and Irenaeus) the echoes of the creation of the world, creation of humankind, and the administration of "all things" fashion a brief narratival arrangement that binds the creation accounts and links these passages to the incarnation. These connections serve his purpose

14 *Haer*. 4.6.2. Similar argument and imagery is found in *Haer*. 4.6.6 and *Haer*. 4.7.4.

15 *EH* 4.18.9. Eusebius notes that Irenaeus cites Justin, but his citation only mentions the language of "Creator" rather than of the three titles.

16 Orbe, "La Revelacion," 58.

17 He typically cites *faciamus* in Gen 1:26 (*Haer*. 4.20.1, *Haer*. 5.1.3), *plasmavit* in Gen 2:7 (*Haer*. 4.11.1, *Haer*. 4.20.1) and *crescite et multiplicamini* in Gen 1:28 (*Haer*. 4.11.1). However, Irenaeus' style and argument frequently employs cognates and parallels. For example, in *Haer*. 4.11.1 he states that God "formed" (*plasmavit*) Adam for "growth and increase" (*augmentum et incrementum*) and he also uses *factus Haer*. 3.23.3 to refer to Gen 1:26.

18 See also *Haer*. 2.28.1. *Haer*. 3.24.2, *Haer*. 4.38.3, and the discussion of scriptural titles in *Haer*. 3.7.2.

19 See a similar use of titles in *Haer*. 3.3.3.

20 *Haer*. 4.6.2.

by uniting the Creator and the Father of Christ, and at least this intention was handed down from Justin.

5.4 The Son of God Conversing with Adam: *Haer*. 4.10.1 (Gen 3:9)

As I mentioned above, the whole of Haer. 4.1–19 addresses the continuity of the work of God throughout both testaments. In *Haer*. 4.10.1 this argument take the form of citing examples of Old Testament theophanies and Christophanies, which applies the particular style of prosopological interpretation. Drawing upon Christ's own assertion that Moses spoke of him in John 5:39–40, Irenaeus suggests that the "Son of God is implanted everywhere throughout his Scriptures" (*inseminatus est ubique in Scripturis ejus Filius Dei*).[21] As general evidence he lists a series of Christophanies in the Mosaic writings, including the Son of God conversing with Adam in Gen 3, Abraham in Gen 18, Noah in Gen 6, and Moses in Exod 3. These appearances are exemplary because he concludes there are countless instances where the writings of the Old Testament reveal the Son.[22] His reference to the Son's "inquiring after Adam" (*autem quaerens Adam*) in Gen 3:9 identifies the moment when Adam and Eve hid from God following their disobedience in Gen 3:6. In this context he offers little commentary because he is not explaining why the Son conversed with Adam, but how this passage participates in a number of theophanic accounts where the Son of God is found interacting with God's people in creation. Gen 3:9 is the first of many Christophanies and prophecies hidden in the Mosaic writings that *illustrate* how the Mosaic writings spoke of Christ (John 5:39–40; John 5:46). This series of illustrative texts gives a scriptural framing to his prosopological reading of other passages. The words of the Lord confirm that the scriptures testify of Christ, so the true interpreter of scripture should search out the scripture and find the person of Christ active within them.

5.5 The Divine Economy and the Growth of Humankind: *Haer*. 4.11.1–2 (Gen 1:28)

Irenaeus continues arguing for the unity of both testaments in *Haer*. 4.11.1–2 by explaining that the purposes of creation are never separated from the unfolding nature of the divine economy. This section offers a narratival reading of the

21 *Haer*. 4.10.1.

22 *Haer*. 4.10.1. *Cf. Epid* 43–46.

creation accounts that is evident in the opening lines of *Haer*. 4.11.2 summarize this view with a well-known Irenaean axiom: "God makes, but the human being is made" (*Deus quidem facit, homo autem fit*).[23] The present tense of *facit* and *fit*, suggest creation is not a singular event but an ongoing process whereby God perpetually forms the human person and prepares them for resurrection. Behr describes this view as the "unalterable fact of creation."[24] God is always the same, but humanity must receive a "beginning, middle, and addition with increase" (*initium et medietatem et adjectionem et augmentum*).[25] For Irenaeus, God is completely self-sufficient, but the creature has unremitting need.[26]

This need is epitomized in the salvation and perfection of humanity achieved through the organized trajectory of established in the creation mandate of Gen 1:28: "Increase and multiply" (*Crescite et multiplicamini*). Irenaeus' read Gen 1:28 in a narratival sense as a paradigm for the growth and advancement of humankind toward God saying, "For He formed him for growth and increase, as the Scripture says: Increase and multiply" (*Plasmavit enim eum in augmentum et incrementum, quemadmodum Scriptura dicit: Crescite et multiplicamini*).[27] Steenberg rightly summarizes the human aspect of Irenaeus' general reading of Gen 1:28, which establishes "the necessity for the course of humanity's growth via the implication of a temporal ascendancy in the command."[28] But this text also frames the trinitarian activity initiated by the command. Orbe observes the two-fold implication of Gen 1:28, where the Word of God continually forms the human person, even as the human person maintains obedience in faith. The Son, obeying the Fathers' command, actively enables the human advancement in salvation. What is more, throughout the events transpiring

---

23 *Haer*. 4.11.2.

24 Behr, *Asceticism*, 37.

25 *Haer*. 4.11.2; Steenberg identifies a parallel passage in Philo, who also cites Plato. Steenberg, *Irenaeus*, 35.

26 D. Jeffrey Bingham, "Christianizing Divine Aseity: Irenaeus reads John" in *The Gospel of John in Christian Theology*, eds. Richard Bauckham and Carl Mosser (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008): 53–67, 55. Steenberg distinguishes between spatial, temporal, and cooperative self-sufficiency. Steenberg, *Irenaeus*, 73.

27 *Haer*. 4.11.1. Steenberg undervalues the broader influence of this passage, only mentioning the citation of Gen 1:28 in this context and a second allusion in *Haer*. 3.22.4. The latter allusion he sets aside as "incidental." Irenaeus alludes to Gen 1:28 in several other contexts: *Epid* 11, *Haer*. 1.28.1, *Haer*. 2.28.1, *Haer*. 3.24.2, *Haer*. 4.38.3, and *Haer*. 5.33.3–4. Steenberg, *Irenaeus*, 97.

28 Steenberg, *Irenaeus*, 96. *Cf*. Bacq, *De l'ancienne*, 96 n. 2. Behr *Asceticism*, 37 n. 12. Behr mentions Gen 1:28 several times, but does not develop Irenaeus' reading of this text. Behr, *Asceticism*, 116–27.

within the divine economy, the messianic expectation of the Old Testament prophets is evident. Citing Matt 13:17, Irenaeus reasons that the prophets desired to see the advent of the Son in every episode of redemption. He specifically mentions the activity of the Word of God conversing with his creatures and dictating the law, along with the general description of the times where God reproved and exhorted his people. All of these actions are organized in such a manner to bring Adam to a state of perfection, because Adam is by nature formed for growth and increase. This distinction, therefore, demonstrates the personal and progressive nature of Irenaeus' reading of Gen 1:28 that directs the faithful toward sanctification and glorification. In this sense, Irenaeus' reading of Gen 1:28 is paradigmatic for the whole course of the divine economy and the growth of the faithful toward God.

In *Haer*. 4.11.2 Irenaeus also uses the notions of "growth and increase" (*augmentum et incrementum*) found in Gen 1:28 to contrast divine aseity with human necessity. The Bishop of Lyons argues that God is perfect, but humankind receives "advancement and increase towards God" (*percipiens et augmentum ad Deum*).[29] In other words, God creates and humanity is created. God gives and humanity receives. Nevertheless, the human person must allow God to work out his or her salvation.[30] Those who are grateful toward God become receptors of God's goodness. They are the "good and faithful servant" (*serve bone et fidelis*) of Matt 25:21 who are continually given an increasing amount of administration and continuously bearing fruit unto eternal life. But those who reject the creative activity of God become the receptors of his judgment.[31] In the reading of Irenaeus, Matt 25:21 illustrates the way that Gen 1:28 functions in the course of the divine economy. It confirms and qualifies the nature of growth and increase in Gen 1:28 that incrementally prepares the faithful to receive God.[32]

29 *Haer*. 4.11.2.

30 Behr, *Asceticism*, 40.

31 *Haer*. 4.11.2.

32 Behr has read this passage in light of *Haer*. 3.22.4 to communicate the developing sexuality in the prelapsarian Adamic state, which has some merit, but Steenberg is right to point to the Christological focus of this passage. Steenberg, *Irenaeus*, 97; Behr, "Irenaeus *Haer*. 3.23.5, and the Ascetic ideal," *StVTQ* 36.4 (1993), 309–10.

5.6 Why God Created Humankind: *Haer*. 4.14.1 (Gen 2:7)

In *Haer*. 4.14.1, Irenaeus' primary goal continues to be the unity of both testaments, and in this section he discusses the question of God's primordial activity. This is not a subject Irenaeus considers with any regularity, but in reaction to the extensive speculations of the heretics, *Haer*. 4.14.1 is one of a few instances where he contemplates God's motivation for creation.[33] For Irenaeus, God's creative impulse is the ultimate glorification of humanity as an outworking of the mutual glorification of the Father and the Son. Irenaeus begins *Haer*. 4.14.1 by explaining how God did not form Adam out of necessity, echoing Gen 2:7, but so that God might confer the blessing of glorification upon him.[34] Irenaeus' vision of God's aseity imagines the eternal perfection of the inter-trinitarian relationship that eliminates any dependence whatsoever upon creation; the Creator "stands in need of nothing and no one."[35]

Irenaeus supports the nature of this unilateral relationship between God and creation in Gen 2:7 with a collection of texts linked through parallel language and concepts of preexistence, creation, and glorification including: John 15:16, John 17:24, Isa 43:5–7, and Matt 24:28.[36] These texts are bound by verbal associations and set in context by a narratival focus. The intention of God from creation is the glorification of the human person through divine fellowship and service of God. God is, contra the Marcionites and Valentinians, the Creator of Adam in Genesis and the Father of Jesus. In the manner of an "architect" (*architectus*), God sketches out the "construction of salvation" (*fabricationem salutis*) that unifies the trajectory of salvation history recorded in scripture.[37] Just as the Word formed Adam in Gen 2:7 so that he might confer blessing upon him, so also, citing the dominical saying of John 15:16, did Christ choose the disciples to follow him. Likewise, Christ does not need his disciples, but his disciples are glorified when they are in fellowship with the Son. The disciples did not choose to follow Christ any more than Adam chose to be created. He alludes to John 17:24 in order to explain how the disciples, when

33 Orbe, *Teología IV*, 189. According to Rousseau *Haer*. 4.14.1 is really a continuation of the argumentation in *Haer*. 4.13.4. He frames *Haer*. 4.13.4 into two sections. The first section includes *SC* 100:534.79–536.103, while the latter section spans *SC* 100:536.104–546.65 and includes *Haer*. 4.14.1–2.

34 *Haer*. 4.14.1.

35 Bingham, "Christianizing Divine Aseity," 55.

36 The key passage for Christ's preexistence is John 8:58 cited in *Haer*. 4.13.4.

37 *Haer*. 4.14.2. Behr, *Asceticism*, 53. Bacq suggests this is an allusion to the construction of the Ark in Gen 6:13–16. Bacq, *De l'ancienne*, 117.

beholding the glory of Christ, participate in his glory. Isa 43:5–7 also follows the same logic and explicitly mentions the divine intention of glorification for the one whom God formed.[38] Finally, Matt 24:28 completes this collection of passages supporting Irenaeus' vision of unilateral nature of the divine-human relationship from creation. The text is part of Christ's apocalyptic warnings that characterize the dreaded "Day of the Lord" with a "proverb-like" saying: "Wherever the corpse is, there the eagles will gather" (*ubicumque est cadaver, illuc congregabuntur et aquilae*).[39] He interprets the eagles gathered around the carcass as the resurrected faithful gathered around the glorified body of the Son of God and participating in his glory.[40] Together these passages illustrate the mutual glorification of the Father and the Son that motivates God to form of Adam in Gen 2:7. God's aseity initiates creation and instructs humankind through a unilateral divine-human relationship that ultimately characterizes all interactions throughout the events of the divine economy. The blessing of glorification innate to the Father and the Son is bestowed upon Adam and his posterity.

5.7 The Sign of Sabbath Rest: *Haer*. 4.16.1 (Gen 2:2–3)

The final reference to Gen 1–3 in *Haer*. 4.1–19 is an allusion to God's Sabbath rest in Gen 2:2–3 in *Haer*. 4.16.1. This section previews a theme that Irenaeus develops in the final chapters of *Haer*. 5. Irenaeus argues that God created circumcision and Sabbath as signs of identification for the children of Abraham. These signs are located in verbal connections between the seventh day of creation in Gen 2:2–3 and other descriptions of Sabbath rest mentioned elsewhere in scripture. He states that these signs of the Sabbath are not without purpose because they "prefigured" (*praefigurabat*) the coming of the Spirit and the eschatological Sabbath (Gen 2:2–3), which he identifies with the future kingdom of God.[41] Following his discussion of circumcision as a sign, his reference to the Sabbath begins with an allusion to Ezek 20:12, Exod 31:13, Rom 8:36, and Matt 6:19.[42] Both Ezek 20:12 and Exod 31:13 describe the Sabbath as a "sign"

38 *Haer*. 4.14.1.

39 Ulrich Luz, *Matthew 21–28: A Commentary*, trans. James E. Crouch (Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 2005), 199.

40 Luz notes this allegorical reading is common from Hippolytus onwards. Luz, *Matthew 21–28*, 200 n. 158. Orbe, *Teología IV*, 188 n. 12.

41 *Haer*. 4.16.1.

42 The discussion of circumcision links Gen 17:9–11, Deut 10:16, and Col 2:11.

(*signo*) between God and his people, which symbolizes the expectation for the people of God to come to rest from their sacerdotal service in the kingdom of God.[43]

In the first two passages, Ezek 20:12 and Exod 31:13, Irenaeus observes that both Ezekiel and Moses identify the Sabbath as a "sign" (*signo*). The terms "sign" and "Sabbath" link these passage together. For Irenaeus, this "sign" was given by a "wise artist" (*sapiente artifice*) with purpose and meaning, and he describes the sign of the Sabbath with a quotation of Rom 8:36 where the people of God continue daily in the service of God as "sheep for the slaughter" (*oves occisionis*).[44] They abstain from all greed (Matt 6:19) and do not store up for themselves treasures on earth. He contrasts this perpetual ministry with the Sabbath rest instituted at the conclusion of creation in Gen 2:2–3. The Sabbath rest is the eschatological Sabbath when Irenaeus suggests those who preserve in the service of the Lord will experience the peace and rest in the eschatological kingdom of God and take their place to dine at the table of the Lord.[45] In his reading, Gen 2:2–3 sets the theological paradigm for the understanding of Sabbath rest. Both Ezek 20:12 and Exod 31:13 confirm that the ministry of the Lord on the Sabbath is indeed a sign, and Rom 8:36 and Matt 6:19 illustrate the nature of this perpetual ministry. These are contrasted with the reward of the eschatological Sabbath rest when the faithful are able to cease from work and recline at the table of the Lord.

5.8 Creation and the Supremacy of God Over All Things: *Haer*. 4.20.1–4 (Gen 1:26, Gen 2:7)

The section offers a shift in the overall structure of *Haer*. 4, where Irenaeus begins a concentrated analysis of Old Testament prophecy that is fulfilled in the New Testament. This objective also contributes to his overall goal of unifying the two testaments under the administration of one God and Father. The thesis of *Haer*. 4.20.1–4a can be summarized by the well-known Irenaean axiom: "the glory of God is a living man" (*gloria enim Dei vivens homo*).[46] He believes that in the incarnation, the Son takes the creation into his divine life

43 *Haer*. 4.16.1. Orbe determines two senses of the Sabbath rest: 1) immediate rest from work, and 2) the continual service of God involving the perpetual sacerdotal exercises and service at the table of God. However, in this instance the service of God in the present life gives way to the Sabbath rest in the eternal kingdom of God. Orbe, *Teología IV*, 208.

44 Noormann, *Irenäus*, 198.

45 Irenaeus will develop this argument in *Haer*. 5.33.2.

46 *Haer*. 4.20.7.

and, as a result, creation participates in the glory of God.[47] The Valentinian emphasis on ignorance is directly opposed to Irenaeus' identification of God's goodness or love as the primary motivation for creation.[48] This section, in particular, provides some of the most intricate textual networking in all of *Haer*. 4 and combines a series of readings strategies including verbal strategies, prosopological interpretations, and general-to-particular reasoning. He cites Gen 1:26 and Gen 2:7 in *Haer*. 4.20.1, and these connect with a network of texts spanning *Haer*. 4.20.2–4a that argue for the creation of *all things* by means of the Word and Wisdom. The language of "all things" (*omnia*) is the catchword that links these passages, as well as a general-to-particular rhetorical argumentation.[49] The summary statement that God has formed all things by his Word and Wisdom in *Haer*. 4.20.4a signifies the conclusion of this particular intertextual reading of the creation texts.

In *Haer*. 4.20.1 Irenaeus describes the greatness of God and its relationship to the notion of *creatio ex nihilo* and utilizes a general-to-particular mode of argumentation by coordinating the general creation of all things mentioned in John 1:3 and *Mand* 1 with the particular creation of humankind in Gen 2:7. God in himself, Irenaeus argues, has "established, selected, adorned and contains all things, and among all things is us and this world" (*constituit et fecit et adornavit et continet omnia, in omnibus autem et nos et hunc mundum*).[50] This is not a God who forms from preexistent matter, but a God who creates out of nothing.[51] In this claim Irenaeus distinguishes himself from the Gnostic and Middle-Platonic doctrines of the origin of the world.[52] He makes the general point that all things have been made by God and nothing exists that God has not created (John 1:3, *Mand* 1). At the same time, he wants to emphasize humankind and the world as particular elements within "all things" (*omnia*) that God has created. Gen 2:7 describes the particularity of the creation of humankind within "all things" (*omnia*) when "God formed the man, taking the dust of the earth, and breathed into his face the breath of life" (*Et plasmavit Deum hominem, limum terrae accipiens, et insufflavit in faciem ejus flatum vitae*). The citation of Gen 2:7, then, illustrates the particular creation of humanity in comparison

47 Orbe, "Gloria Dei vivens homo: Análisis de Ireneo, *adv. haer*. IV, 20, 1–7," *Greg* 73.2 (1992): 205–68. Behr, *Asceticism*, 262–63.

48 *Haer*. 1.2.3; Steenberg, *Irenaeus*, 36–8; Mackenzie, *Irenaeus's Demonstration*, 95.

49 Shotwell, *Biblical Exegesis*, 32–33.

50 *Haer*. 4.20.1.

51 *Haer*. 2.10.4. *Cf.* Theophilus, *Ad Autol* 2.4.

52 Gerhard May, *Creatio ex Nihilo: The Doctrine of 'Creation out of Nothing' in Early Christian Thought*, trans. A.S. Worrall (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1994), 168; Orbe, *Teología IV*, 276. *Cf. Haer*. 4.38.3; *Haer*. 2.25.3; and *Haer*. 5.4.2.

with the general creation and formation of all things. The detailed description of God's involvement in Gen 2:7 heightens the particularity of the creation of Adam. In Gen 2:7, God is not generally speaking all creation into existence, but specifically forming humankind from the dust.

Irenaeus uses Gen 1:26, on the other hand, to depict the means by which God created, namely God created humankind *within* God.[53] His argument, as Orbe points out, inverts the Gnostic notions of the distinctive creative actions of the Demiurge.[54] As Irenaeus argued in *Haer*. 4.14.1–2 and throughout *Haer*. 1, God stands in need of nothing to accomplish creation, because God possess his own "Hands," which is the Son and the Spirit. When the Father speaks to the Son and the Spirit saying, "Let Us make humankind after our image and likeness" (*Faciamus hominem ad imaginem et similitudinem*), this is God creating all things *within* God.[55] Conceptually speaking, the act of creation necessarily includes the activity of all three persons, so that "He taking from Himself" (*ipse a semetipso*) formed all things by means of the Son and the Spirit communicates the creation of humanity is the corporate action united in will and purpose. The Father provided the substance of the clay, the Son acted as the paradigm for the formation of the man, and the Spirit enlivened the form.[56] This presentation of the "mutual interrelatedness of the trinitarian persons" is a striking example of Irenaeus' prosopological interpretation of Gen 1:26 and Gen 2:7.[57] He interprets the divine plural in Gen 1:26 as the Father conversing with the Son and Spirit, and the act of God molding the form of Adam from the dust as the work of the Father with his two "Hands" (the Son and the Spirit). Through his prosopological reading of these texts, Irenaeus interprets the economic function of the divine persons that actively contribute to the

53 The text of Gen 2:7 contains three separate phrases: Gen 2:7a "God reached down taking dust from the earth and formed the man," Gen 2:7b: "and breathed into the man the breath of life," Gen 2:7c: "and the man became a living being." This is the only occasion where he provides a complete citation of Gen 2:7ab and at no point does Irenaeus cite Gen 2:7 in full.

54 Orbe, *Teología IV*, 276.

55 *Haer*. 4.20.1. Parallel uses are found in *Epid*. 55, *Haer*. 5.1.3, and *Haer*. 5.15.4. There is, of course, much debate around the trinitarian discussions of these pre-Nicene Fathers, and while some have argued Irenaeus is "terminologically-contradictory," the degree of overlapping trinitarian terminology is unmistakable. Steenberg, *Irenaeus*, 64. Mackenzie goes so far as to say, "There is little, if anything, in the Nicene formulae which is not present in embryonic or directional form in the works of Irenaeus." Mackenzie, *Irenaeus' Demonstration*, 29. Wingren, *Man and the Incarnation*, 105.

56 Behr, *Asceticism*, 87. Orbe, *Teología IV*, 275 n. 9.

57 Steenberg, *Irenaeus*, 114.

formation of humankind. For this reason, the creation of human life, Irenaeus asserts, could not have been the work of angels, or powers, or any other creature, because they "are not able to create an image of God" (*neque . . . poterant imaginem facere Dei*, Gen 1:26).[58]

This prosopological reading of Gen 1:26 and Gen 2:7 is structurally joined to a cento of passages that are laced together by their associations to the doctrine of *creatio ex nihilo* and the specific vocabulary of creation imagery.[59] Here again, Irenaeus utilizes a logical general-to-particular argument corresponds these texts is the language and concept of "all things" (*omnia*). The texts in *Haer*. 4.20.2–4 are arranged in the following order: *Mand* 1, Mal 2:10, Eph 4:6, Matt 11:27, Rev 3:7, John 1:3, 1 Pet 2:23, Col 1:18, Prov 3:19–20, Prov 8:22–25, and Prov 8:27–31. The first four passages (*Mand* 1, Mal 2:10, Eph 4:6, and Matt 11:27) are linked through a complex connection of specific linking terms. All four contain the catchword "all things" (*omnia*), which explains the general point that Irenaeus wants to argue. More specifically, *Mand* 1 identifies God as the Creator of all things, while Mal 2:10 and Eph 4:6 contain both titles "God" and "Father" as the author of all creation.[60] Finally, the last passage, Matt 11:27, contains the catchword "Father" and speaks of the time when the Father delivered all things over to the Son. It is also noteworthy that Irenaeus offers virtually no commentary on these passages, because in his thinking the texts are self-explanatory and explicit when it comes to teaching the doctrine of creation and identifying God the Father as the author of creation. It is also apparent that Irenaeus' intertextual arrangement intentionally draws together an Old Testament reference (Mal 2:10), an apostle (Eph 4:6) and the words of the Lord (Matt 11:27).[61] The canonical linkage is a means for Irenaeus to marshal the entire corpus of divine revelation in one continuous witness to the Father's creation of all things.

He continues to develop this understanding of the creation of all things with a variety of other passages including: Acts 10:42, Rev 3:7, John 1:14, 1 Pet 2:23, Col 1:18, Prov 3:19–20, Prov 8:22–25, and Prov 8:27–31. In the first five

58 *Haer*. 4.20.1. *Cf. Haer*. 1.5.5, *Haer*. 1.18.6, and *Haer*. 1.30.4–5.

59 *Haer*. 4.20.2–3. For a discussion of *creatio ex nihilio* in Irenaeus see: Orbe, "San Ireneo y la creation"; J. Fantino, *La théologie*, 265–337; Fantino, "La crátion ex nihilo chez saint Irénée" *RSPT* 76.3, (1992), 421–42; Steenberg, *Irenaeus*, 38–49.

60 O'Neill argues the citation of Hermes elevates it to 'creedal status" of *creation ex nihilo*, but Steenberg rightly notes this overstates the case. J.C. O'Neill, "How early is the doctrine of creatio ex nihilo?" *JTS* 53.2 (2002), 455, 63; Steenberg, 'Scripture graphe, and the status of Hermas in Irenaeus,' *SVTQ* 53.1 (2008): 29–66.

61 Orbe, *Teología IV*, 280.

passages, he emphasizes the *all* human persons as a particular subset within all things. These texts do not use the language or conceptual imagery of "all things" (*omnia*) and, as a result, require commentary and explanation. First of all, given that all things have been handed over to the Son (Matt 11:27), now the Son has the authority to judge the living and the dead (Acts 10:42). Alluding to Rev 3:7 and Rev 5:2, 3 and 9, the Son alone has the authority to open the book of the Father because of his sacrifice, which, Irenaeus argues, resulted in his right to receive power over all things, including the living and the dead. Similarly, the Son alone has supremacy over all things on earth (John 1:14) and under the earth (Col 1:18). His sovereignty on earth is also located in his righteous life (1 Pet 2:23). The later three passages from the Proverbs build upon this logic by conveying that God the Father existed with the Son and Spirit before all creation. The two key verbs *fecit* and *aptavit*, alongside the reference to *Verbo* and *Sapientia*, inspire the links between these texts.[62] In Prov 3:19–20 and Prov 8:22–25, Wisdom is in the beginning with God before the creation of the earth, while Prov 8:27–31 describes how Wisdom rejoiced with God at the completion of creation. [63] For Irenaeus, the Wisdom of Prov 8:22 is the personal Spirit that is imparted through the Word of God. These texts fill out the theological reality of the primordial world where the Son and the Spirit are present with the Father prior to creation in Genesis, and support the reality that the Father created all things by His Word and Wisdom in Gen 1:26.

Through the intertextual reading of these passages, Irenaeus concludes in *Haer*. 4.20.4: "There is therefore one God, who by the Word and Wisdom created and arranged all things" (*Unus igitur Deus, qui Verbo et Sapientia fecit et aptavit omnia*). This statement is parallel to his analysis of Gen 1:26 in the opening paragraph. In other words, all of these passages communicate the nature of God existing as Father, Son and Spirit before the foundation of the world. All three divine persons, therefore, are present in Gen 1:26 and actively involved in the creation of all things. This section displays the complexity of Irenaeus' prosopological reading of Gen 1–3, which relies upon other passages that are fashioned through different philological relationships, and shaped by a general-to-particular rhetorical argument.

62 Orbe, *Teología IV*, 282.

63 *Haer*. 4.20.3. Orbe suggests that *Verbo et Sapientia* in the opening line refers to Psalm 32(33):6, but the connections are too obscure to be certain. Orbe, *Teología IV*, 282n24.

5.9 Word of God and the Unity of Scripture: *Haer*. 4.32.1 (Gen 1:3)

Continuing his analysis of Old Testament prophecy, the next allusion to Gen 1–3 surfaces in a highly debated section that describes the teaching of a certain presbyter that was also a disciple of the apostles. According to Irenaeus, this presbyter argues for the unity of the two testaments under the activity of one God who is the Creator of all things. Charles Hill has argued convincingly that the presbyter is Polycarp.[64] In this section, Irenaeus frames both his appeal to Genesis and the relationship of Gen 1–3 to the rest of salvation history as the teaching of this presbyter.[65] To claim angels or another power other than God created the world will not unite the teaching of the Old and the New Testaments. On the other hand, Irenaeus writes that those who believe one God made all things by the Word affirm the most basic theological assumption and the key that unlocks scriptural exegesis. This places the intertextual reception of Gen 1–3 and the apostolic teaching in the New Testament at the forefront of Irenaeus' objectives. In addition, alongside the reference to Justin in *Haer*. 4.6.2, here again Irenaeus connects his intertextual reading to the teaching of his predecessors. In this section, Irenaeus reads Gen 1:3 prosopologically in continuity with John 1:3. This reading is also supported by a series of "verbal" links to the language of Eph 4:5–6, and Eph 4:15–16/Col 2:19.

Irenaeus' prosopological exegesis of Gen 1:3 is distinctly "trinitarian." The allusions to God "speaking," for Irenaeus, are a clear delineation of the divine roles in creation.[66] Steenberg is right to note that Irenaeus ignores the imagery of "light" (*lux*), which is so essential to Philonic and Gnostic readings of Gen 1:3, to concentrate solely on the "triune nature of God's creative activity."[67] He begins with the claim that God created all things by the Word, alluding to John 1:3, and then cites Gen 1:3 saying, "God said, Let there be light: and there was

64 Charles E. Hill, *From the Lost Teaching of Polycarp: Identifying Irenaeus' Apostolic Presbyter and the Author of* Ad Diognetum. Hill, "Polycarp Contra Marcion Irenaeus' Presbyterial Source in *Haer*. 4.27–32," *StuPat* 40 (2006): 399–412.

65 In keeping with his intertextual perspective, Irenaeus notes the result of departing from the unity of the Testaments results in "inconsistency" (*incongruentiam*) and "contradictions" (*contradictiones*). The only difference in this instance is that Irenaeus attributes this intertextual perspective to Polycarp.

66 Steenberg, *Irenaeus*, 70. While Steenberg is right to say this is his only "quotation" of Gen 1:3, the parallel allusion to Gen 1:3 in *Haer*. 2.2.5 is unmistakable and supported by common textual referents. Steenberg, *Irenaeus*, 70.

67 Steenberg, *Irenaeus*, 71 n. 24. Orbe makes attempts to interpret *lux* Christologically, but the context does not support this rendering. This also indicates that Irenaeus and the Gnostics are not always debating the same texts, but networks of texts.

light" (*Et dixit Deus: Fiat lux, et facta est lux*).[68] The emphasis is placed on the verb "said" (*dixit*) as representative of the Son's involvement in creation with God the Father. Irenaeus cites Gen 1:3 specifically because it reflects the first act of speaking creation into existence, thereby communicating the notion that the Son is with the Father from the beginning of creation. He could have included any number of texts From Gen 1 that contain God speaking creation into existence, such as Gen 1:6 and Gen 1:9.[69]

These specific "verbal" links are supported by a range of Pauline and Johannine texts including: John 1:3, Eph 4:5–6, and Eph 4:15–16/Col 2:19. Together with Gen 1:3, all these texts communicate the unity of God in creation and the efficiency of his Word. In this sense the New Testament revelation gives identity to the nature of God acting in creation in Gen 1. I have already mentioned that Irenaeus alludes to the activity of the Word in creation in John 1:3, but he also adds a citation that even more clearly expresses the concept that all things were made in and through the Word. The use of Eph 4:5–6 expresses the singularity of God and the three-fold expression that God the Father is above all, in all, and through all.[70] Irenaeus uses this three-fold expression of Eph 4:5–6 as evidence of a triune God, who is over all creation. For Irenaeus, the blending of these three texts Gen 1:3, John 1:3, and Eph 4:5–6 teach that the Father created all things by means of the Son.

The sources of these allusions also point to the unity between Mosaic account, the Gospels, and the apostolic testimony in their teaching that there is one God who made all things by the Word. This belief, for Irenaeus, is the "head" (*caput*) or foundation upon which all beliefs (or scriptures) rests. He joins these three allusions with another echo of Paul's imagery of the body in Eph 4:16/Col 2:19, which he applies to his intertextual perspective of Genesis.[71] According to Irenaeus, the true interpreter of scripture must, first of all, grasp the "head" (*caput*) of the (scriptural) body (Eph 4:15–16/Col 2:19), which is the doctrine of the creation of all things by means of the Word of God (Gen 1:3, John 1:3, and Eph 4:5–6). Then, after acknowledging this doctrinal "head," the

68 *Haer*. 4.32.1. The emphasis on the consistency of the words (*omnis sermo ei constabit*) contributes to the notion of intertextuality in Irenaeus.

69 His use of Gen 1:3 is unusual, because I would expect Gen 1:26 in this context since he typically uses this text to speak of the divine proclamations. For this reason, I suspect in this case Irenaeus is actually reading or citing the teaching of the presbyter. Outside of this passage, his use of Gen 1:3 is rare. Cf. *Haer*. 2.2.5.

70 *CSf. Epid* 5, *Haer*. 2.2.5–6; and *Haer*. 5.17.4.

71 Noormann, *Irenäus*, 243.

interpreter will have the proper framework for reading scripture so that every part of the body of scripture will fit together in harmony.

5.10 The Spiritual Disciple and the Heretics: *Haer*. 4.33.4 and *Haer*. 4.34.4

Following his summary of the teaching of the presbyter, in *Haer*. 4.33–35 Irenaeus discusses how the "spiritual disciple" (1 Cor 2:15) judges the doctrines of those outside the church, especially the heretics including the Ebionites, Marcion and Valentinus. Given the Ebionites rejection of the incarnation, Irenaeus again returns to his intertextual reading of Isa 7:14 alongside several passages including Gen 1:26 and Gen 2:7. Then his critique of Marcion and the Valentinians is organized around his interpretation of Isa 2:3–4 and the fulfillment of this passage in Christ this passage. Irenaeus' reading of both these texts depends upon an Adam-Christ typology, along with a David, Solomon, and Jonah-Christ typology that links the creation of Adam with the preexistence and economic activity of the Son.

5.10.1 *Ebionites and the Incarnation*: Haer. *4.33.4* (*Gen 1:26; Gen 2:7*)

In *Haer*. 4.33.4 he responds to the Ebionites denial of the incarnation through a combination of allusions and echoes including: Gen 1:26, Gen 2:7, Isa 7:14, Matt 12:41–42, Matt 22:29, and Matt 22:43. He questions their understanding of salvation and how even they could escape the corruption of their bodies unless God had given them a "sign of salvation" (*signum . . . salutis*, Isa 7:14).[72] With a set of rhetorical questions, he explains how Christ, who was of the same fleshy substance as David, Solomon, and Jonah, could be greater than them and powerful enough to subdue the one who is "stronger than men" (*hominem fortis erat*), echoing the role of Satan in Adam's disobedience (Gen 3:1–6).[73] His closing question and final statement function rhetorically as responses to all these theological dilemmas.

Alluding to the creation of humankind in Gen 1:26, Irenaeus asks, "but who else is more superior and excellent than the man who was formed after the likeness of God, except the Son of God, after whose image man was created?" (*Melior autem eo homine qui secundum similitudinem Dei factus est et praecellentior, quisnam sit alius nisi Filius Dei, ad cujus similitudinem factus est homo?, Gen 1:26*).[74] Christ must be greater than all humanity because humankind was

72 *Haer*. 4.33.4. *Cf*. Orbe, "En torno a los Ebionitas," *Aug* 33 (1993): 315–37.

73 *Cf*. Matt 12:29, Matt 12:41–42, and Matt 22:43.

74 *Haer*. 4.33.4.

formed after his image and likeness. So also he is greater than David, Solomon, and Jonah (Matt 12:41–42, Matt 2:43), and the strong man, that is Satan, who subdued humanity (Matt 12:29, i.e. Gen 3:1–6). He was also God who was made human and received the birth from a virgin (Isa 7:14), thereby enacting the salvation from death. Irenaeus summarizes this conception of salvation in the closing lines with reference to the incarnation and the conflation of John 1:14, Gen 1:26, and Gen 2:7 saying: "For this reason in these last days he has revealed the similitude; for the Son of God was made human, assuming the ancient formation into his own nature" (*Et propter hoc in fine ipse ostendit similitudinem Filius Dei, homo factus, antiquam plasmationem in semetipsum suscipiens*).[75] The language of Son of God "became human" (*homo factus*) and "ancient formation" (*antiquam plasmationem*) calls to mind the imagery of the Word becoming flesh in John 1:14 and the formation from the dust in Gen 2:7.[76] Salvation, therefore, is enacted in the recaptulatory nature of the incarnation as reflected in similitude between Adam and Christ's formation.

5.10.2 *Christ the Ploughshare and Pruning Hook*: Haer. *4.34.4* (*Gen 2:7, Gen 3:17–8*)

In *Haer*. 4.34–35 Irenaeus focuses his critique on Marcion, Valentinus, and their followers, and continues to develop typological relationships and illustrative readings of texts in response to their Christology. He begins his criticism by challenging them to read scriptures and the writings of the apostles carefully, because the whole life of Christ is predicted in them. He points to the realization of the New Covenant in Christ and the preaching of the apostles.[77] The new covenant, inaugurated through the life of the incarnate Son of God, becomes the "law of life" (*vivificatrix lex*), or "law of liberty" (*libertatis lex*), as he will later state, that fulfills the Law of Moses.[78] This change in covenant is anticipated in his discussion of Isa 2:3–4. Here Irenaeus finds the figuration of the Christ event in the imagery of the people of God transforming their swords into "ploughshares" (*aratra*) and their spears into "pruninghooks" (*falces*).[79]

---

75 *Haer*. 4.33.4.

76 The echo of John 1:14 is not referenced in either *BP* or *SC*.

77 He also addresses those who wish to take up the position of the Jews and interpret the New Covenant as the construction of the temple under Zerubbabel. Irenaeus argues that during this time no new covenant was given because they were still function under the Mosaic Law. But from the time of Christ the new covenant, which brings peace and life has gone out to the whole earth.

78 Orbe, *Teología IV*, 475 n. 36.

79 *Haer*. 4.33.4.

In order to explain this transition, Irenaeus appeals to the language of John 4:37, "in him is the saying true" (*hoc est sermo verus*), to suggest that in Christ the proclamation of peace in Isa 2:3–4 is realized.[80] But he points out that the same Son of God introduced both the plough and the pruning hook. In other words, the Son is both planting and harvesting.[81] The distinction between the former and the latter is the distinctive economic stages of these events enacted through different human mediators. In the beginning, Adam and Abel prefigure the salvific activity of Son of God in Gen 2–4, while in the "last" days Christ-crucified and the apostolic preaching mediate the fulfillment of salvation.

In terms of the Adam-Christ typology, Irenaeus argues that the Son of God introduced the "plough" (*aratrum*) at the first "formation of Adam" (*Adam plasmatio*), which most naturally applies to the formation from the dust in Gen 2:7. He describes the act of formation in Gen 2:7 as the "first semination" (*primam seminationem*), which is characteristic of Middle-Platonic imagery of planting and semination of the soul.[82] The Son of God is, quite literally, tilling the ground and planting the first human form upon the earth.[83] Orbe vividly describes this event saying: "El Verbo labró la tierra virgen, sembrando en ella, con Adán, el humano plasma; y lo recogió con Cristo, fructificado ya a Su imagen y semejanza."[84] However, it is obvious that the corresponding farming imagery contributes to Irenaeus' intertextual connections, including the language of "earth," "plough," "pruning hook," and the conceptual imagery of God molding Adam from the dust. When these images are applied to the life of Christ, the "plough" (*aratrum*) is revealed in the crucifixion when "wood joined with iron" (*lignum copulatum ferro*) so that Christ's bodily sacrifice "cleansed his earth" (*expurgavit ejus terram*). This imagery points to Christ's crucified body nailed to the cross with iron spikes as the purification and atoning sacrifice. Through his bodily sacrifice on the cross, Christ "ploughs" the earthly substance of Adam's formation (Gen 2:7) and purifies it from all sin. The explicit substantival connection is that the plough, like the nails in

80 The text of John 4:37 is the conclusion to Jesus' discussion about the workers for the harvest in John 4:31–38. The context of reaping and sowing is a natural correlation to the farming imagery of ploughshares and pruning hooks.

81 Orbe, *Teología IV*, 476 n. 42. *cf. I Apol*, 55.

82 The language of "semination" (*seminationem*) has roots in Middle-Platonism as expressed in Justin's thought, but in this instance there is a complex scriptural basis for his use of this imagery. Mark Edwards, "On the Platonic Schooling of Justin Martyr," *TS* 42.1 (1991): 17–34.

83 This agricultural imagery calls to mind the language of Gen 2:5 where no one was found to work the ground and the planting of the Garden in Gen 2:8.

84 Orbe, *Teología IV*, 476 n. 43.

the cross, is a mechanism "fixed with pins" (*tali confixus*).[85] The crucified body of Christ that is fashioned from the earth is fixed to the cross with iron pins, just as a plough, and it combines wood and iron as a means to till the earth. But even more specifically, Christ's atonement "cleaned the overgrown earth" (*emundavit silvestrem terram*).[86] This cleansing overturns the curse God places upon the earth in Gen 3:17–18.

Alongside Adam, Irenaeus also links the "pruning hook" (*falcem*) to the imagery of Abel's slaying, which typifies the apostolic preaching leading to the gathering of the righteous.[87] He appeals to the imagery of Isa 57:1 that contemplates the trouble of a righteous person dying with no recompense or justification. The reason Irenaeus turns to Abel for the "pruning hook" imagery is that a pruning hook performs the function of cutting or trimming vegetation. It is Cain who, in a sense, "pruned back" the innocent Abel and cut short his life. The death of Abel, therefore, anticipates and prefigures the ingathering of the righteous through the salvific work of Christ. Irenaeus is also quick to point out that the liberation of the righteous from evil was anticipated before Abel, declared by the prophets, and accomplished in the person of Christ.[88] To this point, Irenaeus adds that the apostles used these instruments for peaceful purposes and, following Matt 5:39, when struck they did not retaliate but instead offered their other cheek. As a result, Irenaeus' interpretation of this passage draws on an Adam-Christ and Abel-Christ typology, alongside a series of philological connections. He utilizes his intertextual argumentation to draw together Gen 2:7, Isa 2:3–4, Isa 57:1, Matt 5:39, John 4:37, and the narrative of Abel's murder in Gen 4 to depict the prophetic fulfillment of a bodily resurrection and the salvation of the righteous. He does so through the intricate connections of the creation imagery in these texts and an Adam-Christ and Abel-Christ typology.

5.11 Adam in the Parables of Christ: *Haer*. 4.36.2–6 (Gen 2:7)

After refuting Gnostic interpretations of many Old Testament passages, this section, which begins the final section of *Haer*. 4, is ordered around his

85 Orbe discusses the details of the formal connections between the two objects. Orbe, *Teología IV*, 476 n. 46.

86 Although it is not noted in *SC* or *BP*, this must be an echo of Gen 3:17–8 and the effects of the curse upon the ground.

87 *Cf*. Gen 4:10.

88 *Cf. Haer*. 4.30.4.

interpretation of several Gospels parables. Irenaeus contrasts his reading of these parables with more developed treatment of his Adam-Christ typology, verbal associations with other passages, and a narrative reading tailored to the organized unfolding of the divine economy. In *Haer*. 4.36.2–4 he depicts a series of parables that, in various ways, narrate salvation history and unite the work of God throughout both testaments. At three distinct points, *Haer*. 4.36.2, 4 and 6, an echo or allusion to Gen 2:7 surfaces within the flow of Irenaeus' argumentation. In each of these instances, there is a reference to Adam as the "formation" (*plasma*) of God. His Adam-Christ typology connects these passages generally, but in each instance his focus is the nature of Adam's formation in Gen 2:7 and his connections to the rest of events that transpire amid the divine economy. The particular intertextual connections are also fashioned with Gen 2:7 through verbal connections, especially the use of farming imagery

In *Haer*. 4.36.1–2, he interprets the parable of the wicked tenants in Matt 21:33–43. He identifies the master of the house as the Father, the vineyard as the human race formed in Adam, the servants as the prophets, and the son as Christ. Alluding to Gen 2:7, Irenaeus writes, "For God planted the vineyard of the human race when at the first He formed Adam and chose the fathers" (*Plantavit enim Deus vineam humani generis primo quidem per plasmationem Adae et electionem patrum*).[89] While Irenaeus sometimes uses the "vineyard" imagery for the nation of Israel, here the imagery reflects humankind in general. The intertextual connections are framed by the common farming imagery between God's tilling the earth and molding Adam and planting a vineyard in the parable. However, the interpretation of the vineyard is united with the echo of the calling of the patriarchs, the calling of the prophets, and the coming of the Son, which provides a brief summary of the trajectory of salvation history. This short echo alludes to texts such as the calling of Abraham in Gen 12. Irenaeus' intertextual reading of Gen 2:7, therefore, is connected to parallel imagery of farming and the narrative history of salvation.

Following his interpretation of the parable of the wicked tenants, in *Haer*. 4.36.4 Irenaeus provides a series of warning passages predicting the judgment of those who reject the true God. He alludes to several passages including: Luke 21:34–35, Luke 7:35–36, Matt 24:42, Matt 11:23–24, and especially the reference to the "days of Noah" (*temporibus Noe*) in Luke 17:2–6.[90] Irenaeus takes

89 *Haer*. 4.36.2. *cf. Haer*. 4.14.2.

90 Matt 11:23–24 evokes the imagery of Sodom and Gomorrah, which parallels the discussion of Noah in *Haer*. 4.36.3–4. In the immediate context, he also alludes to John 4:14, Matt 21:19, 2 Thess 1:5, Matt 3:10 and Matt 7:19. But these passages have only loose theological connections to the echo to Gen 2:7.

up the interpretation of the "days of Noah" (*temporibus Noe*) in connection to the Nephilim in Gen 6:2–4. He describes the wickedness of the people following this episode in Gen 6:5 and suggests that because the angels sinned by comminging with the sons of Adam, God brought on the deluge in order to restrain the sins of humanity and "preserve the true archetype, the formation of Adam" (*servaret vero archetypum, Adae plasmationem*).[91] Orbe notes a possible alternate reading for "archetype" (*archetypum*) as *arcae typum*, or the "form of the ark." In the former case, God destroys sinful humanity while at the same time preserving a purified form of the nature and character of the one formed from the dust (Gen 2:7). The latter case, on the other hand, actually applies the imagery of "ark" (*arcae*) to the human form fashioned from the dust, so God preserves the figure of the ark, the human form.[92] Although this alternate reading is possible and appealing in some respects, the reference to Adam seems to imply the original formation and thus the "archetype." In any case, both readings convey the same general point that the substance of Adam's formation was preserved even through the events of Noah's life. The argument of this section joins this flood narrative with the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah to express the idea that God privileges those who believe in God and judges those who reject God. Once again, Irenaeus interprets Gospel passages in connection to Gen 2:7, and salvation history.

Finally in *Haer*. 4.36.6, Irenaeus continues the theme of judgment with another echo of Gen 2:7 connected to a discussion of Psalm 23(24):1, Matt 5:45, Matt 22:7, and Rom 13:1–6. In continuity with the previous sections, he argues that God has providence over all things and administers his provision and retribution judiciously. For those who are ungrateful, Irenaeus writes that God "sent his armies" (*mittens exercitus suos*, Matt 22:7) to impose the penalty of his wrath. He focuses on the possessive pronoun "his" (*suos*) that identifies all humankind as the property of the Creator God. He supports this point with citations of Psalm 23(24):1 and Rom 13:1–6 that suggest the earth and everything within it, including the powers and authorities, are subject to the administration of their Creator. This is also why, following the allusion to Rom 13:1–6, he describes the activity of God in narrative fashion including mention of the giving of the Law, the sending of the prophets, and the creation of all things. He also concludes with another reference to "his armies" (*exercitus suos*) in Matt 22:7 alongside an echo of Gen 2:7, saying that they are "his" (*suos*) armies

91 *Haer*. 4.36.4.

92 Orbe, *Teología IV*, 491 n. 72. Orbe points to Hugo Rahner analysis of sea symbolism in patristic thought see, H. Rahner, *Symbole der Kirche* (Salzburg: Otto Muller, 1964), 272–303, 516.

because every human is his own creation even though they may be ignorant of this fact (Gen 2:7).[93] To emphasize the inclusiveness of God's creative acts, he closes with the description of God causing the sun to rise on the evil and the good and sending rains upon the just and unjust alike (Matt 5:45). Once again the formation from the dust in Gen 2:7 contributes to the theological argumentation and intertextual interpretation, by means of unifying all humanity in the original formation from the earth in Gen 2:7. In each parable there is imagery that unites these texts with Gen 2:7 including the farming imagery in Matt 21:33–43 and implied connection to Adam's formation in Noah and "his armies" in Matt 22:7. In each case, the formation of Adam is also framed within a trajectory of salvation history, so that the formation of Adam is preserved and restored in Christ.

5.12 Image, Likeness, and Freedom: *Haer*. 4.37.4 (Gen 1:26, Gen 2:17–18)

Following his emphasis on Adam's formation in the Gospel parables, in this instance Irenaeus contemplates the nature of human liberty with in the divine economy. The entire section of *Haer*. 4.37–39 considers why God made humankind free in Adam. In *Haer*. 4.37.1–2, he states that God's will is universally good and God grants humankind the power of free choice in order that God might judge them justly. In *Haer*. 4.37.3, he laces together several passages expressing the independent will of humankind, while in *Haer*. 4.37.4 he organizes a series of texts to communicate human's power to disobey God. These texts connect the language of "likeness" in Gen 1:26 to the nature of human liberty. He also cites an array of texts that *illustrate* human freedom and validate the connection between the likeness of God in Gen 1:26 and human liberty.

Irenaeus begins *Haer*. 4.37.1 by citing Christ's desire to gather up his children in Matt 23:37, suggesting that this expression, which communicates the "ancient law of human liberty" (*veterem legem libertatis hominis*, Gen 2:17–18), necessitates human beings possess free will from the beginning.[94] Irenaeus reiterates this point in the conclusion of *Haer*. 4.37.4, only in this case he uses the language of "likeness" (*similitudinem*, Gen 1:26). He suggests humanity has the power to act freely in accordance with the divine command or reject God outright. This is because, alluding to Gen 1:26, in the beginning humankind was created with "free will" (*liberae sententiae*) in the "likeness" (*similitudinem*) of God because God possess "free will" (*liberae sententiae*). However, even

93 *Haer*. 4.36.6.

94 *Haer*. 4.37.1. Orbe, *Teología IV*, 508 n. 29.

though they possess free will humankind is subject to the nature of the divine economy, while God is not.[95] As rational creatures within God's economy (not irrational as other created substances), human beings have the ability to differentiate between good and evil works. Those, according to Irenaeus, who of their own free will choose to be disobedient toward God will be subject to God's judgment, while those who choose to be obedient to God will be granted divine blessing. For Irenaeus, the nature of free will in humankind, which they have possessed from the beginning, is validated by the myriad of scriptures that petition the faithful in obedience to commands of God. He reasons that Paul would not give the faithful these examples to practice and abstain from certain practices (contra Gnostic asceticism), if they did not possess the capacity to do so. Irenaeus exemplifies this concept of universal human freedom with allusions to 1 Cor 6:12, Eph 4:25, Eph 4:29, Eph 5:8, and 1 Pet 2:16. All of these passages illustrate the concept of humans as created in the likeness of God (Gen 1:26) with the power to act freely from the beginning.

5.13 Perfection in the Image and Likeness of God: *Haer*. 4.38.1–4

Continuing the theme of human liberty, in the next chapter Irenaeus raises the question of the imperfection of Adam and Eve in Genesis and considers why God did not create them perfect, or as "gods" (*dii*), in the beginning.[96] While Irenaeus acknowledges that all things are possible with God, he appeals to the distinctive natures of Creator and creature exemplified in the creation accounts. He emphasizes, contra the Valentinians, the corporeal nature of Adam fashioned in the beginning and his initial capacity to become accustomed to divine immortality. For Irenaeus the creature could not be created perfect in the same sense as the Creator. A creature is by nature inferior to the Creator, because to be created is to be of more recent origin. For this reason in Genesis Adam and Eve are "infantile" (*infantilia*) and "unaccustomed to and unexercised in perfect discipline" (*insueta et inexercitata ad perfectam disciplinam*).[97] The first couple is, as Behr suggests, categorically "imperfect" in the sense that they require growth and were subject to the conditions and properties of their nature as a created substance.[98] Created substances are subject to time, change, and require growth from imperfection to perfection.

95 *Haer*. 4.37.4.

96 *Haer*. 4.38.4.

97 *Haer*. 4.38.1.

98 Behr, *Asceticism*, 46–7. See also Dennis Minns, *Irenaeus*, 73–4.

The sections spanning *Haer*. 4.38.1–4 contain a series of echoes of Gen 1:26, Gen 2:7, Gen 1:28, and Gen 3:5 that are untied through a series of verbal connections or catchwords, prosopological interpretation, and narrative arrangements. In this context, Irenaeus combines an echo of the formation of humankind in Gen 2:7 with 1 Cor 3:2–3 and Heb 5:12–14 in *Haer*. 4.38.1–2 to examine the infantile nature of Adam and Eve that necessitated growth and maturity toward perfection in the divine life.[99] Irenaeus uses the images of moving from milk to solid food, to exemplify the way that Adam and Eve, who were created as infants, would slowly become accustomed to participate in the divine life in Christ. The catchword "infant" links these passages with Irenaeus' understanding of Adam and Eve's formation. In *Haer*. 4.38.3 he weaves together Gen 1:26, Gen 1:28, Gen 2:7, and Wis 6:19 as exemplary of the harmonious creation where Adam and Eve were perfectly situated to receive growth and advancement towards God. Finally, in *Haer*. 4.38.4 his combination of Gen 1:26, Gen 3:5, Psalm 81(82):6–7, and 1 Cor 15:53 anticipates the future resurrection and glorification of the faithful who are at last perfected in the image and likeness of God.

5.13.1 *Creation and Ascendancy Toward Perfection*: Haer. *4.38.1–2* (*Gen 2:7*)

This section has been the source of much debate going back to the work of Wendt and his fundamental distinction between the restorative and transformative line of Irenaean soteriology.[100] Wingren corrected Wendt by noting the concept of "growth" and the formation of Adam as a "child" to be the formal link between this soteriological bifurcation.[101] Steenberg's treatment of Adam and Eve as infants begins with a citation of this passage, and addresses the philosophical nature of the imperfection of creation. Steenberg regards *Haer*. 4.38.1 as the "single most important passage" in the discussion of Adam and Eve as children in paradise.[102] These studies reveal the significance of this section, but do not address the intertextual references that participate in Irenaeus' reading of Gen 1–2. Alluding to the description of God's formative creation of Adam in Gen 2:7, Irenaeus argues that the infantile and corporeal form in which Adam was fashioned was incapable of receiving the full divine perfection that God could grant. He reasons that even if God imparted to Adam

99 Orbe identifies an echo of Heb 7:19 in the language *proximamus as Deum*.

100 H.H. Wendt, *Die christlich Lehre von der menschlichen Volkommenhiet* (Göttingen, 1882), 22.

101 Wingren, *Man and the Incarnation*, 101.

102 Steenberg, "Children in Paradise," 15.

complete divine perfection, his immature state could not have contained divine perfection, much less retain it throughout his life.[103] What is more, the reason the Son of God came into the world as an infant was to prepare humankind to receive God.[104]

Irenaeus also appeals to several texts to support his assumption that Adam and Eve are created as children in Gen 2:7. In *Haer*. 4.38.1–2 he illustrates this ascendancy toward perfection by alluding to a baby that is nourished with his mother's milk before receiving strong food, derived from 1 Cor 3:2–3 and Heb 5:12–14.[105] In a similar way, the Son prepares the faithful for immortality through nourishment that increases during the course of life. The passages are linked through the concepts of the immature nature of Adam in Gen 2:7 and the imagery of food and drink in 1 Cor 3:2–3 and Heb 5:12–14. The faithful learn of their nature of growth and increase when they transition from the "milk" (*lac*, 1 Cor 3:2) to the "meat" (*escam*, Heb 5:12–14), which is the transition from the advent of the Lord to the reception of the Spirit. In the same way that an infant transitions from milk (Christ) to solid food (the Spirit), so also would Adam and Eve, who were created as children, slowly become accustomed to participate in the divine life through Christ. Not everyone, however, was able to receive the Spirit. Alluding to the narrative of Acts 8:17–19, Simon the Magician could not receive the Spirit from Peter and John, so he offered to buy it.[106] In doing so, Irenaeus identifies those who are not able to receive the Spirit, such as Simon and those at Corinth, to the original formation of Adam that was undisciplined and incapable of receiving the divine perfection.[107]

5.13.2 *Growth, Perfection, and the Original Creation*: Haer. *4.38.3* (*Gen 1:26, Gen 1:28, Gen 2:7*)

In this section, Irenaeus carries on the theme of growth and increase creation with a more detailed discussion of Adam's formation. The act of creating Adam was not a singular event of a purely transcendent deity, but the work of an imminent Creator shaping the very matter of creation. It is, as Behr describes,

103 *Haer*. 4.38.2.

104 Orbe makes the intriguing connection to the description of the Lord's growth in wisdom in Luke 2:40. He points to Justin for a similar comparison in *Dial* 88.2; Orbe, *Teología IV*, 517 n. 30.

105 *Haer*. 4.38.2.

106 The only other uses of this passage are located in Irenaeus' anti-Gnostic polemic. *See Haer*. 1.23.1 and *Haer*. 2.32.3.

107 *Haer*. 4.38.2. *cf*. Acts 8:17–19.

a "hands-on affair."[108] The "hands" imagery is a classic Irenaean anthropomorphic image of God and the only consistent anthropomorphism he uses to depict the creative activity of God.[109] This description of the personal activity of God and the progressive nature of human perfection is, for Irenaeus, grounded in the textual references to Gen 1:26, Gen 2:7, Gen 1:28 and Wis 6:19. He argues God's power and goodness are simultaneously exhibited in a harmonious creation fashioned *ex nihilo*. With an intricate intertextual weaving, Irenaeus depicts the divine activity in these three crucial creation texts in a narrative fashion that anticipates the way God works throughout the unfolding of the divine economy.

The nature of Irenaeus' intertextual reading is a natural consequence of his anthropological perspective of the ascendancy towards perfection reflected in this trinitarian reading of Gen 1:26, Gen 1:28, and Gen 2:7. In the earlier portion of this chapter, he has already described how all creation itself is one harmonious and consistent whole.[110] This extended chronological trajectory orients the faithful towards growth into the image and likeness of God. He alludes to Gen 1:26 and the command to create Adam in the image and likeness of God. This command initiates the actualization of creation described in Gen 2:7 and the augmentation of the newly created person in Gen 1:28. Irenaeus frames these three texts (Gen 1:26, Gen 2:7, and Gen 1:28) with an economic trinitarian perspective with the Father planning and commanding (Gen 1:26), the Son executing and performing the work of creating (Gen 2:7), and the Spirit nourishing and increasing the creation (Gen 1:28).[111] This theological and intertextual depiction of creation orients humanity toward the "growth" of humankind in the image and likeness of God.[112]

His description, however, gives more detail about how humankind is created with the capacity to progress toward the divine likeness.[113] In a narrative fashion he describes this process of growth in a series of stages including: "creation" (*factum*, Gen 2:7), "to grow" (*augeri*, Gen 1:28), "to strengthen"

108 Behr, *Asceticism and Anthropology*, 38.

109 Fantino, *Théologie d'Irénée*, 306.

110 *Haer*. 4.38.3.

111 Holsinger-Friesen assumes Irenaeus imposes the notion of ascendancy on Gen 1:26, but clearly this notion is drawn from Gen 1:28. Holsinger-Friesen, *Irenaeus*, 136–137.

112 Steenberg highlights the relationship between Gen 1:26 and Gen 2:7, but Irenaeus' argument actually hangs on the combination of all three texts in their proper theological interaction. Steenberg, Irenaeus, 106.

113 Behr, *Asceticism*, 124–5.

(*corroborari*),[114] "to abound" (*multiplicari*, Gen 1:28), "to recover" (*convalescere*), "to glorify" (*glorificare*), and finally "to see" (*videre*) God. The two initial commands of Gen 1:28: "be fruitful" (*augeri*) and "multiply" (*multiplicari*) are linguistically connected to the aspects of growth and abounding in this progression.[115] Although he neglects the connection to growth (*augeri*), Orbe identifies "to abound" (*multiplicari*) as an allusion to Gen 1:28 and interprets this as a reference to multiplication through procreation.[116] Given the connection to Gen 1:28 and the progression of sanctification, it is difficult to imagine that Irenaeus merely has procreation in view. Instead, he reads Gen 1:28 in continuity with Gen 1:26 and Gen 2:7, which forms a sanctifying paradigm for human history that assumes procreation, but is more concerned with the general nature of salvation. The other elements in the list, including the term "to strengthen" (*corroborari*) and "recover" (*convalescere*), are not explicitly attributed to any particular passage, but continue the general theme of progress toward the divine likeness.[117] The latter term, "to recover" (*convalescere*), according to Orbe, is equivalent to maturity that prepares the faithful for the next stage of glorification.[118] Elsewhere the term refers to the "recovery" of the image and likeness in Christ that was lost in Adam.[119] So it is not merely maturity, but soteriological restoration of the image and likeness that was lost in Adam's disobedience. Whereas growth characterizes the pre-lapsarian state, in the post-lapsarian state the disobedient Adam and Eve require strengthening and multiplication as God prepares the humanity for recovery

114 The related verb σθενόω is only found in 1 Pet 5:10 as part of a description of the perfection and glorification of the faithful.

115 The succession comprises: creation, growth (αὐξῆδαι), strengthen, multiply (πληθυνθῆναι), recover, and be glorified. The term αὐξῆδαι is only found in Eph 4:16 and Col 2:19. See *Haer*. 4.32.2.

116 Orbe, *Teología IV*, 517 n. 32.

117 The former term is found in references to the sinful state of humankind necessitating strength to overcome their lowly state. Irenaeus frequently uses the language of "strengthen" (*corroborari*) to characterize the depraved state of humanity that requires the impartation of the Spirit. *Cf. Haer*. 3.6.4, *Haer*. 3.12.3, 6, *Haer*. 3.19.3, *Haer*. 3.20.1–3, *Haer*. 4.6.2, *Haer*. 4.33.11, *Haer*. 5.2.3, and *Haer*. 5.3.1. In *Haer*. 3.5.2 he cites the Lord's description of himself as a physician come to heal the sick and, in the next paragraph, describes the work of God over creation saying God "by means of His creation, did nourish, increase, strengthen, and preserve them" (*per conditionem suam aleret et augeret et constabiliret et eis esse praestaret*). The reason for this act of preservation is so that the faithful might be prepared for glorification.

118 Orbe, *Teología IV*, 517 n. 33.

119 *Haer*. 3.18.1.

and glorification throughout the divine economy. These texts, along with Wis 6:19, depict the glorification of the faithful who partake in immortality. In this sense, Gen 1:26 and Wis 6:19 form the bookends of Irenaeus' anthropological progression toward immortality, while the language of creation in Gen 2:7 is complemented by the progressive language of Gen 1:28 that anticipates the glorification and salvation of the faithful. Together, Gen 1:26, Gen 2:7, and Gen 1:28 form a theological paradigm for understanding the divine intention of Adam's progression toward the divine likeness from the beginning.

5.13.3 *Creation, Resurrection, and Glorification*: Haer. *4.38.4* (*Gen 1:26, Gen 3:5*)

In the final paragraph of *Haer*. 4.32.4, Irenaeus concludes his discussion with a summary of glorification that draws together Psalm 81(82):6–7, Gen 1:26, Gen 3:5, and 1 Cor 15:53. For the Bishop of Lyons, God's goodness endowed humankind with free will that allows growth and development into the divine likeness. Contra the Valentinians, the divine economy comprises a single linage of corporal humanity (rather than three distinctive human natures) that follows a trajectory culminating in the salvation and glorification of the faithful. God did so, Irenaeus argues, because human nature could not have sustained the power of divinity if God had given it to them originally. God did not make humanity "gods" in the beginning out of envy or rivalry, as the Gnostics assume, but out of goodness and compassion. This reality, for Irenaeus, is expressed most clearly in Psalm 81(82):6–7, where the Psalmist says "You are gods" (*Dii estis*) announcing the goodness of God in the divine promise of glorification. Psalm 81(82):7, on the other hand, reflects upon the infantile nature of humankind that could not possibly bear the power of divinity because they will "die as humans" (*velut homines moriemini*) and be subject to the conditions of mortality.[120] The reason Irenaeus emphasizes the teaching of the Psalmist is that, contrary to the Valentinians, the God of the Old Testament makes this proclamation, so that the process of glorification began at creation. Therefore, glorification was not a revelation peculiar to the New Testament or Pauline literature, but was taught by the Psalmist and, more importantly, characteristic of the creation accounts themselves.

Through his reading of Psalm 81(82):6–7, Irenaeus laces together 1 Cor 15:53, Gen 1:26, and Gen 3:5 to illustrate this trajectory of salvation. The focal text is Psalm 81(82):6–7 that evidences the two-fold narratival trajectory moving from mortality and death to immorality and glorification. He links the language of becoming "like god" in Psalm 81(82):6 with Gen 1:26, Gen 3:5, while the imagery

120 Orbe, *Teología IV*, 519 n. 45.

of "death" and "mortality" links Psalm 81(82):7 and 1 Cor 15:53. God understood the natural limitations of the creature formed from the dust. Thus, it was necessary for the weakness of the created nature to reveal itself through its own freedom. This economic appreciation for experiencing good and evil implies that the human person must become completely involved in the activity of this present life.[121] It is a system of merit where those who are faithful towards God ultimately receive the blessing of divine likeness. This eschatological reality is also depicted in 1 Cor 15:53 when death (*cf.* Psalm 81(82):7) is overcome and the believer is resurrected in the image and likeness of God. This expresses the nature of this glorified state in terms of a conflation of Gen 1:26 and Gen 3:5 where humankind is at last made, once again, in the image and likeness of God and possesses the knowledge of good and evil. Taken together these texts are all understood in terms of order and a salvific trajectory where Gen 1:26, Gen 3:5, and Psalm 81(82):7 portray the original nature and destiny of the human creature that, conditioned by free will, anticipates participation in the divine nature through resurrection as expressed in Psalm 81(82):6, and 1 Cor 15:53.

5.14 God Makes and Humankind is Made: *Haer.* 4.39.2 (Gen 1:26, Gen 2:5, Gen 2:7)

Continuing his description of the freedom of human nature, in *Haer*. 4.39.2 Irenaeus again emphasizes the necessity for humans to progress morally through obedience. Through acquaintance with good and evil, human beings become more resolute in their obedience toward God, which allows the creative hands of God to refashion the corruptible aspects of human nature.[122] Anticipating the future second creation from the dust, where the faithful are resurrected and recreated in the image and likeness of God, Irenaeus offers a poetic description that blends together the imagery of the creation from the dust in Gen 2:7 with Exod 25:11 and Psalm 44:12(45:11).

The final re-creation is not a singular event set apart from the creative activity of God in the present, but in Gen 1:26 the Father's work of creation by means of the Son and the Spirit is a continuous creation throughout salvation history. This universal truth is summarized in the Irenaean axiom: "For you did not make God, but God made you" (*Non enim tu Deum facis, sed Deus te facit*).[123]

121 Behr, *Asceticism*, 125.

122 *Cf. Haer*. 4.11.2.

123 *Haer*. 4.39.2.

The unilateral creation of God in Gen 2:7 informs this saying and the designation of humanity as the "work of God" (*opera Dei*). As a result, Irenaeus pleads with his readers to "await the hand of your maker" (*manum artifices tui exspecta*) referring to the "hand" (*manum*) of God that formed Adam in Gen 1:26 and Gen 2:7. In continuity with his argument for a patient, progressive sanctification and his understanding of the structure of the divine economy, he suggests that God creates everything in due time.[124] He illustrates growth in sanctification with the imagery of Gen 2:7 and beseeches his readers to offer a softened, malleable heart to God, so that they "preserve the form" (*custodi figuram*) in which the Creator has fashioned them. This form is characterized by "moisture" (*humorem*) evokes the imagery of rain on the earth in Gen 2:5 prior to the formation of Adam in Gen 2:7. This allusion is confirmed in the next line where Irenaeus refers to the "moist clay" (*lutum*) of Adam's formation.[125]

On the other hand, he also applies the imagery of Gen 2:7 to those who remain hardened and obstinate towards God lose "the impressions of His fingers" (*amittas vestigia digitorum ejus*), because the Son and the Spirit are not actively forming them.[126] In doing so, they "reject His workmanship" (*respuas artem ejus*) and will loose both God's "workmanship and life" (*artem . . . et vitam*).[127] The language of *artem* and *vitam* refer back to the artful formation from the dust in Gen 2:7 where Adam became a living being. From this analysis it is clear that the "hand" (*manus*) of God is never separated from creation, but actively involved in a continual act of creation. The creature can become hardened and obstinate toward the Creator and in turn deny the formative presence of the Spirit or remain open and submissive to the Creator allowing themselves to be fashioned by God continually.[128]

Irenaeus corresponds his reading of Gen 1:26 and Gen 2:7 with references to the construction of the Ark of the Covenant in Exod 25:11 and the king's admiration for his bride in Psalm 44:12(45:11).[129] The verbal connections between these texts are the general descriptions of beauty in each passage. After the ark was formed out of wood, Exod 25:11 directs Moses to cover the wood with a

124 Vogel, "The Haste of Sin, the Slowness of Salvation: An Interpretation of Irenaeus and the Fall and Redemption," *AThR* 89 (2007): 443–59.

125 *Haer*. 4.39.2. For Orbe, the reference to water in this context, which most naturally alludes to Gen 2:5, is a reference to the Spirit who, alongside the Son (*cf.* Gen 1:26), is active in the creation of Adam. Orbe, *Teología IV*, 524 n. 23, n. 27–28.

126 *Haer*. 4.39.2.

127 *Haer*. 4.39.2.

128 Behr, *Asceticism*, 117. For the contrary positions on free will in Irenaeus and the Valentinians see: Orbe, *Teología IV*, 527–8.

129 Orbe, "El hombre ideal en la teología de san Ireneo," *Greg* 43 (1962), 464–68.

layer of pure gold. Irenaeus applies this imagery to the resurrected body, where, figuratively speaking, God will cover the mortal form of flesh fashioned from feeble dust with a layering of pure gold and silver. Likewise, Irenaeus also mentions Psalm 44:12(45:11), which compares a king's admiration for the beauty of his daughter to the beauty of the resurrected body and the pleasure God will take in the resurrected, perfected humanity. The quality of the elements of gold and silver along with the admiration of the king imagines the immortal nature of the resurrected body that receives the perfection God intended in Gen 1:26 and Gen 2:7.

5.15 The Prophecy of Eschatological Judgment in Creation: *Haer.* 4.40.3 (Gen 3:1–6, Gen 3:15)

Finally in *Haer*. 4.40.3, Irenaeus closes his book with a discussion of eschatology that builds upon his argument for the theology of the resurrection. He argues that God has prepared good things for those who remain faithful, but the Devil and those who rebel from God will be cast into an eternal fire (Matt 25:41).[130] In Irenaeus' thinking, Adam and Eve's disobedience was not merely the result of a self-motivated rebellion, but of the schemes of a carefully calculating *provocateur*. Certainly Adam and Eve's immaturity contributed to their indiscretion, and they (and their posterity) remain culpable for their actions, but this deceiver rather than the humankind receives full measure of God's retribution.[131] He connects the parable of the wheat and the tares (Matt 13:24–30; 36–43) with the description of apostasy in Gen 3:1–6 and the ultimate destruction of the serpent in the correspondence between Gen 3:15 and Gal 4:4.[132] The connections between these passages are found in the common imagery of the apostasy in Gen 3:1–6 and Matt 13:37–43, as well as the prophecy of the *protoevangelium* in Gen 3:15 that is fulfilled in Gal 4:4 and the destruction of the Devil in Matt 25:41. These intertextual connections are informed by an Adam-Christ typology that unifies the work of God in both testaments.

Irenaeus begins *Haer*. 4.40.3 with a discussion of the parable and, following the words of the Lord in Matt 13:37–43, he identifies the Lord as the one who sows the good seed and the Devil as the one who sows the tares. His discussion of Matt 13 transitions into a more general discussion of the apostasy in

130 *Haer*. 4.40.1.

131 Victor K. Downing, "Doctrine of Regeneration in the Second Century," *ERT* 14.2 (1990): 99–112, 110.

132 Bingham, *Irenaeus' use of Matthew's Gospel*, 50.

Gen 3:1–6. Envious of Adam as God's special creation, the Devil (the enemy of Matt 13:25) came and sowed tares in the garden that produced Adam and Eve's transgression in Gen 3:6. Through his actions the enemy of God desired to introduce enmity between God and humanity, thereby upsetting their privileged relationship. The devil, however, failed to inflict enmity between God and humanity because he had compassion on the first couple and, as a result, the responsibility of the transgression fell upon the serpent. According to Irenaeus, Adam did not desire to commit apostasy against God, but could not resist the deception of the enemy. Following Adam and Eve's transgression God banished the Devil from his presence (*cf.* Gen 3:14–5, Matt 13:42), and ultimately the work of Christ eradicates the enmity the Devil desired to inflict between God and humanity. Irenaeus emphasizes the prosopological aspect of Gen 3:15, when he highlights that God *spoke* to the serpent the prophecy of Gen 3:15. This prophecy is fulfilled in the incarnation when Christ was "born of a woman" (*de muliere factus*, Gal 4:4). The act of apostasy begins with the serpent conquering the woman (Gen 3:6) and concludes with Christ, through a woman, gaining victory over the snake (Gal 4:4). In this sense, Irenaeus implies the incarnation is the fulfillment of the promise of the serpent's destruction in Gen 3:15. The vengeance of God that the Devil desired to come upon Adam and Eve by making them the "enemy of God" (*inimicum Deo*), was instead enacted upon Satan for his role in the transgression. For this reason, the Devil and his angels are subject to judgment and cast into the eternal fire (*cf.* Matt 13:41, Matt 25:41).

5.16 Conclusion: Irenaeus' Intertextual Reading of Gen 1–3 in *Haer.* 4

In *Haer*. 4, Irenaeus conflates and harmonizes the language and imagery of Gen 1–3 with a variety of other scriptures. In most instances there is no introductory formula to signify a reference to Genesis, instead he blends this imagery into the flow of his argumentation. This intertextual use of scripture in *Haer*. 4 continues to sharpen the specific reading strategies that have characterized his reading of Gen 1–3 in the previous books. In *Haer*. 4, he applies similar reading strategies including: narratival arrangements, catchwords, literary reading, typology, prosopological interpretation, illustrative uses, general-to-particular arguments, and specific canonical arrangements. Not all of these categories are mutually exclusive, but often work in harmony as he reads creation. In addition, the book is framed by two references to his predecessors (Justin and the Presbyter) who also contribute to his intertextual reading of Gen 1–3. In each of these instances, Irenaeus continually returns to the language, imagery, and

events of Gen 1–3 as a means to interpret other passages and images with in the rest of the scriptural witness. Irenaeus' scripture hermeneutic is governed by these intertextual references, as he works through his polemical response to his opponents and explains his own theological system.

Beginning with his references to Justin (*Haer*. 4.6.2) and the Presbyter (Haer. 4.32.1), Irenaeus reveals that his intertextual reading of Gen 1–3 is not entirely unique. These two sections evidence Irenaeus' dependency on two individuals who have guided his intertextual reflection of Gen 1–3. These are not the only places that Irenaeus' draws on the thought of his predecessors, but they are two instances where his intertextual reading of Gen 1–3 shares similarities with some of those under whom he studied. Justin shows his tendency for prosopological readings of Gen 1–3 that identify the divine persons with the titles: "Framer," "Maker," and "Nourisher." He also frames Gen 1–3 alongside references to the incarnation that unites the Father of Jesus with the Creator in Genesis. Similarly, his reference to the teaching of the Presbyter applies a prosopological reading of Gen 1:3 that identifies the activity of the Word of God with God *speaking* creation into existence. This prosopological interpretation is also supported by an array of other intertexts including: John 1:3, Eph 4:5–6, and Eph 4:15–16/Col 2:19. There is no doubt that Irenaeus extends the teaching of Justin and the Presbyter, but these instances express the learned aspect of Irenaeus' intertextuality and his reading of Gen 1–3 in particular.

Turning to his intertextual strategies in *Haer*. 4, first of all, Irenaeus continues to extend the nature of his narratival arrangement of texts. In these instances, Irenaeus frames a series of scriptural allusions in varying chronological relationships. The imagery of Gen 1:28, in particular, provides a theological paradigm for human growth that is realized in the unfolding of salvation history. He makes this point explicit in *Haer*. 4.11.2, where he also argues that throughout the growth of the divine economy, the ancients longed to see the advent of the Son (Matt 13:17). But this also includes the way that he reads the texts of Gen 1–3 together as a single unified narrative account of creation, as well as reading these creation texts in correspondence with later revelation. The former case is clear in *Haer*. 4.pf.4 where Irenaeus conflates Gen 1:26 and 2:7 into one creation account of humankind. The "hands of God" create Adam from the dust and in the image of God. Irenaeus emphasizes the interpretation of these passages as a literal account of creation, without any extended or explicit reference to texts outside of Gen 1–3. In the later sense, Irenaeus balances his harmonious reading of creation texts by drawing together their connection to later revelation. In *Haer*. 4.6.2 he describes the creative acts of God in successive allusions to Gen 1:26, Gen 2:7, and Gen 1:28, and then he conflates this imagery of creation with his theology of recapitulation in Eph 1:10. Finally,

Irenaeus focuses on the covenantal structure of scripture and gives close attention to the way the covenants, beginning with Adam, unify the divine economy. In *Haer*. 4.34.4, Irenaeus discusses how the fulfillment of the New Covenant in Christ restores and extends God's creative work in Gen 1–2.

Second, the collection of catchwords and more general verbal associations that Irenaeus uses to link texts continues to develop in this book. There is also particular attention given to the imagery surrounding Adam's formation from the earth. In most cases, Irenaeus offers little or no commentary on these texts, but instead views the passages as themselves commentary upon the creation in Gen 1–2 or vice-versa. They all testify to God as the Creator of all things. In many cases the terms are not cognates, but share common features or general classifications. Beginning in *Haer*. 4.16.1, Irenaeus connects the "sign" of the "Sabbath" in Exod 31:13 and Ezek 20:12 with the description of Sabbath rest in Gen 2:1–2. In *Haer*. 4.20.1–4a the language of "all things" (*omnia*) is the specific term that unites a series of passages including: *Mand* 1, Mal 2:10, Eph 4:6, and Matt 11:27. In *Haer*. 4.34.4 the general "farming" imagery connects the harvesting imagery of the New Covenant in Isa 2:3–4 with the formation of Adam in Gen 2:7 and reverses the curse in Gen 3:17–18. Similar imagery surfaces in *Haer*. 4.36.1–2, with reference to the planting of a vineyard in the parable of the wicked tenants (Matt 21:33–43).

Third, Irenaeus continues to use a variety of typological connections, especially in *Haer*. 4.33–36. These are crafted through his intertextual perspective and closely related to a particular aspect of the work of Christ. These typological relationships include an Adam-Abel-Christ, Adam-Noah, Adam-Christ, and David-Solomon-Jonah-Christ. These conceptual connections do not imply hierarchy, and the texts of Gen 1–3 may serve as a primary or supportive text depending upon the context. For example, responding to the Ebionites, he describes how Christ must be greater than David, Solomon, Jonah, and even the evil one who subdued humanity (Matt 12:41–42, Matt 2:43, Matt 12:29), because humankind was formed in his image (Gen 1:26). In *Haer*. 4.33.4, his Adam-Christ typology conflates Isa 7:14, John 1:14, Gen 1:26, and Gen 2:7 to highlight the correspondence between salvation and the incarnation. He also unites the figures of Adam, Abel, and Christ in *Haer*. 4.34.4 where the formation of Adam prefigures the incarnation and the death of Abel prefigures the ingathering of the righteous. In addition to the allusions to Gen 2–4, his typology draws on Isa 2:3–4, Isa 57:1, Matt 5:39, and John 4:37. The Adam-Noah typology involves the interpretation of the "days of Noah" in Luke 17:2–6, and the Nephilim in Gen 6. Irenaeus understands the judgment upon Noah as a means for God to preserve the formation of Adam (Gen 2:7) from complete destruction. Besides the personal typological relationships, his eschatological interpretation of the

Sabbath day of rest in Gen 2:2–3, which is more prevalent in *Haer*. 5, emerges in *Haer*. 4.16.1. In this sense Gen 2:2–3 is a sign (Exod 20:12, Exod 31:13) that anticipates the conditions of life the faithful will enjoy when they dwell eternally in God's service (Matt 6:19 and Rom 8:36).

Fourth, the prosopological style of interpretation that punctuated other books continues in *Haer*. 4, where Irenaeus identifies particular divine persons functioning in correspondence to creation texts. Beginning in *Haer*. 4.pf.4. He interprets the proclamation of Gen 1:26 as the two hands of God, the Son and the Spirit that participate in the work of creation. Similarly, in *Haer*. 4.6.2, a section dependent upon Justin, the verbal forms of God's creative activity are used as specific titles for God in order to identify the Creator in Gen 1:26, 1:28, and 2:7. These titles include God as "Framer," "Maker," and "Nourisher." This kind of interpretation also involves the way Irenaeus reads theophanies, such as the allusion in *Haer*. 4.10.1 to the Son of God inquiring after Adam in Gen 3:9. In this instance, Irenaeus borrows from Christ's words in John 5:39–40 that Moses spoke of him, and uses this passage to identify a series of texts that record Christ's theophanic appearances in the Old Testament. Finally, in *Haer*. 4.20.4, Irenaeus uses Prov 3:19–20, Prov 8:22–25, Prov 8:27–31 in connection with Gen 1:26 to explain the "trinitarian" nature of God creating in Genesis, and likewise in *Haer*. 4.32.1 he alludes to John 1:3, Eph 4:5–6, 15–16, and Col 2:19 to argue that the Word of God is with the Father creating in Gen 1:3.

Fifth, Irenaeus frequently applies texts in an illustrative fashion, where he appeals to the imagery or patterning within a passage to explain a theological concept. This includes the use of the language in Gen 1–3 as an illustration for a theological point drawn from a separate passage, or the use of other scriptures to illustrate and interpret Gen 1–3. His illustrative use of texts also includes the application of scriptural figures or events to his contemporary setting. Along the lines of this second point, he appeals to the language of 2 Cor 11:3 in *Haer*. 4.pf.4 and remarks that the Gnostics believe they have discovered ineffable mysteries, which promotes same deception as the serpent in the Garden (Gen 3:1–5). The Gnostics, then, manifest the deception of the serpent in Irenaeus' own setting. In *Haer*. 4.10.1 Irenaeus alludes to Christ's words in John 5:39–40 that Moses wrote of him, and then he cites a series of theophanies, including Gen 3:9, as illustrations of the presence of the Son of God in the Old Testament. Finally, in *Haer*. 4.39.2, he appeals to the imagery of Adam's formation in Gen 2:7, along with other passages, to explain the nature and beauty of the resurrected body.

Sixth, Irenaeus also applies a classical general-to-particular or part-to-whole style of argumentation. In *Haer*. 4.20.1–4, Irenaeus weaves together a set of texts that argue logically from the general concept that God created all things to

the more particular point that God created humankind as a subset within the creation of all things (Acts 10:42, Rev 3:7, John 1:14, 1 Pet 2:23, and Col 1:18). These texts are not linked by any particular catchword, but conceptually describe the inclusive nature of God's creative activity and the power of the Son to accomplish the Father's creative will. In these instances his choice of intertexts is directly connected by the inclusiveness of image within the passage.

Seventh, he argues for a canonical arrangement of texts that intentionally link texts from different portions of scripture. Most often this takes the form of stringing together texts drawn from the prophets, the words of the Lord in the Gospels, and apostolic writings. These passages often bound by other verbal connections, but he also selects these texts from disparate portions of scripture in order to unify the scriptural witness. In *Haer*. 4.16.1 his eschatological reading of Gen 2:2–3 links Exod 20:12, Exod 31:13, Matt 6:19, and Rom 8:36. Irenaeus makes the same point when he links Mal 2:10, Matt 11:27, and Eph 4:6 in *Haer*. 4.20.1. These passages describe the creation of all things by means of the Word in Gen 1–2, and the truth of this reality is confirmed at every stage of the divine economy.

Throughout *Haer*. 4, Irenaeus applies a diversity of reading strategies to Gen 1–3 as he steadily build his case for the unity of both testaments and the growth of humankind toward perfection in the image and likeness of God, the resurrection of the body, and the eschatological judgment. These reading strategies demonstrate the way Irenaeus' intertextual reading is expressed within his applied exegesis. In *Haer*. 5, however, the complexity of Irenaeus' theological treatment of these themes reaches its climax, and provides the most detailed and extended intertextual reflection on these early chapters of Genesis.

CHAPTER 6

From Creation to the Resurrection of the Body: The Intertextual Reception of Genesis 1–3 in Book 5 of *Adversus Haereses*

6.1 Introduction

The survey of Gen 1–3 in the previous chapters communicates an unmistakable intertextual logic in Irenaeus' scriptural interpretation. The final book in Irenaeus' five-part refutation of the Gnostics presents a fitting conclusion and culmination to his intertextual reception of Gen 1–3. This chapter provides the most consistent and extensive set of intertextual relationships formed with Gen 1–3 than any of the previous books. Having described the Gnostic mythological system in *Haer*. 1, refuted it on several crucial points in *Haer*. 2, and firmly established his Christology in *Haer*. 3–4, finally in *Haer*. 5 he completes his refutation with a careful argument for resurrection of the body. For Irenaeus, this argument is the pinnacle of his anti-Gnostic polemic, because he views the creation, preservation, and resurrection of the flesh as the work of God. Given his attention to the resurrection, it is only natural that the creation and preservation of the body in Gen 1–3 is pivotal to his argument. More than the previous books, he regularly returns to the content and imagery in Gen 1–3 to frame his arguments and biblical interpretation, which is why this chapter is the most extensive and detailed. However, like the previous chapters, the creation accounts also continue to function as the authentic account of the creation, and at the same time they establish a prophetic paradigm anticipating the unfolding of salvation history, the nature of the resurrected body, and the eschatological kingdom.

Haer. 5 falls neatly into three general sections comprising: *Haer*. 5.1–14, *Haer*. 5.15–24, and *Haer*. 5.25–36.[1] *Haer*. 5.1–14 discusses the resurrection of the flesh, contra the Gnostics, as the culmination of human salvation begun at creation. The second section, *Haer*. 5.15–24, argues for the harmony between the activity of the person and work of Christ in the Gospels and the original creation. Third, *Haer*. 5.25–36 focuses on Irenaeus' eschatological vision and treats a

1 Orbe, *Teología v.1*, 14. See also W. Overbeck, *Menschwerdung: eine Untersuchung zurliterarischen und teologischen Einheit des fünften Buches 'Adversus Haersus' des Irenäus von Lyon* (Peter Lang, Bern, 1995).

© KONINKLIJKE BRILL NV, LEIDEN, 2015 | DOI 10.1163/9789004294523_007

number of prophetic texts in light of God's progressive plan of redemption within the divine economy. A short conclusion in *Haer*. 5.36.3 fills out the work with a summary of the essential argument for resurrection and the glorified body fashioned once again in the image of God. This short conclusion brings *Haer*. 5, and indeed the whole work, to a fitting conclusion.

Within the course of these arguments there are forty-eight allusions of Gen 1–3 that are found in half of the thirty-six chapters.[2] It is clear that the contents of Gen 1–3 are at the forefront of his mind from the opening discussion of the *salus carnis* in *Haer*. 5.1.1 to the final allusion to Gen 1:26 in the closing lines of *Haer*. 5.36.3. He constantly returns to the imagery as he weaves it together with other texts through the various aspects of his intertextual arguments. Irenaeus continues to utilize the variety of intertextual practices that have characterized his exegesis to this point including: organizational functions, verbal connections, typology, illustrative application, general-to-particular arguments, prophecy and fulfillment, prosopological interpretation, and canonical arrangements. Together, these classifications clarify in analytical terms precisely *how* Irenaeus reads scripture intertextually. Amid his theological arguments, these strategies bolster his support his theological reasoning from the scriptures.

6.2 Refuting Valentinians, Ebionites, and Marcion: *Haer.* 5.1.1–5.2.1

As he has argued elsewhere, Irenaeus commences *Haer*. 5 with formal defense for the necessity for the incarnation in response to the Ebionites, Valentinians, and Marcion.[3] Against the Valentinians and the Ebionites, he argues that Word become flesh in order to reveal the nature of the Creator. The incarnation is not only effectual for salvation, but it is instructive in the sense that it clarifies the creation events in Gen 1–3. Similarly, when he turns his attention to Marcion, he identifies the connections between the Creator in Gen 1–3 and the Father of Jesus in the Gospels. Both of these arguments are built upon intricate

2 Like the previous books, there are several references in *BP* that were unidentifiable including: Gen 1:26 and Gen 2:7 in *Haer*. 5.11.2 (*cf*. 1Cor 15:49–50), Gen 3:19 in *Haer*. 5.17.1, Gen 3:1–6 in *Haer*. 5.24.3 (John 8:44), and Gen 1:26 and Gen 2:7 in *Haer*. 5.33.1–4.

3 *Haer*. 5.1.1–2.3. Sakari Häkkinen, "Ebionites," in *A Companion to Second-Century Christian 'Heretics,'* 247–78. Häkkinen suggests that Irenaeus derived his views from a revised catalog of heresies developed from Justin's *Syntagma*. See also Orbe, "Errores de los ebionitas (Analisis de Ireneo, Adversus haereses, v, 1, 3)," *Mar* 41 (1979): 147–70.

intertextual scriptural readings fashioned through a literal reading of Gen 1–3 and an Adam-Christ typology.

6.2.1 *The Valentinians on Adam and Christ*: Haer. *5.1.1–2* (*Gen 1:26, Gen 2:7, Gen 3:1–6, Gen 3:24*)

In *Haer*. 5.1.1.-3 Irenaeus addresses, once again, the Valentinian and the Ebionite views of the incarnation. First of all, in *Haer*. 5.1.1 he argues that if the Word of God did not become flesh, the revelation of God would have remained obscure and unattainable.[4] While the incarnation is effectual, it is also theologically instructive as it illuminates the understanding of the creation event. After all, Irenaeus reminds his readers, no one knows the mind of God or offers God counsel (Rom 11:34) except the Word of God. Once the divine Logos, who is the Counselor of the Father (John 1:18), became incarnate he offered up spiritual instruction. As a result the faithful, through communion with the Son of God (1 John 1:6) are able to perform the commands of his teaching (James 1:22) and advance towards divine perfection. This sophisticated intertextual description of the incarnation's didactical nature forms the backdrop for Irenaeus' explanation of the content of Christ's revelatory instruction, which he develops in the next few chapters.

He characterizes the revelation of the Word described above with notions of salvific perfection in the image and likeness of God and redemption from apostasy, both of which comprise subtle echoes of Gen 1:26, Gen 2:7 and Gen 3:1–6.[5] Beginning with his reading of Gen 1–2, he writes:

> We who were but lately created by the only best and good Being, by Him also who has the gift of immortality, having been formed after His likeness [Gen 1:26] predestinated according to the foreknowledge of the Father [Eph 1:11–12; 1Pet 1:2] that we, who had as yet no existence, might come into being, and made the first-fruits of creation [James 1:18].[6]

The echo of Gen 1:26 emphasizes the Christological connection and describes Adam as "formed after his [Christ's] likeness" (*ad eum similitudinem facti*). The reference to creation in the likeness of Christ is the qualitative description of humanity as "predestinated" (*praedestinati*) for immortality (Eph 1:11–12)

4 *Haer*. 5.1.1.

5 While Orbe identifies this as an allusion to Gen 1:26, it is not mentioned in *BP* or *SC*. Given the contextual description it seems certain Irenaeus has the imagery of Gen 1:26 in view. Orbe, *Teología v.1*, 60–1. See also Fantino, *L'homme*, 114.

6 *Haer*. 5.1.1.

by the "foreknowledge" (*praescientiam*) of the Father (1Pet 1:2) through the economic administration of the preexistent Word [James 1:18].[7] The divine command in Gen 1:26 is not a momentary, impulsive decision, as it was for the Gnostics, but a carefully calculated salvific arrangement designed to lead humanity incrementally towards the divine likeness.[8] The conflation of these New Testament texts clarifies the divine intention for creation in Gen 1–2, and, in this way, elucidates the literal interpretation of the text.

Second, the same intensive literal reading of Gen 1–2 continues in *Haer*. 5.1.1 with an extended description of the unjust apostasy committed in Gen 3:1–5, when the serpent, by means of cunning persuasion, gained dominion over Adam and Eve in the beginning and captured the creation that did not belong to him [John 8:44]. The verbal connections between Gen 3:1–5 and John 8:44 are located in the correspondences to "Satan" and the "beginning" in the Lord's words, and the general reference to humanity as "from your father the Devil."[9] For Irenaeus the prepositional phrase is possessive, implying that Satan took possession of humanity through the deception of the serpent. Satan, then, has tormented God's creatures throughout salvation history until the incarnation. Once again Irenaeus describes humanity as the "ancient handiwork of God" (*antiqua plasmatio Dei*), which always connotes the physical body of Adam fashioned from the dust in Gen 2:7.[10] The Adam-Christ typology continues to inform his theology of the incarnation. When Christ assumed humanity, he became the means of physical redemption. Twice in this context Irenaeus characterizes redemption from apostasy with the blood redemption language of Eph 1:7 and the ransom text of 1 Tim 2:6.[11] Through his death and resurrection Christ offered himself as a "redemption" (*redemptionem*) payment to the Father for all those who had been led into captivity through the deception of the serpent. This theological reading links his intensive literal reading with his Adam-Christ typology and demonstrates continuity between these reading strategies. The contemplation on the work of Satan through the serpent conflates Gen 3:1–6 with John 8:44, while the Adam-Christ typology of Eph 1:7, and 1 Tim 2:6 theologically connects the work of Christ with the activity of the serpent.

---

7 *Cf. Haer*. 4.38.3, James 1:18.

8 *Haer*. 1.5.5, *Haer*. 1.18.2, *Haer*. 1.24.1–2, and *Haer*. 1.30.6.

9 *Haer*. 5.1.1.

10 Orbe, *Teología v.1*, 87. *Cf. Haer*. 3.18.7, *Haer*. 4.36.2, 4, *Haer*. 5.14.1–2, *Haer*. 5.15.3, and *Haer*. 5.21.1.

11 *SC* notes Col 1:14, but the redemption language of *sanguine* alludes to Eph 1:7.

Irenaeus employs that same Adam-Christ typology in his critique of the docetic Valentinians in *Haer*. 5.1.2, who suggest the Word only appeared to become incarnate, but did not in reality assume flesh. Against a Valentinian docetism, he adds another brief allusion to Gen 2:7, which is also conflated with his recapitulation argument from Eph 1:10. If Christ merely appeared to become incarnate then it is logical to assume that he received nothing from Mary. However, the redemption of the body necessarily assumed that he received from Mary true flesh and blood. In Irenaeus' words, "For He would not have been one truly possessing flesh and blood, by which He redeemed us, unless He had summed up in Himself [Eph 1:10] the ancient formation of Adam [Gen 2:7]." Instead of the more general reference that Christ summed up "all things" (πάντα) in himself, Irenaeus particularizes Paul's argument, so that it is clear that Christ summed up the formation of Adam in himself. He has already made the case the humanity is a particular focus with in the general reference to the creation of all things.[12] This figural interpretation of Eph 1:10 specifies the apostle's language, and clarifies precisely the focus of Christ's salvific work. For Irenaeus, it is not logically consistent that Christ could recapitulate Adam's formation in himself only in appearance, nor merely appear to redeem the body that is subject to death. He must do so in reality, which means he must have assumed in himself the same substance of Adam's flesh.

6.2.2 *The Ebionites on Creation and Incarnation*: Haer. *5.1.3* (*Gen 1:26, Gen 2:7, Gen 3:6, Gen 3:23*)

While the Valentinians deny the humanity of Christ, the Ebionites reject his deity. They regard Jesus as the Messiah, but reject the virgin birth.[13] Irenaeus' polemical response is laced with Genesis creation imagery and read in correspondence with Luke 1:35, John 1:13, 1 Cor 5:7, and 1 Cor 15:22.[14] He appeals to the imagery of these texts in order to illustrate the continuity between Adam and Christ's formation. Furthermore, the denial of the incarnation is more fundamentally a denial of the potentiality for union, or "mingling" (*commixtionem*), between God and the human person, which is described in the

12 *Haer*. 4.20.1–2.

13 Häkkinen, "Ebionites," 247–78. Irenaeus is the first to mention the Ebionites among his analysis of heretics and he has done so on several occasions: *Haer*. 1.26.2, *Haer*. 3.11.7, *Haer*. 3.21.1, and *Haer*. 4.33.4. Orbe isolates some interesting linguistic parallels in first and second part of *Haer*. 5.1.3, which correspond to Irenaeus' polemical summary with his theological rebuttal. Orbe, *Teología v.1*, 88–89. The two sections comprise *sc* 153.24.61–26.71 and *sc* 153.26.71–83.

14 *Haer*. 5.1.3.

Spirit and the power of God coming upon Mary in Luke 1:35.[15] For Irenaeus, the Ebonite's denial of the incarnation identifies them with those still bound by Adam's sin of disobedience. To illustrate this point, he utilizes the Pauline culinary imagery of bread-making in 1 Cor 5:6–7, saying that the Ebionites "remain in the old leaven of birth" (*veteri generationis perseverantes fermento*).[16] By remaining in the condition of the heretics, they remain bound to Adam who was "conquered" (*victus*, Gen 3:6) and "expelled from paradise" (*projectus es de paradiso*, Gen 3:23).[17] The old leaven of 1 Cor 5:7, therefore, *illustrates* Adam's post-lapsarian condition, and all humankind, including the Ebionites, who reject the incarnation remain in this state.

Irenaeus continues the illustrative correspondence and the parallel conceptual patterning between the "bread-making" metaphor in 1 Cor 5:7 (Gen 3:6 and Gen 3:23) and the "human-making" imagery in Gen 2:7 and Luke 1:35. Not only do the Ebionites rebuff the proper understanding of Adam's fallen nature, but they also misunderstand the creative performance of the Word and Spirit from the creation to the incarnation.[18] Applying his Adam-Christ typology (Rom 5:12, 1Cor 15:22), Irenaeus parallels the nature of Adam's formation "in the beginning" (*initio*, Gen 2:7), and Christ's formation "in the end" (*fine*, Luke 1:35). He emphasizes the substance, or *plasma* (Gen 2:7), of Adam's formation as a way to identify the solidarity of the whole human race in Adam.[19] But the account in Gen 2:7 does not merely emphasize the *plasma*, because the plasma without the "breath of life" (*adspiratio vitae*) remains inanimate. Through the infusion of the breath of life, Adam becomes a "living human" (*animavit hominem*, Gen 2:7) and a "rational being" (*animal rationabile*). Rationality is a key component of the *imago dei* and Irenaeus' view of human freedom, though the use here is also polemical. Since the Ebionites are in the line of Adam and endowed with human freedom and rationality, they willingly choose to reject the validity of the incarnation, and their choice has soteriological implications.

---

15 Here Irenaeus appears to be employing Eucharist imagery with the composite nature of wine, verses mere water. For the complex interpretation of this term, see: Orbe, *Teología v.1*, 101–2.

16 *Haer*. 5.1.3. Orbe points to a similar idea in Jesus' warning against the yeast of the Pharisees and Sadducees in the Gospels (Matt 16:6, 11, Mark 8:15, Luke 12:1), which may also be part of this use of 1 Cor 5:7. Orbe, *Teología v.1*, 90, 99.

17 *Cf. Haer*. 3.23.7. The language *non recipientes*, referring to the Ebionites, introduces each allusion/echo.

18 In this case the similar language of *neque intelligere volentes quoniam* and *non contemplantes quoniam* links these concepts.

19 Behr, *Asceticism*, 38.

Irenaeus' illustrative use of Gen 2:7 serves as theological validation that human *plasma* can in fact receive divine unction. The imagery and divine activity recorded in the description of the incarnation in Luke 1:35 corresponds to Adam's formation. Thus, the Ebionites reject the proper connections between Luke 1:35 and Gen 2:7. While the language of "Holy Spirit" (*Spiritus sanctus*) in Luke 1:35 is self-evident, he interprets the "Power of the Most High" (*Virtus Altissimi*) as the "Son of the Most High God and Father of all" (*filius Altissimi Dei Patris omnium*), thereby distinguishing between the activity of the Father, Son, and Spirit in the incarnation.[20] Through the trinitarian activity expressed in a conflation of Luke 1:35 and Gen 2:7, the child born of Mary was united with the "ancient substance of Adam's formation" (*antiquae substantiae plasmationis Adae*), so that, once again, the substance of Adam's formation becomes "living and perfect" (*viventem et perfectum*) in the person of Christ.[21] Returning again to the Pauline imagery of 1 Cor 5:7, Christ is the "new lump" (νέον φύραμα) or the "new generation" (*novam . . . generationem*) that, once again, imparts life to the faithful (1 Cor 15:22).[22] All who remain joined to Adam's formation (i.e. the Ebionites) are subject to death, while all that remain faithful to Christ will be made alive.[23] The final echo of 1 Cor 15:22 highlights the Adam-Christ typology that pervades this intertextual reading of Gen 2:7, Luke 1:35, and 1Cor 5:7.

The tenor of Irenaeus' objection to Ebionite Christology, therefore, is not necessarily their reading of Luke 1:35 (or their rejection of Luke's Gospel altogether i.e. *Haer*. 1.26.2), but their lack of a coherent understanding of the events within the divine economy and vision for the man formed in Gen 1–2 epitomized in the intertextual correspondence between Gen 2:7, Luke 1:35, 1Cor 5:7, 1Cor 15:22. Irenaeus makes it clear that any dispute over Luke 1:35 (not to mention how this passage interprets Isa 7:14) must also address the apparent economic continuity between the substance of Adam's formation and Christ's incarnation. This becomes most evident in the closing lines of *Haer*. 5.1.3 where, citing Gen 1:26, Irenaeus formulates clear trinitarian theology of history and economic trajectory of salvation that is often expressed in a prosopological manner of reading.

He uses the imagery of Gen 1:26 in connection with his imagery of "hands" (*manus*) as a trinitarian analogy depicting the immediacy of God's presence in the formation of Adam (both in the beginning and throughout salvation

20 For the implicit connections between Luke 1:3 and Isa 7:14 in Irenaeus' exegetical response to the Ebonites see: Orbe, *Teología v.1*, 93–4.

21 *Haer*. 5.1.3.

22 *Haer*. 5.1.3. *Cf*. Rom 6:6, Eph 4:22, and Col 3:9.

23 *Cf*. Rom 5:12.

history). The Son and the Spirit are the "hands of God" (*manus Dei*) in Gen 1:26 to whom the Father proclaims, "Let Us make man in our image and likeness" (*Faciamus hominem ad imaginem et similitudinem nostram*).[24] Noting the intertextual connections between Gen 1:26 and Luke 1:35, the "hands" imagery in this context is linked to the two-fold mention of the Son and the Spirit in Luke 1:35. These same "Hands" are at work in the incarnation in Luke 1:35, fashioning Christ in the same pattern as Adam. Through the imagery of hands, the two-fold mention of the "Holy Spirit" (πνεῦμα ἅγιον) and the "Power of the Most High" (δύναμις ὑψίστου) in Luke 1:35 become the paradigm through which to understand the plural pronoun in the proclamation "Let Us make" (*Faciamus*) in Gen 1:26. Just as the Spirit and the Son (Power) are working in Luke 1:35, so it is the Spirit and the Son working in Gen 1:26.

Building upon the imagery of the "Hands" of God in Gen 1:26, Irenaeus concludes with an allusion to John 1:13, suggesting that the incarnation is a divine act and not the work of human desire or will. Christ is not merely human, but a "living man" (*vivum . . . hominem*, Gen 2:7) born out of the good pleasure of God for the sake of Adam.[25] When John 1:13 is set in continuity with Gen 2:7, John 1:13 expresses Christ as the ideal man of Genesis. For Irenaeus, John 1:13 is the natural theological conclusion to the creation of Adam.

While Irenaeus can appear inconsistent in his use of *imago* and *similitudo*, Fantino's analysis concludes, by and large, the *imago* refers to the incarnate Son of God, while the likeness refers to the faculty of reason or free will endowed to the creature and the Spirit that conforms the faithful to Christ's image. In this sense, soteriological function of the Word as the image and the Spirit as the likeness in Gen 1:26 is confirmed when this text is read in continuity with Luke 1:35 and John 1:13 (not to mention the Pauline Adam-Christ typology). Orbe comes close to making this argument when he suggests in passing that pre-incarnate readings of Gen 1:26 (and post-incarnate readings of the Ebionites) did not understand the "scope" of Gen 1:26 until the revelation of the incarnation in Luke 1:35 and John 1:13.[26] The titles and activity of the divine persons in Luke 1:35 also solidifies the personal distinction between image and likeness. With the revelation of the incarnate Son, the one who is willing to read scripture in continuity with scripture discovers the Son and Spirit of Luke 1:35 is the image and likeness of Gen 1:26. Of course this theological distinction cannot be separated from the anthropological object of salvation. It is the human form that is the locus of the Word and Spirit's activity throughout

24 *Haer*. 5.1.3.

25 *Haer*. 5.1.3. *Cf*. Col 1:19 (Phil 2:13).

26 Orbe, *Teología V.1*, 111.

history. Thus, Irenaeus does not debate the Valentinian and Ebionites over any particular passage from Gen 1–3, but through a community of texts read alongside these creation texts.

6.2.3 *Marcion on the Creator and the Father*: Haer. *5.2.1* (*Gen 1:26*)

Following closely with the previous section, in this chapter Irenaeus counters the Marcionite distinction between the Creator in Genesis and the Father of Jesus.[27] Irenaeus argues that Marcion believes the supreme God has no association to the material world; creation belongs wholly to the Demiurge of Genesis, who is also Yahweh the God of the Jews.[28] The sensible and material world are in every way *alien* to the Supreme God. Drawing a sharp distinction between the creation in Genesis and the Savior in the Gospels, Marcion believes the Supreme God sent a Savior to a world that did not belong to him to redeem a people that were not his own.[29]

Contrary to Marcion, Irenaeus reads the creation accounts in a highly literal manner and identifies humankind as God's property by nature, since humankind is God's creation. The logical conclusion is that the Father sent the Son to redeem what already belonged to him.[30] His polemic in this context focuses on two aspects of Marcion's thought: 1) the unjust nature of redeeming another's property and 2) the ineffectual nature of redemption without blood.[31] The former addresses the reading of John 1:11, the latter contains echoes of Eph 1:7, and both are set in relationship to Gen 1:26.[32] First, Irenaeus argues *a priori* that to steal the property belonging to another is unjust. Even if humanity belonged to the Demiurge and is *alien* (John 1:11) to the true God, it is not right or lawful to steal. Second, redemption that does not involve physical, bodily sacrifice (Eph 1:7) does not redeem the true nature of humanity. Without bodily sacrifice, the Savior did not truly become human and, as a result, humanity

27 *Cf. Haer*. 4.18.4.

28 There is much debate regarding the accuracy of Irenaeus' presentation of Marcion. Orbe, *Teología v.1*, 121. Harnack, *Marcion*, 295.

29 According to Tertullian, the language of coming "to another's property" (*in aliena*) is essential terminology of Marcion taken from John 1:11. Tertullian, *Marc*. 3.6.2, *Marc*. 3.9.10. See also: Orbe, *Teología v.1*, 118. Harnack, *Marcion*, 266–88. Orbe locates an allusion to John 1:11 in this citation, but it is not noted in *SC* or *BP*. Orbe, *Teología v.1*, 123.

30 *Haer*. 5.1.1. Although he does not mention Marcion specifically, Irenaeus is clearly speaking of Marcion here because of the parallel passage in *Haer*. 3.11.2.

31 Orbe, *Teología v.1*, 121.

32 Rousseau cites this passage as Col. 1:14, but the presence of *sanguine* here and in Eph 1:7 make the latter the more likely passage in consideration.

remains subject to mortality. Corresponding to the both positions, Irenaeus appeals to the literal, plain sense reading of Gen 1:26. The creation of humankind in the image and likeness of God suggests that they are not the property of another, but God's very own creation. Not only this, but the incarnation assumes Christ took possession of his own creation and assumed flesh, thereby effecting the redemption of the people that are "his very own" (*suo propria*).[33] At the incarnation the divine decree of Gen 1:26 comes to fruition and allows John and Paul to make sense of the incarnation in relation to the formation of Adam.

6.3 The Resurrection of the Body: *Haer*. 5.3.1 and *Haer.* 5.5.2

Haer. 5.3.1 begins a new section in the overall structure of *Haer*. 5 that addresses the *salus carnis*. Having worked through a critique of the Valentinians, Ebionites and Marcion, Irenaeus now provides a close evaluation of the Gnostic reading of 2 Cor 12:9.[34] It is obvious that Irenaeus is familiar with competing Gnostic interpretations of this passage defending the renunciation of the corrupt body fashion by an incompetent Demiurge. The language of 2 Cor 12:9 and is cited in full in *Haer*. 5.3.1 and orients *Haer*. 5.3.1–5.5.2. The discussion focuses upon the interpretation of the language of "weakness of the flesh" (*infirmitatem . . . carnis*) and the "power of God" (*potentiam Dei*).[35] In the hands of Irenaeus, this Pauline text becomes a theological axiom manifesting the power of God over human weakness. The verbal and illustrative correspondence between Gen 1–3, 2 Cor 12:9, and the interrelated texts frames this section as a whole. Gen 2:7, in particular, serves as a crucial illustration of the power to restore the flesh.

6.3.1 *The Power of God the Weakness of the Flesh*: Haer. *5.3.2–3* (*Gen 2:7*)

After concluding these polemical arguments, Irenaeus announces the text of 2 Cor 12:7–9 and cites the passage in the opening lines of *Haer*. 5.3.1. He then comments on this text through linking terms that unite a series of related texts including: Gen 2:7, 1 Cor 15:53, and Heb 11:19. His argument is framed into two logical claims: 1) God has the power to raise the flesh, and 2) the flesh is fit and capable of receiving vivification. Within this rhetorical structure, Gen 2:7 is a

33 *Haer*. 5.2.1.

34 Orbe notes that Irenaeus' comments are not set against any particular heretic (docetists, Marcionites, Gnostics), but against all of them collectively. He suggests that he speaks in general terms to include any who would reject the *salus carnis*. Orbe, *Teología v.1*, 167.

35 *Haer*. 5.3.2. *cf. Haer*. 2.34.3–4.

key validation for Irenaeus' understanding of the relationship between God's creative power and the resurrection. Then, continuing his discussion of the *salus carnis*, in *Haer*. 5.5.1–2 Irenaeus interprets 2 Cor 12:9, and the power of God to raise the flesh, alongside a number of allusions to the longevity of the patriarchs and the nature of paradise including: Gen 2:7, Gen 2:8 (*cf*. 2:15), Gen 3:23, Gen 5:24, (c.f. Gen 5:3–32) Gen 9:29, 2 Kgs 2:11, Jonah 2, Dan 3:19–25, and 2 Cor 12:4. Joining his anthropology and eschatology, he describes the economic vision for Adam's formation. God's two Hands, the Son and the Spirit that formed Adam in Gen 2:7, continue to sustain creation throughout salvation history.

First of all, discussing the power of God in 2 Cor 12:9, Irenaeus makes verbal and illustrative connections between the description of the resurrection and the "power" (*virtutem*) mentioned in Heb 11:19 and 1 Cor 15:53, with the demonstration of God's creative power in Gen 2:7.[36] Heb 11:19 describes the "power" (*virtutem*) God has to raise the dead, while 1 Cor 15:53 more explicitly describes the imagery of the power of God to raise the corruptible body to incorruption. The power made perfect in weakness in 2 Cor 12:9 is the power to raise the flesh expressed in Heb 11:19 and 1 Cor 15:53. Therefore, the latter texts illustrates the power of God to form and enliven the flesh. What is more, Irenaeus adds that the original creation in Gen 2:7 is even "more difficult and incredible" (*multo difficilius et incredibilius*) than the resurrection from the dead, because it was *creatio ex nihilo*.[37] The resurrection in 1 Cor 15:53 and Heb 11:19 is a mere reassembling of the original form that decomposed into the earth. In the first instance, Irenaeus views the mortality of the flesh as experientially pedagogical, through which humankind becomes aware of the power of God. He goes so far as to define the weakness of the flesh as being "mortal by nature" (*natura mortalis*) and there is no hint of humanity's relationship to sin.[38] Mortality is the natural condition of created beings that are, by nature, imperfect. As a result, death is not retributive, but a natural consequence of creaturely existence.[39]

Nevertheless, even if God has the power to raise the flesh, Irenaeus reasons that the body must have the aptitude to receive life again. Appealing to the logical analysis of the form fashioned in Gen 2:7, he argues both that God has power to form flesh from the earth and the flesh is capable of receiving

36 *Haer*. 5.3.1. See also *Haer*. 3.19.9, *Haer*. 3.22.1, and *Haer*. 5.10.2.

37 *Haer*. 5.3.2.

38 *Haer*. 5.3.1. Altermath, "The Purpose of the incarnation," 65.

39 Brown, "On the necessary imperfection of creation," 21. *Cf*. Orbe, "El hombre ideal en la teología de s. Ireneo," *Greg* 43 (1967): 449–491, 455.

the life imparted by God. Consequently, this section entertains the contrast between the temporal life in the body and the eternal life given by the Spirit. Here Irenaeus distinguishes between two "modalities of life" that are separated by degree not nature.[40] The distinction between the present life and the resurrected life is not a distinction in nature, but a distinction in degree, from a "weaker" or "temporal" life to a "stronger" or "eternal" life.[41] This reading is borne out of intertextual connections with 2 Cor 12:9. He draws out the imagery of the fashioning of the body in Gen 2:7, including the harmonious binding of the various body parts, such as the sensitivity of the sensory organs and the agility of the muscular system. The aesthetic harmony of the body reveals the "wisdom of God" (*sapientia Dei*) in creation that is indicative of God's power. Utilizing his rhetorical arsenal he compares the flesh to a sponge or a torch.[42] Just as the sponge is fit to absorb water and the torch to possess fire, so also is the flesh, as Gen 2:7 testifies, "found fit and capable of receiving the power of God" (*Invenietur autem perceptrix et capax caro virtutis Dei*).[43] Just as the body has the capacity to receive the power of God in Gen 2:7, so also in the resurrection.[44]

6.3.2 *The Flesh in the Hands of God*: Haer. *5.5.1–2* (*Gen 2:7, Gen 2:8, Gen 2:15, Gen 3:23*)

Continuing his discussion of the *salus carnis*, in *Haer*. 5.5.1–2 Irenaeus exploits the longevity of the patriarchs and the nature of paradise as he elucidates, in response to 2 Cor 12:9, the power of God to raise the flesh. Joining his anthropology and eschatology, he describes the economic vision for Adam's formation. Irenaeus again applies a prosopological reading of Gen 2:7 and the "two Hands" of God, that is the Son and the Spirit, who form Adam from the dust, continue to sustain creation throughout salvation history. In Adam, Irenaeus writes, the hands of God became accustomed "to join together, to preserve, to sustain, to bring his form and place him where they pleased" (*coaptare et tenere et bajulare suum plasma et ferre et ponere ubi ipsae vellent*).[45] The last three

40 Behr, *Asceticism*, 95–6. *Cf. Haer*. 2.34.3–4.

41 Behr, *Asceticism*, 96.

42 *Haer*. 5.3.3.

43 *Haer*. 5.3.2. In the following section, *Haer*. 5.3.3, Irenaeus develops this argument and suggests the life the Gnostics enjoy now supports the capability of the flesh to participate in life.

44 This section confirms that Behr and others are right to correct Rousseau on his assertion that "life" in *Haer*. 2.34.3–4 is something other than bodily existence. Rousseau, "L'Eternité des peines", 843. *Cf.* Donovan, "Alive to the Glory of God," 289.

45 *Haer*. 5.5.1.

verbs (*bajulare, ferre, ponere*) are derived from Gen 2:8 (*cf.* 2:15), where God planted a garden in paradise and placed Adam there for growth and maturity.[46] The former two verbs (*coaptare, tenere*) explain the Son and the Spirit's role in holding simultaneously sustaining the bonds and preserving the life of the created form. This characterization of the inter-trinitarian activity is not, in Irenaeus' view, reserved to Adam's pre-lapsarian life. He has already noted that at no time did the "Hands of God" never abandoned Adam, because the existence and preservation of the flesh depends wholly upon the will and pleasure of God.[47]

Irenaeus joins his citation of Gen 2:8 with an allusion to Adam's expulsion from the Garden in Gen 3:23. While God's will and desire for Adam was the Edenic life, Adam relinquished this opportunity in his disobedience. Extending the application of his prosopological reading, any scriptural account involving the preservation or protraction of life in the body following Gen 3 is explained through the relationship to the Hands of God and the nature of paradise including: the translation and assumption of Enoch (Gen 5:24) and Elijah (2 Kgs 2:11), the preservation of Jonah in the whale (Jonah 2), and the preservation of Shadrach, Meshach and Abednego in the furnace (Dan 3:19–25).[48] This also includes the longevity of the patriarchs (i.e. Gen 5:3–32, Gen 9:29) who enjoyed their prolonged life for no other reason than the pleasure and will of God. In each instance the same "Hands" that fashioned Adam and placed him in paradise are the same "Hands" extending and preserving life throughout the unfolding of the divine economy.

While the preservation of the body is reserved for the Hands of God, the experiences of Enoch and Elijah raise the question of the location of paradise.[49] Irenaeus' interpretation of paradise is a sensible, intermediate realm separate from the earth, where the just and righteous dwell in anticipation of resurrection and immortality.[50] He links the experiences of Adam, Enoch, and Elijah, with Paul's rapture to paradise in 2 Cor 12:4. All four contain the language of "paradise" (*paradisus*) in each passage and, in the case of the latter three, the experience of being caught up to heaven. Adam, on the other hand, had existed in paradise and after his disobedience was cast out into this world.[51] In this sense, Enoch, Elijah and Paul exemplify the inversion of Adam's

46 Orbe, *Teología v.1*, 239.
47 *Haer*. 5.1.3.
48 *Haer*. 5.5.2.
49 *Cf. Epid* 10.
50 *Cf. Epid* 12.
51 *Haer*. 5.5.1.

expulsion from paradise in Gen 3:23 and function as a paradigm for the faithful that will make their way back into paradise to dwell in the presence of God. Contrary to Gnostic assumptions, their physical bodies are no hindrance to the paradisiacal life.

6.4 Perfection in the Image and Likeness: *Haer.* 5.6.1 (Gen 1:26, Gen 2:7)

Having used the testimonies of the faithful in the Old Testament to communicate the power and providence of God over the preservation of the flesh within the economy, in *Haer*. 5.6.1 Irenaeus provides a more focused treatment of the final resurrection in the image and likeness of God (Gen 1:26). This section, in particular, contains some intense reflection on the imagery of the body and Adam's formation from the dust. The anthropological vocabulary is interpreted literally and connects to other passages with similar imagery. Specifically, he links the image of God mentioned in Gen 1:26 with the flesh formed in Gen 2:7, saying it is "the flesh that was molded according to the image of God" (*carni quae plasmata secundum imaginem Dei*).[52] Irenaeus also links reason and freedom with the *imago dei*, but he explicitly rejects any notion of locating the image in the immaterial.[53] Irenaeus does not come to this conclusion merely from his contemplation on Gen 1:26, but from the intertextual association with Rom 8:29. Fantino does not mention Rom 8:29 in his evaluation of this passage and only mentions it elsewhere in passing as a purely eschatological reality.[54] While many have observed that the bishop can appear "inconsistent" in his usage of these terms, Steenberg argues that when he does clearly distinguish them, the distinction may be understood as "the ontological formation of the human person (image) and the actualization of the human nature in an individual's lived life (likeness)."[55] The former applies most properly to the person of the Son, while the latter applies to the activity of the Spirit, but Irenaeus arrives at this rendering of likeness through linking Rom 8:29 and Gen 1:26, which are connected through the language of "image" and the concept of

52 *Haer*. 5.6.1.

53 Fantino, *L'Homme*, 87–9. *Epid*. 11. *Haer*. 4.37.4.

54 Fantino, *L'homme*, 18, 125–28. For similar uses of Rom 8:29 see *Haer*. 4.20.8 and *Haer*. 4.37.7.

55 Steenberg, *Irenaeus*, 138. Fantino suggests that the likeness is "presence of the Spirit," but Behr is right to connect it with the breath of life that is lost in the apostasy. Behr, *Anthropology*, 115; Fantino, *L'homme*, 117–8. See also Fantino, *L'homme*, 4–44. Wingren, *Man and the incarnation*, 82. Osborn, *Irenaeus*, 211.

"conformable" (*conforme*).[56] Alluding to this Pauline passage, Irenaeus argues that the flesh was created to be conformable (*conforme*) and adapted (*adaptans*), by means of the Son and Spirit, to the image of the incarnate Son.[57] When Irenaeus reads Gen 1:26 in continuity with Rom 8:29, he interprets the notion of being conformed to the likeness as the activity of the Spirit transforming the faithful into the glorified and perfected image of the resurrected Christ.[58] This transformation is not an instantaneous event but a prolonged *plasmatio hominis* that extends throughout the course of the divine economy to the final consummation.[59]

The whole person, as Irenaeus argues, and not merely part of the person, was made in the image and likeness of God. The complete human person is one who is composed of body, soul, and Spirit and the three elements express the participation in the "triune reality" of the Father, Son, and Spirit. The Gnostics (especially the Valentinians), on the other hand, erect an anthropological dualism that partitions humanity in three distinctive natures: hylic, psychic, and spiritual.[60] The psychic human is fashioned after the likeness of the Demiurge, the pneumatic after the likeness of Sophia, and the body of the hylic after the image of Anthropos. In essence, Irenaeus argues in Gen 1:26 that God did *not* say "Let Us make *the soul* after the image and likeness of God," but God said "Let us make *the man* after the image and likeness of God." For Irenaeus, the soul and the Spirit are both *part* of the person, but they do not constitute the whole person.

Furthermore, the perfected human person is not merely body and soul, but also requires the indwelling of the Spirit (1 Cor 2:6). Irenaeus appeals to the two terms "perfect" (*perfectus*) and "spiritual" (*spiritalis*), which he views as synonymous, derived from 1 Cor 2:6 and 1 Cor 2:15 and related conceptually to the person formed from the dust and after the image of God in Gen 1:26 and Gen 2:7.[61] Irenaeus' view is fundamentally unitary, and comprising the

---

56 *Haer*. 5.6.1.

57 Orbe suggests a possible conflation with Phil 3:21 that contains similar imagery and the language of "transform" (μετασχηματίζω), but Irenaeus never mentions this text elsewhere. However, as Orbe also points out, the subject performing the work of transformation is Christ (*cf.* Phil 3:20).

58 Fantino, *L'homme*, 18, 178. Orbe, *Teología V.1*, 268.

59 Orbe, *Teología V.1*, 270; Steenberg, *Irenaeus*, 136.

60 *Haer*. 1.5.1–5.

61 In *Haer*. 1.8.3. Irenaeus describes how the Valentinians appeal to 1 Cor 2:14–15, along with 1 Cor 15:46, to explain their three-fold distinction of persons. 1 Cor 15:46 speaks of the "earthly" (*choicum*) 1 Cor 2:14 speaks of the "animal" (*animale*) and 1 Cor 2:15 speaks of the "spiritual" (*spiritale*). Irenaeus has already mentioned that the Valentinians refer to

anthropological "commingling and union" (*commixtio et adunitio*) of the soul receiving Spirit along with the "admixture" (*admixtae*) of the body fashioned in the image of the incarnate Son (i.e. Gen 1:26, Gen 2:7).[62] Thus, his anthropological framework is essentially tripartite, consisting of a body and soul that is infused with the Spirit of God. He will often use this philosophical definition of the human person as composed of body and soul, and Irenaeus' reading of 1 Cor 2:11 is consistent with his anthropological framework.[63] The Spirit of a man in 1 Cor 2:11 is the Spirit of God.[64] But his use of 1 Cor 2:11 implies that the presence of the Spirit alone, without the presence of the body is not a perfect or spiritual person. This is, as Behr notes, Irenaeus' primary point of emphasis when he closes with a citation of 1 Thess 5:23.[65]

The composite nature of Irenaeus' anthropological discussion from Gen 1:26, Gen 2:7, 1 Cor 2:6, 11, and 15 is expressed fully in the language of 1 Thess 5:23. 1 Thess 5:23 is the crucial passage that unites the anthropological poles of Genesis and Paul. It mentions all the component parts of the human person: body, soul, and Spirit, along with the language of "perfect" (*perfectus*).[66] Arguing from 1 Thess 5:23, those who are "perfect" are those who present to the Lord all three parts in concord. Contrary to the breath of life that infuses the formation from the dust, the flesh is vivified and made spiritual by the Spirit. These exegetical relationships communicate the creation of humankind and the eschatological perfection of the human person who is created in the image and likeness of God.

---

themselves as spiritual and perfect and in the context of *Haer*. 1.8.4, he cites the Valentinian use of 1 Cor 2:6 that finds Paul speaking of the mysteries of the Pleroma.

62 *Haer*. 5.6.1; *cf*. 1 Cor 3:1. He also alludes to 1 Cor 12:7 as those who bring to light the mysteries of God.

63 *Cf. Haer*. 2.33.5 and *Epid*. 7.

64 *Haer*. 5.6.1.

65 Behr, *Anthropology*, 100. Behr provides a good discussion of the interpretative difficulties of this passage presented in Rousseau's translation. Rousseau wants to render the *homo spiritus*, as the human soul, but as Behr notes, Irenaeus never does so. So the *Spiritus* is the *Spiritus Dei* as the one who owns and inhabits the human creature. Behr, *Anthropology*, 99 n. 51. Likewise, Orbe (contra Rousseau) consistently identifies the *spiritus hominis* with the *spiritus Dei*. Behr and Orbe are right to observe that in Irenaeus, the *Spiritus* is always divine, comes from God to humankind, and is considered an essential component of the perfect human. Orbe, *Teología v.1*, 274–5. *Cf. SC* 152.227–32.

66 *Haer*. 5.6.1. *Cf. Haer*. 2.33.5.

6.5 The Narrative of Resurrection: *Haer.* 5.7.1–2 (Gen 2:7, Gen 3:19)

In *Haer*. 5.7.1–2 Irenaeus continues his discussion of Pauline resurrection texts with a discussion of 1 Cor 6:14 and Rom 8:11 in conversation with a number of other texts including Gen 2:7 and Gen 3:19.[67] Irenaeus announces and cites 1 Cor 6:14 and then discusses this passage through a series of interrelated texts including: Gen 2:7, Gen 3:19, John 20:20, Rom 8:11, Psalm 21:30(22:29), and 1 Cor 15:36, 42–44.[68] These passages are, once again, coordinated through intense reflection on anthropological terminology in Gen 2–3. In doing so, Irenaeus interprets a Pauline theology of the body as a logical economic conclusion to the anthropology of Gen 2:7 and Gen 3:19. Irenaeus argued previously that the incarnate Christ is the true image of God (Rom 8:29), but in this section he develops this thesis by suggesting Christ's resurrected and glorified body is paradigmatic for the resurrection of the faithful.

Irenaeus begins with an allusion to Christ's resurrection appearance in John 20:20 linked with 1 Cor 6:14 and Rom 8:11. Referring to the corruptible nature of the human form in Rom 8:11, he asks the fundamental exegetical question, "What, then, are mortal bodies?" (*Quae sunt ergo mortalia corpora*).[69] Paul's language of "mortal bodies," Irenaeus reasons, cannot refer to the soul or the Spirit, because these are naturally immortal. Neither is this a type of Gnosticized "spiritual" body. Instead, turning to Gen 2:7 he argues souls are incorporeal and bodies are corporeal. The *flatum vitae* that enlivens the man in Gen 2:7 must be, contrary to the mortal body fashioned from the earth, immortal. Logically it also follows that if the *flatum vitae* is immortal then the soul is immortal also, since Adam became a "living soul" (*animam viventem*, Gen 2:7).[70] Irenaeus also finds the incorporeal nature of the soul in the parallel terminology of Psalm 21:30(22:29), "my soul shall live to Him" (*anima mea illi vivet*), arguing that David speaks as if the soul is immortal and not subject to corruption. For Irenaeus, then, Paul's term "mortal bodies" must refer to the corporal substance fashioned from the dust in Gen 2:7 that receives the *flatum vitae* from God. All of these are bound by catchwords, "soul" (*anima*), "body" (*corpus*), and "living" (*vivientim*). The creation from the dust delimits the meaning of the term "mortal bodies" in Rom 8:11. Death does not apply

67 Rousseau's reordering of the chapter divisions to include the last lines of *Haer*. 5.6.2 as the opening lines of *Haer*. 5.7.1 is appropriate, as it corresponds both in content and structure to the rest of *Haer*. 5.7.1–2.

68 *sc* 153:84.78ff. See also: *sc* 152, 173.

69 *Haer*. 5.7.1. Wingren, *Man and the incarnation*, 206 n. 69.

70 *Cf. Haer*. 2.34.4.

to the soul, because the soul is the breath of life. In death the body becomes "without breath" (*sine spiratione*) or "inanimate" (*inanimalis*) and, according to Gen 3:19, dissolves back into its original substance.

Having established the meaning of mortal bodies through correspondence between Gen 2:7 and Rom 8:29, in *Haer*. 5.7.2 Irenaeus describes how the "power of God" (*virtute . . . Dei*) is able to resurrect the mortal flesh referring back to 1 Cor 6:14. In the previous discussion, Irenaeus concluded that the mortal body of Rom 8:11 is the same body that decomposed back into the earth (Gen 3:19), but now he must complement this discussion with the eschatological vision of the resurrection of the same mortal body. The allusion to the power of God incites an allusion to 1 Cor 15:43b, which also connects back to the dissolution of the flesh in Gen 3:19. The use of 1 Cor 15:42–44 sets up the eschatological dialectic between the natural body and the spiritual body. The Valentinians, on the other hand, identify the "mortal body" of Rom 8:11 and the "animal body" of 1 Cor 15:44 with the soul, or the psychic element, that is by nature corruptible, mortal, and resuscitable.[71] The pneumatics, or the spiritual bodies, are altogether of a different quality and nature. For Irenaeus, however, the "natural body" (*corpus animale*) suffers from "corruption" (*corrtpuione*), "dishonor" (*ignobilitate*), and "weakness" (*infirmitate*). This is the body that is "sown" (*seminas*) in 1 Cor 15:36, which links with the "earth" (*terra*) as the substances from which the body was cast (Gen 2:7).[72] Just as the "moral bodies" of Rom 8:11 are identified as the corporeal body, so also is the seed sown in 1 Cor 15:36 identified with the flesh, not the soul. All of these terms are catchwords that unite these texts and characterize the contrast between the natural body and the spiritual body.

Finally, the language of "sowing" (*semino*) and the imagery of the decaying body mentioned in 1 Cor 15:36 and 1 Cor 15:42 are drawn together with several characteristics of the body mentioned in 1 Cor 15:43–44. While Gen 3:19 is set as a backdrop to all these descriptions of the flesh, Irenaeus makes the passage explicit when he remarks the flesh is weak because it is composed of "earth" (*terra*). The ignoble images of dust and seeds communicate, for Irenaeus, the humility and fragility of the human form. In itself, the flesh does not have the power to overcome its own inherent weakness.[73] That power must be supplied by the power of God that resurrects the same natural body that is sown in weakness as a glorified spiritual body (Gen 3:19, 1Cor 15:43–44).[74]

71 Orbe, *Teología v.1*, 349–50.

72 *Cf.* John 12:24.

73 *Haer*. 5.7.2.

74 *Haer*. 5.7.2.

He conflates the decomposition imagery of Gen 3:19 with the first half of 1 Cor 15:43a, because, for Irenaeus, the dissolution of the flesh only applies to the "natural body." The glorified body, or spiritual body, that was sown into the earth in Gen 3:19 is raised in power in 1 Cor 15:43–44.

6.6 The Spirit and the Image and Likeness: *Haer.* 5.8.1 (Gen 1:26)

Having provided a highly involved exegetical discussion of the resurrection of the flesh, in *Haer*. 5.8.1 Irenaeus extends this argument with a closer evaluation of the Spirit's function in the resurrection of the faithful. Irenaeus argues the "pledge" (*credentes*) of the Spirit, mentioned in Eph 1:14, renders the faithful spiritual even in the present dispensation of the divine economy.[75] The indwelling of the Spirit occurs *in the flesh*, not by removing or setting aside the flesh. In this sense the mortal is, even in the present, swallowed up by immortality (2 Cor 5:4). This point explains Paul's argument that the faithful are not in the flesh, but in the Spirit in Rom 8:9. Contrary to the Gnostics, being "spiritual" (*spiritualis*) was not characteristic of select individuals temporarily united to a body and soul, but those who, with body and soul, have received the Spirit. This explains how the faithful who receive the Spirit as a pledge, according to Rom 8:15, are able to cry out "Abba Father" (*Abba, Pater*) as they groan for their future resurrection when they shall see God face to face (1 Cor 13:12).

This argument is a logical part-whole transition from the present state of the Spirit to the future resurrected life. The pledge of the Spirit in the present (Eph 1:14, Rom 8:9, 15) is a portion of the "universal grace of the Spirit" (*universa Spiritus gratia*) that will be the fullness of the Spirit imparted to the faithful by God the Father at the final consummation (Gen 1:26, 1 Cor 13:12).[76] The pledge is a promise for what the faithful will receive in the resurrection when they are rendered, once again, "in the image and likeness of God" (*secundum imaginem et similitudinem Dei*).[77] However, this is not a return to the Edenic state, but a restoration of the similitude to God that finally accomplishes the "perfect will" (*perficiet voluntatem*) of the Father set forth in the beginning (Gen 1:26). This is one of the few instances where the Spirit, rather than the Son, explicitly accomplishes the fulfillment of Gen 1:26, although the Son must be in view because the Son always executes the will of the Father.[78] In this case,

75 *Haer*. 5.8.1.

76 *Haer*. 5.8.1. He uses 2 Cor 5:4 to argue implicitly for both positions.

77 *Haer*. 5.8.1.

78 Orbe, *Teología v.1*, 376–7.

the Father's will is embodied in Gen 1:26, and realized when the pledge of the Spirit that leads the faithful incrementally toward perfection, gives way to the fullness of the Spirit that renders them in the image and likeness of God.

6.7 Flesh, Blood, and the Kingdom of God: *Haer*. 5.10.1, *Haer*. 5.12.1–6, *Haer*. 5.14.1–2

The section of *Haer*. 5.9.1–14.4 concerns the interpretation of 1Cor 15:50 and the enigmatic saying, "Flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God" (*caro et sanguis Dei hereditare non possunt*). The Gnostics regard this passage "decisive evidence" against any claim for a future bodily resurrection.[79] Irenaeus' response entails the complex intertextual argumentation where he concludes that flesh and blood, in their present state, cannot inherit the kingdom of God, but must be *inherited* by the Spirit.[80] He applies a variety of intertextual reading strategies including verbal associations, Adam-Christ typology, and general-to-particular reasoning. In *Haer*. 5.10.1, Irenaeus interprets the original sense of image and likeness in Gen 1:26, but anticipates how the imagery sets a framework for the eschatological life in the Spirit. Then, in *Haer*. 5.12.1–6, he develops the logical contrast between humanity created in Gen 1–2, with the present life in the Spirit and the future eschatological life. Finally, in *Haer*. 5.14.1–2 he addresses the key language "flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of heaven." He also closes with a polemical illustration drawn from Greco-Roman wrestling to describe Gnostic readings of 1 Cor 15:50 that serve to defend, once again, Irenaeus' practice of reading scripture intertextually.

6.7.1 *The Olive Tree and the Image and Likeness*: Haer. *5.10.1* (*Gen 1:26*)

In *Haer*. 5.10, the controlling text in this section is the imagery of the wild olive tree in Rom 11:17, which he interprets as the flesh that is engrafted to the Spirit as the good olive tree. Those who are not engrafted with the Spirit are, according to Matt 7:9, cut off and thrown into the fire. These same individuals are fruitless and expose themselves as the tares sown among the wheat in the parable of Matt 13:25. Those engrafted to the good olive tree, on the other hand, "receive the Word of God engrafted" (*insertionem accipientes verbum Dei*), which ensures their progress toward "the pristine nature of humankind" (*pristinam . . . hominis naturam*).

79 Pagels, *The Gnostic Paul: Gnostic Exegesis of the Pauline Letters* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1975), 85. *Cf. Haer*. 5.13.2.

80 Behr, *Asceticism*, 105.

Irenaeus focuses on the language of the "pristine nature" of Adam's original formation in the image and likeness of God (Gen 1:26). This qualification of a "pristine nature" connotes a pre-lapsarian condition of Adam, but also, given the contextual scriptural imagery (Rom 11:17, Matt 7:9, and Matt 13:25), describes the salvific trajectory of the divine economy that tends towards the eschatological perfection of the faithful. The faithful who are, at present, engrafted to the good olive tree of the Spirit will receive the engrafting of the Word that forms them in the image and likeness of God.

6.7.2 *The Breath of Life and the Spirit*: Haer. *5.12.1–6* (*Gen 1:26, Gen 2:7*)

Continuing his intertextual reading of 1 Cor 15:50 in *Haer*. 5.12.1–6, Irenaeus stresses the dissimilarity between the experiences of life and death. For Irenaeus, death and life are ontologically contrasting conditions; they cannot mutually coexist within the same person. The flesh, for its part, remains a bystander that may be drawn in the direction of corruption or incorruption. But Irenaeus must address the reality that, in the present, even those who experience life are still subject to death and corruption. For this reason, he speaks of "life" (*vitae*) in two senses that distinguish the present life within the divine economy given by the breath of God, which remains subject to death, and the eschatological glorified and incorruptible life in the Spirit.[81] Each section in *Haer*. 5.12–2–4 contains echoes or allusions to Gen 1:26 or Gen 2:7 set in intertextual relationship to other texts including: Isa 25:8, Isa 42:5, Isa 57:16, Acts 2:17, 1 Cor 15:22, 1 Cor 15:45–46, and Gal 1:15–16.[82] These are joined through both a detailed Adam-Christ typology and general-to-particular logic.

In the opening paragraph of *Haer*. 5.12.1, Irenaeus establishes the contrasting natures of life and death. While death has the power to overtake the human and drive life away, life bestowed by the Spirit must also possess the power to overcome death and restore the human to life with God (Rom 6:11). This economic distinction grounds his exegetical contrast in a general-to-particular fashion between the breath of life that animated Adam in Gen 2:7, with the vivifying Spirit in 1 Cor 15:45 that causes the human to become spiritual. The universality of the ephemeral life given by the breath to Adam, gives way to the particularly spiritual life bestowed by the Spirit through Christ. Then, Irenaeus' union of Genesis and Paul is confirmed with reference to Isa 25:8 and Isa 42:5. In Isa 25:8 the reality of death's champion over life gives way to the eschatological life of God that swallows up death and wipes away every tear and sorrow. The verb κατεπίνω (*devoro*) in Isa 25:8 LXX is the same term Paul

81 Similar to arguments he has made in *Haer*. 5.3.2 and *Haer*. 5.7.1–2.

82 *Cf. Haer*. 5.18.1–2.

uses in 1 Cor 15:54 and 2 Cor 5:4. Irenaeus describes the contrast in the nature and quality of life in the temporal life and the eternal life. The former life was given by the breath of God (Gen 2:7), while eternal life is given by the Spirit. Citing Isa 42:5, the same God who fashioned the earth also imparted breath to all and the Spirit to those who walk upon the earth. These texts confirm the transition from the breath to the Spirit and the way he unites texts in a general-to-particular fashion. He distinguishes between the collective nature of the breath that is imparted to all people, and the Spirit given only to those "who walk upon it [the earth]" (*qui calcant illam*). All humanity has inherited the "earth" (*terra*), which is the substance God uses in Gen 2:7 to fashion Adam, but now only those who have received the Spirit have sufficiently overcome or "tread down their earthly desires" (*inculcant terrenas concupiscentias*).[83] Likewise, in Isa 57:16 the breath is "common throughout creation" (*communiter in conditione*) as a part of the creative work and, therefore, ephemeral and vulnerable.[84] The Spirit, on the other hand, is consubstantial with God, and proceeds outward from God (Acts 2:17) remaining permanently in its place within the human form.

Continuing the contrast between the breath and the Spirit, Irenaeus applies the Adam-Christ typology of 1 Cor 15:45–6 to reinforce the salvific and economic trajectory of this relationship that corresponds to Gen 2:7. He employs Adam and Christ as paradigms for the qualitative distinction between the breath in Gen 2:7 and vivifying Spirit in 1 Cor 15:45.[85] The breath of life given to Adam (and by extension to all humanity) is provisional and temporary, abandoning the body after death. The Spirit, which follows after the breath, is eternal and permanent. Following the logic of 1 Cor 15:45, the first Adam is animated or rational, while the second Adam is spiritual. Contrary to the Gnostic sensibilities, the spiritual does not precede the rational (humanly speaking); the progression moves from the breath to the Spirit, or the animal to the spiritual. The need for the Spirit was introduced because the one who was made a "living soul" (*animam*) in Gen 2:7 forfeited his life though disobedience.[86] In *Epid* 15 Irenaeus argued that had Adam and Eve been obedient to God's command they would have remained immortal. As a result the animating breath lost its strength and requires the vivification of the Spirit through adoption. Those who do not possess the Spirit of God by adoption retain only the breath of life. The distinction turns upon each person's "receptive capacity" for the

83 *Haer*. 5.12.2.

84 Behr, *Asceticism*, 105–6.

85 Ibid., 535.

86 *Haer*. 5.12.2.

animating breath of life, which is temporal and mortal, or the vivifying Spirit, that is eternal and immortal.[87] According to Behr, there are not two sources of life, but one and only one life-giving Spirit who imparts the breath of God in Gen 2:7 and is poured out in fullness upon the faithful (Acts 2:17). Irenaeus' interpretation of the breath of life in Gen 2:7 is only properly understood within the economy of salvation and the vivifying Spirit of 1 Cor 15:45.

In *Haer*. 5.12.3–6 Irenaeus bolsters this anthropological argument by establishing the economic continuity and discontinuity between the breath of life in Gen 2:7 and the vivifying Spirit in 1 Cor 15:45. In *Haer*. 5.12.3 he notes for the strict continuity in the substance of the flesh that receives life. Although there are two modalities or degrees of life, one temporal and the other eternal, there is only one substance of the flesh partaking of both degrees of life. The same substance that dies and dissolves back into the earth (Gen 3:19) is the same substance that receives the vivifying Spirit (1 Cor 15:45).[88] Whereas the same lost sheep is the one that is found (Luke 15:4–6), the same body of Christ that experiences corruption is raised to new life in the Spirit. For this reason, just as there is solidarity with Adam in death, so also is there solidarity with Christ in the resurrection (1 Cor 15:22).

This soteriological tension between solidarity with Adam in death and solidarity with Christ in life (1Cor 15:22) is supported by a series of Pauline texts (Col 3:5, Col 3:9–10, and Phil 1:22) and an allusion to Gen 1:26. The transition from one degree of life to the other happens by setting aside not the substance of the flesh, contrary to the Valentinians, but the lusts (*concupiscentias*) of the flesh (Col 3:5). This is, for Irenaeus, the "old man" (*veterem hominem*, Col 3:9), or the former way of life (*pristinae . . . conversationis*), not the "ancient formation" (*veterem . . . plasationem*, Gen 2:7) that was fashioned from the earth, because to live in the flesh is the work of the Spirit (Phil 1:22).[89] Instead, those who desire solidarity in Christ's resurrection must put on the "new man" (*novum hominem*) who is being renewed through the true knowledge of God and conformed to the image of the Creator (Col 3:10). Connected through parallel imagery, Irenaeus interprets Paul's reference to the "image of the Creator" (*imaginem conditoris*) as confirmation of the fulfillment of God's intention for humanity to be made in the image and likeness of God (Gen 1:26).[90] This new

87 Behr, *Asceticism*, 107.

88 *Haer*. 5.12.3.

89 *Haer*. 5.12.4. The pejorative use of the Pauline imagery *veterem hominem* should not be confused with the frequent positive portrayal the *antiquam plasmationem* that is the physical substance of Adam's body. Orbe, *Teología v.1*, 87.

90 *Haer*. 5.12.4.

man of Col 3:9 is, for Irenaeus, the recapitulation of the same one created in the beginning to partake of the divine life.

In the closing sections of *Haer*. 5.12.5–6, there are two more echoes of the original formation of the flesh in Gen 2:7. Given the soteriological orientation of this section, the substance of the flesh continues to provide linking imagery that threads texts together his arguments. In the same manner as others, Paul was born of a woman (Gal 1:15–16) and received "ancient substance of flesh" (*antiqua carnis substantia*, Gen 2:7). Later he persecuted the church until he had direct converse with the Lord, then he preached the gospel *in the flesh*.[91] In the same manner as the Pauline old man/new man dialectic (Col 3:9–10), the very life of Paul reveals a continuity of substance before and after conversion.

The conversion of Paul is theologically analogous to Christ's miraculous healing accounts in the gospels, because they both exemplify a transition from the temporal life to eternal life in the Spirit. He argues that those who received physical restoration at the hands of Christ, "who formed humankind in the beginning" (*ab initio plasmavit hominem*), did so in the same substance of the flesh. The various parts of the body such as the eyes or the hands were not taken from a different substance, but retained the nature of their original form in a healthy condition. However, distinguishing between the particular and the universal, healing the particular members of the body typifies the universal restoration of the whole body in Christ, who confers life upon every portion of the flesh. There is no part or member that does not experience incorruption and life as one integrated whole. Therefore, the same one who created and organized the human form in the beginning is the same one who confers life upon his handiwork in the end.

6.7.3 *Reconciliation in the Body of Christ*: Haer. *5.14.1–2* (*Gen 2:7*)

This section brings closure to Irenaeus' extended reflection on 1 Cor 15:50.[92] While the Valentinians believe this Pauline language plainly refutes a bodily resurrection, Irenaeus builds his case for the *salus carnis* through a series of intertextual networks (especially Pauline) that drawn continually from that language and concepts resonate in Gen 1–3. In the final section, *Haer*. 5.13.2, he isolates what he perceives as the exegetical root of the problem. The Valentinians interpret the two terms, "flesh" (*caro*) and "blood" (*sanguis*), without respect for Paul's intended meaning and neglect to scrutinize the actual force (*virtutem*) of the terms themselves.[93] Instead, they examine the

91 *Cf. Haer*. 3.12.9.

92 For the Valentinian reading of 1 Cor 15:50 see Pagels, *The Gnostic Paul*, 85–86.

93 *Haer*. 5.13.2.

"terms themselves" (*ipsas dictiones*) apart from any association with the rest of scripture.[94] As an illustration he compares the Valentinian exegesis of 1Cor 15:50 to an amateur wrestler who, with only *single* move, latches on to *one part* (*unam partem*) of his opponent's body.[95] With a combination of moves, his adversary has no trouble overcoming the inexperienced wrestler. Not to be outdone, the conquered wrestler foolishly continues to maintain his grasp on the *one part* of his opponent's body and to the amusement of all the spectators he shamefully declares victory. In the same way, the Valentinians isolate these terms and refuse to consider the meaning of parallel imagery found throughout the Pauline corpus or the rest of the scriptural witness.[96] By separating terms from their natural Pauline context, they force the apostle into contradiction.[97] Even the description of the mortal assuming immortality in the immediate context of 1 Cor 15:54 communicates, according to Irenaeus, the salvation of the flesh. As a result, by neglecting the true understanding of one passage (1 Cor 15:50) they misunderstand a multitude of others.

Considering the nature of Irenaeus' exegetical concerns and the tissue of Pauline passages containing the terminology of "flesh" (*caro*) and "blood" (*sanguis*), he argues Paul cannot intend to devalue the flesh because elsewhere these terms are essential for defending Christ's human nature and the salvation of flesh.[98] In both cases, the nature of the flesh in Gen 2:7 occupies a formative role. First, Irenaeus reasons that the blood of the righteous must be required, otherwise the Lord would not have spilled blood. From Abel (Gen 4:10), to Noah (Gen 9:5–6), to Christ (Matt 23:35), the blood of the righteous has always been required. These three passages necessitate that Christ, receiving the same flesh and blood as the original formation of Adam (Gen 2:7), recapitulated the shedding of the righteous blood in his own person and redeemed what was lost in Adam.

Second, against any notion of docetic Christology, Irenaeus argues that flesh requires salvation otherwise the incarnation would be pointless. Using Gen 2:7 to interpret the language of flesh in 1 Cor 15:50, Irenaeus designates flesh as the very substance created from the dust. If life in the body required a different substance then the Father would have moulded Adam from some other substance. However, as Gen 2:7 illustrates, God moulded the man from

94 *Haer*. 5.13.2.

95 *Haer*. 5.13.2. *Cf. Haer*. 5.14.4.

96 He provides a number of examples throughout *Haer*. 5.13.3–4 including: Phil 3:20–21, 2 Cor 5:4, 1 Cor 6:20, 2 Cor 4:10–11, 2 Cor 3:3, Phil 3:10–11, and 1 Cor 15:13–21, 32.

97 *Haer*. 5.13.3, 5.

98 Donovan, *One Right Reading?*, 150.

the dust of the earth and, after he became disobedient, the entire economy of salvation converged upon the advent of the Lord, when he assumed the same flesh and blood. In the words of D'Alès, he was "chair de notre chair."[99] In the incarnation he sought out the same substance that has perished (Luke 19:10) and recapitulated in himself the very same flesh and blood, in order to redeem the body of flesh (Col 1:21–22) that was under bondage to sin and bring it into friendship and concord with God.[100] Wingren expresses this essential connection saying, "Sin is never in itself anything human, but on the contrary is the Devil's destruction of man as God made him."[101] Through the rest of the chapter, Irenaeus argues for consistent correlation between the flesh and blood of the first and second Adam through a series of intertexts.[102] In the end he concludes, contra the Valentinians, that flesh and blood in 1 Cor 15:50 should not be interpreted *properly* (*non proprie*), but metaphorically (and intertextually) as referring to the carnal works of the flesh that deprived humankind of life in the beginning.[103]

6.8 Creation, Resurrection, and the Healing of the Blind Man: *Haer.* 5:15.2–16.2

To this point in Irenaeus intertextual argumentation, he has maintained a rigorous defense of bodily resurrection from a copious amount of New Testament (especially Pauline) passages. In *Haer.* 5.15.1, Irenaeus broadens his approach in order to unify the purpose of God throughout the divine economy. From *Haer.* 5.15.2—5.24.4 Irenaeus comments on a series of three events from Christ's life that epitomizes the narrative of salvation. First, in *Haer.* 5.15.2—5.16.2 he connects the healing of the blind man in John 9 with Adam's formation in Genesis, second in *Haer.* 5.16.3–20.2 he links the crucifixion with Adam's disobedience, and third, in *Haer.* 5.21.1—24.4 he compares Christ's temptation account with Adam's disobedience. All three sections are framed by varying applications of an Adam-Christ typology and including both symmetrical and asymmetrical correspondence. These typological relationships are also linked through a variety of catchwords and illustrative imagery resident in Gen 1–3 and the Gospels.

99 D' Alès, "La doctrine de la récapitulationen Saint Irénée." *RSR* 6 (1916): 185–211, 193.

100 *Haer.* 4.14.2.

101 Wingren, *Man and the incarnation*, 86–87.

102 He alludes to Rom 6:6, Rom 6:12–13, Rom 6:19, Rom 7:5, 1 Cor 15:50, Eph 1:7, Eph 2:13, 14–15, Col 1:22, Col 2:19, and 1 Pet 2:22.

103 *Haer.* 4.14.4.

Finally, in order for Irenaeus' to support this typology he also reads creation in continuity with the economic understanding of the inter-trinitarian relationships. In this way, the revelation of Christ elucidates the identity of the divine persons functioning *in* the creation accounts themselves. All divine persons, Father, Son, and Spirit are perceivable in the language and descriptions of the creation account when read in continuity with New Testament revelation.

Therefore, beginning with Irenaeus commentary on the healing of the blind man in John 9:1–7, he interprets this narrative in continuity with the formation of Adam from the dust in Gen 2:7.[104] In essence, Irenaeus interprets Jesus miraculous act as a pedagogical illustration revealing the personal interrelationships between the Christ and the creative Word of God and between the Word of God and the Father/Creator. This account also confirms the resurrection and immortality for those who are destined for corruption. As he binds together these poles of the Son's mediating creative activity, Irenaeus draws together a myriad of passages that support his reading of Genesis and John.

6.8.1 *The Work of God and the Formation of Humankind*: Haer. *5.15.2* (*Gen 2:7*)

The argument of *Haer*. 5.15.2 advocates that John 9:1–7 reveals Christ as the Word of God who mediates the creative purposes of God the Creator and Father. As with the other sections that follow, the whole correspondence is organized by an Adam-Christ typology, and a direct association between Christ and the work of God in creation. Christ revealed the Creator and Father to humankind, in order to pacify those whom, driven by confusion or madness, might abandon the true God. He does so by showing his disciples that he is the same one who, following the command of his Father, molded Adam from the dust and breathed into him the breath of life (Gen 2:7).

However, not all of Christ's miracles are accomplished by the same procedure. There is a subtle distinction in the mode of healing in the account in John 9:1–7.[105] In most cases, Christ healed by means of a word (*sermonem*) because, according to Irenaeus, this manner of healing is sufficient for all infirmities that derive from sin.[106] He points to the healing of the lame man at Bethesda

104 *Haer*. 5.15.2–16.2.

105 Orbe, *Teología v.2*, 27–8.

106 *Haer*. 5.15.2. Steenberg asserts this section denies the imputation of guilt from one generation to the next, but the language "sin of disobedience" (*inobaudientiae peccatum*) is singular, while "infirmities" (*languores*) is plural. This implies some type a relational inheritance between the original transgressor and the sins committed in subsequent generations, but Irenaeus is not explicit enough to draw any definitive conclusions. Steenberg

where Christ's conversation with the man exposes sin as the origin of his affliction (John 5:1–15). After Jesus tells the man to get up and walk, he implores him to abstain from sin so that nothing worse comes upon him. For those born with physical abnormalities or imperfections, Christ heals by means of a work (*operationem*). The physical restoration of the body requires the immediacy and labor of the creative Word. The miracle of John 9 exemplifies the latter case. The poor beggar who was born blind (John 9:1–2) received healing, not by means of a spoken word, but by means of the work of a hand because his deformity was not the result of personal sin. His remedial actions reveal himself to be the same "hand of God" (*manum Dei*) forming Adam from the dust in Gen 2:7.[107] This procedural correspondence binds these passages theological and connects the identity of the Creator with Christ.

Christ's intent to reveal himself as the Creator in Genesis is, for Irenaeus, evident from the opening query of the disciples. They ask Christ to explain the origin of the man's blindness (John 9:2), to which he responds that personal sin was not the issue (contrary to the lame man at Bethesda), but the purpose of his blindness was to manifest in him the "works of God" (*opera Dei*, John 9:3).[108] From this key phrase in John 9:3, Irenaeus articulates what may be one of his most essential axioms saying, "Now the work of God is the fashioning of humankind" (*Opera autem Dei plasmatio est hominis*).[109] Behr calls this statement the "basic structure of Irenaeus' thought."[110] For Irenaeus, the "works of God" in John 9:3 is a catchword that refers to directly to the formation of humankind and does not include the other days of creation, nor does it include angels. The designation "work(s) of God" is reserved solely for the shaping and forming of human nature. To speak of the "works" (*opera*) of God in the plural or the singular (*opus*) makes no difference, because the plural has a collective sense sourced in the singular aspect of God's creative activity.[111] The foremost demonstration of this theological axiom is, of course, Gen 2:7, which details the "process" (*operationem*) of God's creative agenda: "And the Lord took dust from the earth and formed man" (*Et sumpsit Dominus limum*

---

also points to *Haer*. 4.27.2–3 and *Haer*. 4.33.2, but there is even less in these sections to support this claim. Steenberg, *Of God and Man*, 46 n. 72.

107 *Haer*. 5.15.2.

108 *Haer*. 5.15.2.

109 *Haer*. 5.15.2.

110 Behr, *Asceticism*, 116.

111 For the interchange of the plural *opera* and the singular *opus* see *Haer*. 4.32.2. Orbe, *Teología V.2*, 37.

de terra, et plasmavit hominem).[112] In the same way, when the Jesus chooses to restore the blind man's eyes he repeats the *same process* of creation: "and the Lord spat on the ground and made clay and smeared it on the blind man's eyes" (*Dominus expuit in terram et fecit lutum et superlinivit illud oculis*, John 9:6).[113] The corresponding accounts (Gen 2:7 and John 9:3) are linked through the "earth" (*terra*) imagery, including "dust" (*limum*) and "clay" (*lutum*), the procedural use of the "hand" (*manus*) in creation and healings and, although he does not make the connection explicit, the moisture of the spittle could match the rain in Gen 2:5 that waters the ground prior to Adam's formation. For Irenaeus, Gen 2:7 forms a functional paradigm for God's anthropological purposes and, through a series of conceptual links, follows this pattern stringently.

The repetition of process also points to the parallel identity of the divine "artist" (*artifex*) in both accounts. Irenaeus states very clearly that Jesus' intention was to point out his role to the original creation of Adam and manifest the "hand of God" (*manum Dei manifestans*) that performed the work of creation. The "hand of God," as I discussed previously, is a common Irenaeus' analogy and, in reference to the hand of Jesus that healed the blind man, serves as a synecdoche for the person of the Word. This connection between Christ and the Word, as Irenaeus acknowledges, is not entirely continuous. There is some economic discontinuity between Gen 2:7 and John 9:6. In the first account, Adam knew God and held converse with the Word, but the connection between Jesus and the Creator in Gen 2:7 requires faith and "understanding" (*intellege*).[114] Irenaeus believes Jesus desires to keep his disciples from seeking after another hand that fashioned Adam (Luke 19:10). He even suggests that the Word of God omitted to form the eyes in the womb, or in secret, so that he could manifest his creative identity in public (John 9:3,6). The public demonstration was a pedagogical and revelatory necessity because, while he formed Adam visibly, he forms all others invisibly in the womb. Only by an outward action could Jesus show that he is the one who both formed Adam and all his posterity. This also indicates that the Word is capable of restoring all other physical abnormalities and redeeming the corrupt human nature that was lost in Adam. The particular healing of the blind man becomes its own paradigm for the restoration of humanity in general. Christ came to seek out "lost"

112 *Haer*. 5.15.2. The exchange of *Deus* for *Dominius*, reflects the influence of the Gospel account upon his reading of Gen 2:7.

113 *Haer*. 5.15.3.

114 *Cf. Haer*. 5.16.2.

(*perditos*, Luke 19:10).[115] The lost sheep in Luke 15:4–6 represent humanity crippled by sin, but through his creative powers that span the entire trajectory of the divine economy, Christ is able to hoist the sheep of humanity upon his shoulders and restore it to the fold of life.

6.8.2 *Christ the Creator*: Haer. *5.15.3* (*Gen 2:7, Gen 3:6*)

To this point, Irenaeus has made every effort to link the creative Word with the person of Christ through the corresponding accounts of Gen 2:7 and John 9:1–7.[116] His reading of these passages is governed by an Adam-Christ typology that utilizes a variety of verbal associations and parallel imagery. Irenaeus provides a close reading of the Johannine account as he corresponds the whole narrative to the work of the Son of God in creation. In this section he extends the connections by reflecting on the fetal development of the blind man in John 9:3, Irenaeus makes the general assertion: "Now the Word of God forms us in the womb" (*in ventre plasmat nos Verbum Dei*). This *in vitro* imagery calls to mind the formation of the prophet Jeremiah in the "womb" (*vulva*) in Jer 1:5 and Apostle Paul's formation in the "womb" (*utero*) in Gal 1:15.[117] The one who formed the blind man in the womb (John 9:3) is the same one who formed Jeremiah and Paul in the womb and, when set in continuity, they reveal the identity of the one who formed Adam in the beginning. Throughout the entire divine economy, including the prophets, apostles and all others, the same God forms humankind in the womb. In this line of argument, he identifies the healing of the eyes as synecdoche for the formation of the whole person. Even though the Word fashions all humanity from beginning to end, the original decision to form the human person was the will of the Father.[118] The creative activity of the Word was not motivated by an independent agenda, but a direct fulfillment of the command of the Father established in the beginning.

Finally, similar to the function of the Lukan parable of the lost sheep, Irenaeus closes *Haer*. 5.15.3 with a reference to the restoration of the body by means of the "washing of regeneration" (*lavacro regenerationis*, Titus 3:5). Through the transgression of Adam, his formation had become subject to

115 This connection is similar to what we found in *Haer*. 5.14.2 with the allusion to Luke 19:10, only in the present case he combines this passage with the parable of the lost sheep in Luke 15:4–6.

116 *Cf. Haer*. 5.15.4.

117 *Haer*. 5.15.3. See also: Jer 1:5 in *Epid* 43.

118 *Haer*. 5.15.3. *Cf.* Gen 1:26.

corruption and mortality (Gen 3:6).[119] In the context Irenaeus does not mention baptism, but instead simply refers to the Lord's command to the man to go and wash in the pool of Siloam (John 9:7). While there may be baptismal implications from his connection, what is evident is that the washing restores the man's sight. His restored sight, moreover, is also reflective of his new understanding (*cognosceret, cf.* John 9:37–38). By means of Christ's revelatory act the one who healed his eyes is the same Word of the Father who created Adam from the dust of the earth, and the washing is the means to formally overturn the sin incurred through Adam's disobedience.

6.8.3 *The Consistency of Creation*: Haer. *5.15.4* (*Gen 1:26, Gen 2:7, Gen 3:8–9*)

With each section, Irenaeus continues to build his intricate Adam-Christ typology between Genesis and John. From this correspondence, he has contended that the very same Word of God who fashioned Adam from the dust of the earth (Gen 2:7) at the Father's command (Gen 1:26), became incarnate in the person of Christ and refashioned the eyes of the blind man (John 9:6). In terms of Valentinian theology, this correlation between Genesis and John challenges them on two points.[120] First, he argues the Valentinians reject Adam's formation from the earth and claim that he was formed from a kind of fluid matter.[121] If the blind man's eyes were formed from the substance of the earth (John 9:3), but his body from a different substance, Irenaeus reasons, the substance of their eyes would be incompatible with the substance of the body. Logically speaking if the eyes of the blind man were formed from the earth (John 9:6), the substance of the flesh must also be from the earth (Gen 2:7). Second, the compatibility of substance also points to the consistency of the Creator. It is contradictory if the Savior, who is spiritual, fashioned the eyes in the Gospels, but the Demiurge, who is animal, fashioned the body.

In a move to explain what he perceives as the second exegetical fallacy, he locates continuity with the divine discourse of the Father proclaiming, "Let Us make" (*Faciamus*) in Gen 1:26, and he brings to the surface the other analogous dialogical aspects of each account.[122] The interpretive move in this case locates corresponding dialogical elements between the passages, and then also links the identity of the individuals functioning in both texts. Irenaeus observes

119 This is a clear echo of Adam's transgression in Gen 3:6, though it is not noted by *BP* or *SC*. Orbe, *Teología v.2*, 58–9.

120 Orbe, *Teología v.2*, 63.

121 *Haer*. 5.15.4. *Cf. Haer*. 1.5.5.

122 *Haer*. 5.15.4.

that after their disobedience, Adam and Eve were overcome by shame and fear and hid themselves from the presence of the Lord (Gen 3:8). In Gen 3:9 the Lord, walking in Garden in the evening, calls to Adam, "Where are you?" (*Ubi es*), in order to seek out his creature that was cowering behind a grove of trees.[123] The events of Adam's sin and the Lord's response in Gen 3:7–9 function typologically in connection to Christ's actions in John 9. Irenaeus refers to Gen 3:6–9 as scripture "signifying what would be" (*significans quod futurum erat*).[124] Just as Adam and Eve concealed themselves behind the trees in the Garden, so also does the Lord come to people blinded by disobedience. In Irenaeus' view, the work (*opera*) of the Lord lay hidden and people were unaware of the true Creator.[125] The healing of the blind man, however, brought to light the work of God (John 9:3, 6) and reminded all of God's creative purposes. Irenaeus also parallels the Lord walking in the "evening" (*vespere*, Gen 3:8), with Christ's incarnation coming in the waning years of history, or the "last times" (*novissimis temporibus*), to offer salvation.[126] Finally, just as the Lord, looking for Adam and Eve, called out to them, by means of the same voice (*eadem vocem*) the Lord call out in search of Adam's posterity. When he conversed with the blind man and restored his sight, Christ revealed himself to be the creative Word of the Father that fashions humanity from beginning to end.[127] The Word in Gen 3:9 and John 9 is not speaking on his own, but proclaiming the words of the Father.[128] Throughout the divine economy, the same Father who commanded the Son and the Spirit to perform the work of creation (Gen 1:26) is conversing with his creatures by means of the Word, drawing them back to the divine likeness. Thus, for Irenaeus, the logical inconsistency in the creative beings of the Valentinian system is a contrast with the uniformity of the creation accounts in Genesis and John.

123 *Haer*. 5.15.4.

124 *Haer*. 5.15.4.

125 *Cf. Haer*. 5.15.2–3.

126 *Haer*. 5.15.4.

127 It is not exactly clear which text Irenaeus has in mind when he alludes to Christ speaking in John 9. The first time Christ speaks to the man is in John 9:7. But Irenaeus could be alluding to the people's questioning of Jesus' whereabouts in John 9:12 as a connection to the questioning of Adam and Eve's whereabouts in Gen 3:9. The other possibility is that Irenaeus is thinking of the conversation that Jesus has with the blind man after his trial in John 9:35–41.

128 *Haer*. 5.16.1.

6.8.4 *The Formation and Dissolution of the Flesh*: Haer. *5.16.1* (*Gen 1:26, Gen 2:7, Gen 3:19*)

In the previous section Irenaeus proposed two logical inconsistencies in the Valentinian system. The first is the incompatibility of creative substances and the second is the inconsistency in creative beings. The latter was taken up in more detail in the preceding discussion, while the former directs the focus of the present section as he continues to develop his Adam-Christ typology. Here Irenaeus argues from the perspective of Adam's death and, citing Gen 3:19, he observes that when humans die their bodies return to the substance of the earth. Logically, then, if bodies return to earth then it is reasonable to conclude they have their substance from the earth. The substance of body that dissolves back into the earth (Gen 3:19) is, therefore, the same substance from which the body was created (Gen 2:7). He reiterates that this same substance Christ used to fashion the blind man's eyes in John 9:6. This presents a logical and exegetical correspondence between the substance of a decomposing body (Gen 3:19), the substance used to fashion humankind (Gen 2:7), and the substance used to heal the blind man's eyes (John 9:6). Therefore, throughout the divine economy, from Genesis to John, the same Word of God that continually fashions humankind from the same substance at the command of the one and same God and Father. Summarizing the anthropological conclusions drawn from the intertextual reading of Gen 2:7 and John 9:6, Irenaeus deduces that there must be only one God who "from the beginning even to the end forms us and prepares us for life, and is present with his handiwork, and perfects it after the image and likeness of God (*quae ab initio usque ad finem format nos et coaptat in vitam et adest plasmati suo et perficit illud secundum imaginem et similitudinem Dei*)."[129]

6.8.5 *The Son and the Spirit as Image and Likeness*: Haer. *5.16.2* (*Gen 1:26, Gen 2:7, Gen 3:6*)

This portion concludes Irenaeus' highly involved correspondence between the events in John 9 and Gen 1–3. In correspondence to the closing allusion to Gen 1:26 in the previous section, Irenaeus transitions into a discussion of the *imago dei*. He continues to extend his Adam-Christ typology in *Haer*. 5.16.2 with a more developed the Christological and Pneumatological reading of image and likeness (Gen 1:26). In Irenaeus' interpretation the faithful knew that humanity was made after the image and likeness of God according to Gen 1:26, but since Adam offended God through disobedience the true image remained hidden and invisible. Although, he does not make the connection explicit, it

129 *Haer*. 5.16.1.

seems likely that the blindness of the man in John 9 is part of this argument for the invisibility of the image. This reading of Gen 1:26 interprets the language of "image" and "likeness" as representative of the personal activity of the Son and the Spirit in creation.

In the first instance, Irenaeus' offers two implications of the revelation of the image of God in Christ.[130] First, he revealed the true form of the perfect man made in the image of God (Gen 1:26). The incarnation manifested clearly the fulfillment of God's command in Gen 1:26. God the Father had proclaimed that humankind would be made in the image and likeness of God, but as salvation history began to unravel the fulfillment God's original command was not visible until the Word of God, the Image of God, became flesh (John 1:14). The relation of the *imago dei* to the corporeal flesh has long been recognized, and more than one scholar has rightly suggested that Irenaeus distinguishes between the image and likeness. But this section is more focused on the Christological implications of the image of God than the anthropological.[131] This distinction in emphasis has often been misunderstood in summaries of Irenaeus' anthropology. Brunner, for example, argues that Irenaeus distinguishes between image and likeness and locates the "image" in human rationality.[132] But this analysis neglects the Adam-Christ typology in this context and Irenaeus' theological and economic interpretation of image and likeness, which is not related strictly to the human person, but the divine persons of the Son and the Spirit.[133]

Orbe, on the other hand, identifies Irenaeus' Christological and Pneumatological reading of image and likeness in this section. He argues that Irenaeus

130 Orbe, *Teología v.2*, 87.

131 Fantino, *L'homme*, 83. Donovan, "Alive to the Glory of God," 294. Meijering searches for elements of neo-platonic background, and contrasts this view with Plotinus' understanding of the image of God. Meijering, "God Cosmos History," 262. *Cf.* Steenberg, *Irenaeus*, 125 n. 82. Minns, *Irenaeus*, 74.

132 Given his Gnostic polemic and their elevation of reason, I believe that he would want to emphasize the link between the image of God and Christ rather than rationality. In other places he goes to great lengths to prove the limits of human reason.

133 Fantino's extensive analysis of image of God in Irenaeus remains the most developed study of image and likeness. Fantino makes the distinction in the interpretation of *similitudo* as a translation of ὁμοίωσις or ὁμοιότης. The former he characterizes as the soteriological work of the Spirit that leads the human person incrementally toward the perfection of the divine likeness. The latter is an anthropological category that comprises the human likeness to God manifested in freedom or rationality. This thesis, however, remains preliminary without original copies of Irenaeus' work, and does not fully capture the personal sense of likeness as it applies to the Spirit, which Irenaeus suggests here. Fantino, *L'homme*, 117–8.

speaks of the Image of God in two senses, the Image (personal) and the Image (substantial).[134] The distinction is not strictly located in identity but in visibility; that is to say the invisibility or visibility of the Image within the progression of the divine economy. The Image (personal), the Word of God, was with the Father at creation and throughout the dispensation of the Old Testament. The Image (substantial) communicates the knowledge of the transcendent Father as visible and sensible. When Adam was created in the image and likeness of God, he was created by means of the Image (personal), the Word of God the Father, and set on a soteriological trajectory toward the Image (substantial), the Word-incarnate. This is what Irenaeus means when he writes that it was "said" (*dicebatur*) that humankind was created in the image and likeness of God, referring to the divine command in Gen 1:26, but it was not "revealed" (*ostendebatur*), precisely because the "Word was invisible" (*invisibile erat Verbum*) in creation and throughout the dispensation of the Old Covenant.[135] When the Image of God became incarnate (John 1:14), or the Image (substantial), "indeed the image was truly revealed" (*imaginem enim ostendit verum*). The invisible Image of God became the visible and sensible Image of God, and assumed the very nature of the creature that was made in "his own image" (*imago ejus*).[136] Then again, the ultimate Image (substantial) is the resurrected glorified Christ, who is also the exemplar of the true Image of God and reflects the destiny of the faithful that are gradually being assimilated to this Image. In this way the texts of John 1:14 and Gen 1:26 are theologically bound together through his Adam-Christ typology, the linking terms of "flesh" (*caro*) in John 1:14, and the creation of Adam in Gen 1:26 and Gen 2:7, and his theological understanding of the *imago Dei*.

Second, Irenaeus submits that the Image (substantial) established the likeness.[137] If the Word is the personal Image of God, then it logically follows that the Likeness is the Spirit of God.[138] As with the Image, the Likeness, or the Spirit of God, is linked with the physical and corporeal aspect of Adam and essentially function as the spiritual or divine quality directing the faithful

134 Orbe, *Teología v.2*, 92–3.

135 *Haer*. 5.16.2. Note the both *dicebatur* and *ostendebatur* are in the singular referring specifically to divine command in Gen 1:26 and the revelation of the incarnation in John 1:14.

136 *Haer*. 5.16.2.

137 There is some debate about the reading of *constituit* in *Haer*. 5.16.2. Rousseau, following the Armenian, replaces and uses *restituit* instead of *constituit*. *SC* 153.217. But I follow Orbe, who prefers *constituit*, because there is no *restoration* (*restituit*) of the likeness until there is *installation* (*constituit*) of the Spirit in the person of Christ. Orbe, *Teología v.2*, 103. See also Donovan, *One Right Reading?*, 161 n. 3.

138 Minns, *Irenaeus*, 74.

incrementally toward the true Image (substantial).[139] As a result, the function of the Likeness (Spirit), is to assimilate the corporeal nature of humanity to receive the Image of God and prepare the faithful for the new life of the resurrection. Irenaeus suggests that in paradise Adam did "easily lose the similitude" (*similitudinem facile amisit*) after his disobedience (Gen 3:6). Orbe reasons that it was easily lost because the Image (substantial) was invisible; Adam could not comprehend what he would become and was easily dissuaded from this eschatological vision.[140] The loss of the Likeness, therefore, does not merely have anthropological implications, but also Christological and Pneumatological. After Adam, humankind lost the Likeness (Spirit) qualitatively, but not substantially.[141] The loss of Likeness is a slackening of the presence of the Spirit, which is no longer able to sustain the life of humankind. In this case the "Likeness" lost in Adam but regained in Christ, is the "strength of the breath of Life" that sustained Adam in his pre-lapsarian state.[142] While the Image of God (substantial) was preparing the faithful for the incarnation throughout the Old Covenant, he was also preparing them to receive back the Likeness. Irenaeus has already discussed the links between the breath with the Spirit and how the breath, which has come from the Spirit, loses is strength after Adam and Eve's disobedience. The Likeness received though the Spirit at Pentecost, therefore, is qualitatively superior, because it is eternal and lasting. This correspondence between Likeness and the Spirit amplifies the theological implications of Irenaeus' Adam-Christ typology, and fashions intertextual links through common imagery of Likeness and Spirit.

6.9 Christ, Adam, and Restoration at the Tree: *Haer.* 5.16.3, *Haer*. 5.17.1–4, *Haer.* 5.19.1, *Haer*. 5.20.2

Following his typological reading of John 9, in *Haer*. 5.16.3–20.2 he extends his Adam-Christ typology with correspondence between the crucifixion and Adam's disobedience. Once again the Adam-Christ typology yields both symmetrical and asymmetrical correspondence between these figures. These typological relationships are also linked through a variety of catchwords, illustrative imagery, and prosopological interpretation of Gen 1–3 and the Gospels.

139 *Haer*. 5.6.1. Orbe, *Teología v.2*, 94.

140 Orbe, *Teología v.2*, 97–8. If this is the case this need to be synthesized with Irenaeus' view of Adam's pre-lapsarian immaturity. Minns, *Irenaeus*, 73.

141 Orbe, *Teología v.2*, 96–7.

142 Behr, *Asceticism*, 114–5.

Whereas Adam was disobedient and offended God through his actions at the tree, Christ was obedient and remained faithful even unto death on the tree.

6.9.1 *Christ's Passion and Adam's Disobedience*: Haer. *5.16.3* (*Gen 2:17, Gen 3:6*)

Advancing his efforts to link the Word of God with the work of Christ, in *Haer*. 5.16.3 Irenaeus discusses the passion of Christ in correspondence with the disobedience of Adam. Through his passion, Christ undoes the effects of the disobedience that transpired in the beginning at the "tree" (*ligno*, Gen 3:6). In contrast to the disobedience of Adam (Gen 3:6), Irenaeus cites Phil 2:8 describing how the second Adam was made obedient unto death. The catchword *ligno* combines with the asymmetrical relationship of Adam and Christ's actions toward God. The Word of God was clear when he set forth the command in the Garden not to eat of the tree of knowledge of good and evil (Gen 2:17). Irenaeus implies a general solidarity and culpability with Adam in his sin when he uses the plural inclusive "we offended in Adam" (*Adam offendimus*) when "he did not perform his commandment" (*non facientes ejus praeceptum*). The solidarity is important because Irenaeus' response describes how in the second Adam "we are reconciled" (*reconciliati sumus*, Rom 5:10) to God and made obedient to death.[143] These comparisons between the first and second Adam reinforces the economic parallelism between the work of Christ in the Gospels and the Word of God in Gen 1–3 and solidify the theological coherence of the activity of one God, who is Creator and Father.

6.9.2 *Restoration and Friendship with God*: Haer. *5.17.1–2* (*Gen 2:17, Gen 3:8*)

Irenaeus develops the previous connections between the Adam-Christ typology in this section with additional theological connections. One significant concern is the identity of the one who established the command for Adam to abstain from eating of the tree of knowledge of good and evil in Gen 2:17. Irenaeus applies a prosopological reading and concludes that the Creator, Father, Lord, Maker, and Fashioner do not reflect, contrary to his Valentinian opponents, different beings, but all of these names speak of the activity of one and the same God.[144] In fact, the reference to God as the wise "Maker and Fashioner" (*Factor et Plasmator*) is a combination of verbal titles drawn from the proclamation to make humankind in Gen 1:26 and the fashioning of Adam

143 *BP* and *SC* do not mention this allusion, but Orbe recognizes the language of this passage. Orbe, *Teología v.2*, 115. *Cf*. Rom 5:19.

144 *Haer*. 5.17.1.

in Gen 2:7.[145] Together they identify the same God working in both accounts of creation, and commanding Adam to abstain.

Corresponding to this theological identity, Irenaeus remarks that the Word of God actually uttered the command in Gen 2:16. Irenaeus views the Son as the actualization of the Father's communication. So everywhere God speaks, the Word of God is active. Irenaeus' cites Gen 3:8: "Adam heard the voice of the Lord God" (*Audivit . . . Adam vocem Domini Dei*) as support for this theological interpretation. The Word of God is the one who speaks the command in Gen 2:16 since he is the "voice" of the Lord God. In the bishop's reasoning, the *vocem* of Gen 3:8 represents the activity of the *Verbum* of God.[146] The personal "Voice of God" (*Vox Dei*) is also the "Word" (*Verbum*) of God who manifests the commands of the Father. Utilizing the dialogical connection, he also refers to Christ statement to the paralytic in Matt 9:2, "your sins are forgiven."[147] The same incarnate "Word" (*Verbum*) is able to proclaim the forgiveness of sins in the Gospels (Matt 9:2). In the incarnation, the Word of God became the mediator between God and humanity (1 Tim 2:5), thereby overturning the disobedience that occurred at the tree. Christ could only have the authority to forgive sins, if Adam had offended his command in Genesis. Forgiveness of Adam's disobedience is only possible if the one proclaiming forgiveness is the same one who established the law of Gen 2:17 and against whom Adam sinned in Gen 3:6. At the same time, the Word of God, who proclaimed the command of Gen 2:17 and the forgiveness of sins in Matt 9:2, did not speak of his own will, but the will of the Father.

Furthermore, Irenaeus wants to be clear that this God against whom Adam sinned is not the same Father of whom the Valentinians speak. While the Valentinians distinguish between the Father and the Creator, Irenaeus asserts that in Gen 3:6 Adam sinned against same Father who commanded, through the Word of God, not to eat of the tree in Gen 2:17. This is why, Irenaeus concludes, the Lord taught the faithful to pray, "forgive us our debts" (*nobis debita nostra*, Matt 6:12), because all humankind are the debtors of the Father for transgressing the command of Gen 2:17.[148] These texts are linked with the catchwords including the term "forgive" (*remitto*) that connects Christ words

145 The titles, Factor and Plasmator (Ποιητὴς, Πλάστης) mirror the verbs in the Septuagint: Ποιήσωμεν (Gen 1:26) and ἐπλασεν (Gen 2:7).

146 For similar parallels between *vocem* and *Verbum* see *Epid*. 12 and *Haer*. 5.15.4.

147 *Cf*. Luke 5:20.

148 *Haer*. 5.17.1. Osborn suggests that Irenaeus viewed the original sin in terms of "inherited guilt," but Steenberg denies this claim. Osborn, *Irenaeus*, 218. See also *Haer*. 3.18.7 and *Haer*. 3.23.2.

to the paralytic in Matt 9:2 and the Lord's prayer in Matt 6:12. This extends the theological implications of Adam's sin to all humanity that, in turn, also requires the forgiveness of sins. He uses the combination of "propitiating" (*propitians*) for the faithful and "canceling" (*consolatus*) the debt of Adam's sin. He also speaks of the true "remission" (*remissionem*) of sin in the mediation of mercy through the Son (Luke 1:78).[149] Through the combination of incarnation and obedience, the incarnate Word of the Father reestablishes communion with the "Creator" (*Factorem*) that was lost through Adam's disobedience and cancels the debt of Adam's sin. Therefore, through the verbal and personal correspondence between the prohibition in Gen 2:17, the forgiveness of sins unites the activity of God in both accounts.

6.9.3 *Disobedience and Restoration at the Tree*: Haer. *5.17.3–4* (*Gen 2:17, Gen 3:6*)

Following the argument in the previous section, the intertextual discussion of Adam's disobedience (Gen 3:6) against the command of God (Gen 2:17) and the activity of the Word incarnate continues in *Haer*. 5.17.3–4. Irenaeus also fashions more intertextual relationships through a variety of linking terms and concepts. The healing of the paralytic and Christ's proclamation of the forgiveness of sins (Matt 9:2, Luke 5:24), alongside the petition for forgiveness of debts in the Lord's prayer are supported references to the power of the Lord to forgive sins in Psalm 31(32):1–2 and cancellation of debts in the crucifixion in Col 2:14. The case of the former, Psalm 31(32):1–2 announces through the Psalmist that the blessed will find forgiveness of sins. The catchword, "forgiven" (*remitto*) links this passage with the discussion of Gen 2:17, Matt 9:2, and Matt 6:12 above. But Irenaeus alludes to Psalm 31(32):1–2 as evidence that forgiveness was announced before the coming of Christ. On the other hand, Col 2:14 also uses the phrase, "he has destroyed the handwriting of our debit and affixed it to the cross" (*delevit chirographum debiti nostri et affixit illud cruci*). This passage draws on the language of "debts" (*debiti*) and "cross" (*cruci*) to connect the whole argument back to the command not to eat from the tree in Gen 2:17, and the disobedience of Adam at the tree in Gen 3:6. By means of a tree, all were made debtors to God, so also by means of a tree there is forgiveness of sins. These references also draw together a prophet (Psalm 31(32):1–2), the Lord's words (Matt 9:2 and Matt 6:12), and an apostle (Col 2:14).

In *Haer*. 5.17.4 Irenaeus supports this typological association between the tree of disobedience with the tree of the cross with a variety of interrelated symbols of the cross. For example, while cutting down trees in the

149 *Haer*. 5.17.1.

construction of the tabernacle, the disciples of Elisha negligently loose the axe head in the water (2 Kgs 6:1–7). So Elisha threw "wood" (*lignum*) into the water and the axe head miraculously floated to the surface. He interprets this recovery of the axe head as the recovery of the Word of God who was "hidden" (*absconditum*) from humanity at the tree of disobedience and found at the tree of the cross.[150] Alongside the "wood" (*lignum*) imagery, he uses the closely related imagery of an "axe" (*securis*) in Matt 3:10 and Jer 23:29. He also contemplates the four regions of the cross in Eph 3:18, and the extended hands of Christ on the cross as the unification of the two people together under the provision of one God (Eph 4:6).[151] They are brought together under the "head" (*caput*) of Christ whose death on the "wood" (*lignum*) recovers what was lost by means of a tree in Gen 3:6. United by these various catchwords, these passages extended the theological continuity and discontinuity between the work of Adam and Christ.

6.9.4 *The Dispensations of Adam and Christ*: Haer. *5.19.1* (*Gen 3:1–6, Gen 3:8*)

The theological and exegetical harmony between the dispensation of Adam's disobedience (Gen 3:1–6) and the dispensation of Christ persists in *Haer*. 5.19.1. Irenaeus argues that the heretics ignore the integrative nature of these divine economies.[152] In summary fashion, he points to several theological intertextual connections, many of which appear in previous books: the Creator assuming the very flesh he created, Adam's disobedience overturned by Christ's obedience, the Virgin Mary becoming an advocate for the virgin Eve, the sin of the first-created (*protoplasti*) man undone by the first-begotten (*primogeniti*), the serpent conquered by a dove (Matt 10:16), and humanity being freed from subjection to death. These typological relationships are united through parallel imagery and terminology, and together they harmonize various theological aspects of the dispensations of Adam and Christ. All this imagery of recapitulation points to the loosening of the "bonds" (*alligati*) that bind humanity to death. Thus, the centerpiece of this interconnection is the crucifixion, where the invisible Word became incarnate for the salvation of the world and was obedient unto death upon a cross.

Of all these recapitulatory relationships, the Eve-Mary typology receives the most attention. Irenaeus describes both symmetrical and asymmetrical aspects between Eve's actions in paradise with the Annunciation. He contrasts

150 *Haer*. 5.17.4.

151 *Cf. Epid* 34. The imagery of the extended hands on the cross is attributed to an elder, which also implies that this intertextual argumentation is partly received.

152 *Haer*. 5.19.2.

the lies of the serpent that deceived the "virgin Eve" (*virgo Eva*, Gen 3:1–5) to the truth proclaimed by the angel to the virgin Mary (Luke 1:30–35). The former was led astray by the word of an angel and fled from the presence of God (Gen 3:8), but the latter received angelic communication and was obedient. Pointing to the aesthetic coherence between the obedience of Mary and the disobedience of Eve, Irenaeus characterizes Mary as an "advocate" (*advocata*) for Eve. The Eve-Mary typology serves to complement and illuminate the intricacies of the Adam-Christ typology.

Other theological connections support the correspondence between the dispensations of Adam and Christ. Echoing the narrative of Gen 3:1–6, Irenaeus correlates the language of serpent in Matt 10:16 to the activity of the serpent in paradise. He casts the "serpent" (*serpentis*) and the "dove" (*columbae*) imagery of Matt 10:16 in a recapitulatory relationship where the innocence of the dove overcomes the shrewdness of the serpent. Similarly, the sin of the first-created man (*protoplasti*, Gen 2:7) was corrected (*emendationem*) by the punishment (*correptionem*) of the first-begotten man (*primogeniti*, Luke 2:7). He treats the *peccatum* of Adam in the Garden (Gen 3:6) is the object and basis for the atonement, so that Christ receives the punishment for Adam's sin. This action unties (*resolutis*) the bonds that bound Adam, and his posterity, to death.[153] Therefore, this mosaic of typological relationships drawn from the imagery of Gen 3:1–6 are all interconnected and realized in the crucifixion of the incarnate Word of God. The same Word that created Adam assumed the flesh of his creation and was obedient unto death on the cross in order to address the sin of Adam's disobedience.

6.9.5 *Flee to the Church and Be Nourished by the Scriptures*: Haer. *5.20.2* (*Gen 2:8, Gen 2:16, Gen 2:17, Gen 3:3*)

This section concludes Irenaeus reflection on relationship between Adam's disobedience at the tree and Christ's obedient death on the cross. He applies this imagery to his own theological context and portrays the doctrines of the heretics as contemporary manifestations of the serpent's deception. He illustrates the blind leading the blind (Matt 15:14) and those who incessantly seek after truth in vain (2 Tim 3:7) to characterize their lies. According to Irenaeus, their teaching deviates from the true path and they wonder down various unmarked roads, so that their opinions have no agreement or connection (*inconsonanter et inconsequenter*).[154] The church, on the other hand, boasts the collective unity and agreement in doctrine, grounded in the organized

153 *Cf. Haer.* 3.22.4.

154 *Haer.* 5.20.1.

economic revelation of the Father, Son and Spirit. Irenaeus portrays the church with Edenic imagery and compares the deception of Adam and Eve with the contemporary actions of the heretics. Like Adam and Eve, the faithful are in the midst of the "tree of Gnosis" and must withstand the temptations of their seductive intellectual fruit.

For this reason, Irenaeus implores the faithful to seek refuge in the church to be nourished by the scriptures. The nature of the Garden of Eden prefigures the church, which becomes the manifestation of paradise in the present age.[155] Orbe points to the possible influence of Matt 15:13, where the unfaithful will be uprooted like trees, which is likely given the reference to the blind leading the blind in the immediate context (Matt 15:14).[156] While the faithful are planted in the church, the unfaithful will be uprooted and cast out. Elsewhere Irenaeus refers to the church as a vineyard planted in Adam with his sons representing the trees.[157] This imagery of being "nourished" (*enutriri*) by the church corresponds to the imagery of "planting" (*plantata*) Eden in Gen 2:8 and the Lord's command in to eat freely from the Garden, except of the tree of knowledge (Gen 2:16–17, *cf.* Gen 1:28).[158] Irenaeus uses the plural "we may eat" (*manducabitis*), rather than the singular "you may eat" (*manducabis*), which reflects Eve's recitation of the command in Gen 3:2.[159] He links the divine command to eat from every tree in Gen 2:16 with the reading of the scriptures, where "every tree" (*omni . . . ligno*) becomes "every Scripture" (*omni Scriptura*).[160] In this sense, while the faithful dwell within the paradise of the church the faithful are encouraged to partake of every truth found in the scriptures.

Conversely, the prohibition against eating from the tree of knowledge of good and evil (Gen 2:17, *cf.* Gen 3:3) is reinterpreted as a command to abstain from the teaching of the heretics.[161] In the same way, Eve conversed with the tempter, so now the faithful stand before the tree of Gnosis and in the presence of the intellectual temptations of the heretics. He reinterprets the prohibition of Gen 2:17 (Gen 3:3) for the faithful of the church: "but you shall not eat with an elevated perception nor touching any heretical dissension"

155 Behr, *Asceticism*, 66. See also the discussion of the church as the locus of the Spirit in *Haer*. 3.24.1.

156 Orbe, *Teología V.2*, 328. BP and SC do not identify this allusion.

157 *Haer*. 4.36.2. Orbe, *Parábolas I*, 251. *Cf. Haer*. 5.10.1.

158 *Cf. Haer*. 5.5.1.

159 Orbe, *Teología V.2*, 330–2. SC 152.306. The three variants in the context are all plural (*manducabitis, manducate, manducavertitis*). *Cf. Epid* 15 and *Haer*. 5.23.1.

160 *Haer*. 5.20.2.

161 *Cf. Haer*. 5.23.1.

(*a superelato autem sensu ne manducaveritis neque tetigeritis universam haereticam dissensionem*).[162] The second clause, with the use of *tetigeritis*, refers Eve's reiteration of the divine command (Gen 2:17) in Gen 3:3. Eve extends the prohibition from not eating, to not even touching (*tetigeritis*) the fruit. By all appearances, Irenaeus believes Eve reported the command accurately, because he characterizes this conflation of Gen 2:17 and Gen 3:3 as the command of the Spirit of God. Therefore, the faithful should not merely abstain from partaking of their doctrines, but avoid all contact with the heretics. In addition, the use of "elevated" perception (*superelato . . . sensu*, τῆς ὑπερφρονήσεως) corresponds to Rom 12:3 and reflects Irenaeus' understanding of the mental state of the serpent and the heretics who claim to have "the knowledge of good and evil" (*agnitionem . . . boni et mali*, Gen 3:5 and 22) that surpasses the wisdom of the true God.

In Irenaeus' reading, the prohibition in Gen 2:16–17 (Gen 3:2–3) acknowledges the limits and constrains of human reason and warns against any capitulation to heretical doctrine. He implores his readers to "be wise with prudence" (*sapere ad prudentiam*, Rom 12:3) in order to keep from duplicating the disobedience of Adam and Eve.[163] Those who heed the command of God, contrary to Adam, Eve, the serpent, and the heretics, remain securely within the "paradise of life" (*paradiso vitae*), but those who partake of the doctrines of the heretics will surely be cast out of paradise (Gen 3:23).[164] Irenaeus depicts the contemporary application of the command of God (Gen 2:17) as the obedience to the preaching of the church understood in terms of the recapitulation, or restoration, the communion of the God and humankind in the person of Christ (Eph 1:10) and through the union with the Spirit. In the paradise of the church, the life the faithful enjoy through the Spirit is life in flesh and blood and the command as a means to manage human immaturity and protect the faithful from repeating the sin of Adam.[165]

---

162 *Haer*. 5.20.2.

163 *Haer*. 5.20.2. Steenberg, *Irenaeus*, 156–7. The use of *manducabitis* suggests this passage is conflated with Gen 3:2. See *Haer*. 5.23.1.

164 *Haer*. 5.20.2. Orbe, *Teología v.2*, 337. BP and SC do not identify this allusion. *Cf. Haer*. 3.23.6.

165 Steenberg, *Irenaeus*, 158.

6.10 The Temptations of Adam and Christ: *Haer*. 5.21.1–3 and *Haer*. 5.23.1–2

This section constitutes the third facet of Christ's life that Irenaeus employs to unify the Creator in Gen 1–3 with the Father of Jesus. The first is the healing of the man born blind in John 9:1–7 (*Haer*. 5.15–16.2), the second is the crucifixion (*Haer*. 16.3–20.2), and the third is the temptation account (*Haer*. 5.21–24.4). Each of these aspects of Christ's life are compared and contrasted to the events of Adam's creation and disobedience in Gen 1–3.[166] Rather than a chronological correspondence, this three-fold argument follows a logical association between the divine activity in Gen 1–3 and the incarnation, crucifixion, and final conquering of Satan. The reordering of the Christological events elevates the significance of the temptation account and the way it overturns the events in Gen 3. In the context of salvation history, Irenaeus uses the temptation account to show how the Son, who assumed the same flesh as Adam, was faced with the same deceptive tactics and overcame the same enemy that deceived Adam and Eve in paradise. In *Haer*. 5.21.1–3 specifically, he carefully analyzes the symmetrical and asymmetrical aspects of both temptation accounts. He also explains the theological implications of Adam's disobedience and Christ's obedience. Then in *Haer*. 23.1–2 he addresses the specific claim that God lied to Adam and Eve about their punishment of death, since it did not appear that they died in the "day" that they ate from the tree.

6.10.1 *The Disobedience of Adam and Obedience of Christ*: Haer. *5.21.1–3* (*Gen 1:26, Gen 2:7, Gen 3:6, Gen 3:15*)

Beginning in *Haer*. 5.21.1, Irenaeus reports that Christ recapitulates (Eph 1:10) the devices of the enemy who conquered Adam. From the opening scene there is an explicit reference to the *protoevangelium* in Gen 3:15 that orients this entire section. His interpretation of Gen 3:15 envisions the work of Christ provoking the enemy, who had conquered Adam in Genesis (Gen 3:6), and crushing his head. He also alludes to God directing his punishment to the serpent in Gen 3:14.[167] Ever since God made the proclamation to the serpent in Gen 3:15, according to Irenaeus, humankind had been diligently anticipating the birth of a man from a virgin and in the likeness of Adam. For Irenaeus, similitude between Adam and Christ denotes that the virginity of the woman was implicit in the conquering of Satan, because elsewhere he describes how Adam is

166 *Haer*. 5.18.1, *Haer*. 5.21.3, and *Haer*. 5.24.4.

167 *Haer*. 5.21.1.

fashioned from the "virgin" earth (Gen 2:5).[168] For the Bishop of Lyons, however, the prophecy of Gen 3:15 is mediated by the corresponding references to the "seed of the woman" (*semen mulieris*) in Gal 3:19 and Gal 4:4. [169] The fundamental problem is the injustice that is inflicted upon the events of the divine economy through the deceit of Satan. To be sure, Irenaeus does not believe that Satan has triumphed over God, but over God's creatures. In Irenaeus' reasoning the complex economic design reflected in the correspondence of Genesis and Galatians, was necessary in order to eradicate the injustice of Satan. Since the injustice was committed against Adam, only a descendant born in the likeness of Adam could rightly gain victory over the enemy. Conversely, a mere man born naturally into the captivity has no recourse to vanquish the enemy. Furthermore, since Adam's disobedience was mediated by way of Eve, because it was Eve who ate of the tree first and then Adam in Gen 3:6. In the same way, the victory in Christ was also mediated by a woman from whom Christ received the same *plasma* of the original formation.[170] The synthesis of these Pauline texts with Gen 3:15 implies, for Irenaeus, that the one born of a woman is the Son of God made man, thereby fulfilling the prophecy of Gen 3:15 and preparing the way for humankind's victory over death and reception of new life in Christ.[171]

Irenaeus' exegesis becomes more precise in *Haer*. 5.21.2–3 where he offers a careful evaluation of the Lord's temptation in Matthew's Gospel in correspondence to Adam and Eve's disobedience in Gen 3:6. Contrary to the Gnostic teaching, the Adam-Christ economic ties bind the Creator of Adam with the Father of Jesus. The former received the careful touches of the Creator in the beginning, but faltered by means of deception, while the latter, being born of a woman, performed the commands of the Creator and perfected humanity in the image and likeness of God (Gen 1:26). The fulfillment of Gen 3:15 (through Gal 3:19, Gal 4:4), then, is ultimately the fulfillment of divine mandate in Gen 1:26. The triumph over the enemy through the obedience of Christ restored the plan of God for humankind to be made in the image and likeness of God.

When the Son of God experienced temptation at the hands of the same enemy, the result was altogether contrary to the disobedience of Adam. When tempted in Matt 4:2–10, Christ made use of the Law as a means to thwart the

168 *Haer*. 3.21.10.

169 *Haer*. 5.21.1. In *Haer*. 3.23.7 he appeals to Gal 3:19 and in *Haer*. 4.40.3 he alludes to Gal 4:4. *Cf*. Wis 2:24, John 8:44, 2 Cor 11:3, and Rev 12:9.

170 BP identifies an allusion to Gen 2:22, but the reference is directed at the formation of Adam in Gen 2:7 and Eve's involvments in Adam's disobedience in Gen 3:6.

171 *Haer*. 5.21.1.

very schemes the enemy used to conquer Adam and expose the identity of the apostate angel who was hidden in the serpent.[172] Irenaeus reports that Christ fasted before he was tempted (Matt 4:2) in order to reveal his true humanity that is continuous with Adam's formation and to provoke Satan to a duel. Examining their corresponding actions following the temporal references (*in principio . . . in fine*), Orbe locates four parallel aspects of each temptation narrative: 1) Whereas Adam was prohibited to eat by means of the Law (Gen 2:16), Satan commanded Christ to eat (Matt 4:3); 2) Adam was without hunger (Gen 2:16), while Christ had fasted for forty days (Matt 4:2); 3) While there is deceit in paradise because the enemy remained hidden in the serpent (Gen 3:1–5), Christ exposed the identity of the tempter as Satan himself (Matt 4:10); 4) Adam ate of the tree through the persuasion of the serpent and against the command of God, while Christ withstood the persuasion of the same enemy and, following the commands of God, did not eat.[173] In addition to the elements described above, Irenaeus also mentions other dissimilar facets of these events including: 1) Adam as the victim and Christ as victorious, 2) death generated in Adam and life instituted in Christ, 3) Satan empowered through Adam's sin and confounded in Christ obedience, 4) and Satan acting prideful while Christ remained humble.[174] These must be held in tension with the implicit parallel aspects of these events bound by a series of typological relationships linked by parallel imagery, such as the premise of Satan tempting humankind, the common generations of Adam and Christ, the use of food, and the presence of divine Law.

Therefore, throughout *Haer*. 5.21.2, Irenaeus rehearses Christ's three temptations (Matt 4:3, 6, 8), and in *Haer*. 5.23.3 he develops the typological connections between the Law of the Creator (Gen 2:17) and the Law of Father that was proclaimed in Christ. All this continuity and discontinuity, for Irenaeus, is set in relief with the economic progress of salvation history. Through his recourse to the Law, the Savior has overthrown Satan by storming the house of the strong man Christ's obedience and recitation of the Law conquered Satan and spoiled his goods (Matt 12:29), thereby fulfilling the promise of the Creator in Gen 3:15.[175]

---

172 *Epid* 16. Neither *BP* nor *SC* identify references to Gen 2:16 in this context, but the comparisons of the use of the Law with Adam's disobedience to the Law (Gen 2:16) are unmistakable.

173 Orbe, *Teología V.2*, 380. Irenaeus also compares Satan's deceptive use of Scripture with the heretics in *Haer*. 5.21.2.

174 *Haer*. 5.21.1–2.

175 *Haer*. 5.21.2. Wingren, *Man and the incarnation*, 12, 119. *Cf. Epid* 8.

6.10.2 *God is True and the Serpent is a Liar*: Haer. *5.23.1–2* (*Gen 1:5, Gen 1:24–31, Gen 2:16–17, Gen 3:1–5*)

His typological reading is also expressed in the temptation accounts of Adam and Christ, in *Haer*. 5.23.1–2, he addresses the truthfulness of the Creator based upon the divine prohibition of Gen 2:17. In the closing lines of *Haer*. 5.22.2, he conflates the deception of Satan in the temptation account in Luke 4:6 with the Lord's words in John 8:44. He also alludes to John 8:44 in closing lines of *Haer*. 5.23.2, so structurally his allusions to John 8:44 in *Haer*. 5.22.2 form an *inclusio* that frame his reading of Gen 2:16–17 in *Haer*. 5.23.1–2 as a whole. For Irenaeus, Satan's deceit in the temptation of the Lord is characteristic of his actions from the initial scene of creation (Gen 3:1–5). For the Gnostics, especially the Valentinians and Ophites, the serpent is an instrument of Sophia who compassionately leads Adam and Eve away from the trickery of the Demiurge. They point out that though the Creator *said* Adam and Eve would die in the day they ate the fruit, yet they *did not* appear to die a physical death on the same day. This communicates that the prohibition of Gen 2:16–17 is nothing more than an empty threat to intimidate the first couple into submission. According to the Gnostics, the serpent was truthful and the Creator deceived Adam and Eve.[176]

Irenaeus asserts that the Lord's words in Gen 2:16–17 were, in fact, a loving and gracious command. The divine prohibition places a moral boundary on Adam and Eve in order that might enjoy the holiness and blessedness of the Edenic state. Satan's interpretation, on the other hand, distorts the good purposes of God. He points to the serpent's subtle perversion of the Lord's command in Gen 3:1–5. In Irenaeus' reading, the serpent's query is his first act of deception, because he knowingly and maliciously construes the Lord's command.[177] He accentuates the prohibition against the tree of knowledge and insinuates that God's command is overtly authoritarian. Eve, according to Irenaeus, exposed the deceit of his assumption simply by reporting the full version of God's command, which the serpent had omitted, and explaining that God permitted them to eat from *every* tree, except one (Gen 3:2–3). The serpent persisted in his deceit, even in the midst of the paradise of God, as if the omniscient God was unaware of his true intent. Irenaeus assumes that Satan was jealous of Adam and Eve and ignorant of the "greatness" (*magnitudinem*) of God.[178] This assumption is also reflected in what Irenaeus identifies as the serpent's second lie; the enticement of becoming as gods and endowed

176 *Cf. Haer*. 1.30.7.

177 Steenberg, *Irenaeus*, 172.

178 *Haer*. 5.23.1.

with the knowledge of good and evil (Gen 3:4–5). Unaware of the deception hidden in the serpent's words, Eve was deceived when the serpent openly challenged the consequences of the Lord's command. Irenaeus isolates Gen 3:4 and inverts the order of the serpent's dialogue, in order to accentuate what Irenaeus identifies as the third and ultimate lie: Adam and Eve would not die if they ate from the prohibited tree of knowledge (Gen 3:4). For Irenaeus, this is a direct assault on the nature and integrity of God. The Bishop of Lyons takes up the interpretation of Gen 3:4 in careful detail in *Haer*. 5.23.2. What is clear, for Irenaeus, is that the theological control on his reading of Gen 3:4 is the nature of God in distinction to the nature of the serpent. God is true, while the serpent is a liar (John 8:44).[179] The fact that they *eventually* died proves that God was speaking the truth. He concludes logically, or *a posteriori*, that "God was true, and the serpent was a liar, was proved by the result, death having passed upon them who had eaten" (*Sed quoniam Deus verax, mendax autem serpens, de effectu ostensum est, morte subsecuta eos qui manducaverant*). The result of death proves the veracity of God's command, and ultimately serves as the basic theological point that governs the rest of the interpretations.

The problem remains, however, that Adam and Eve did not *immediately* die, but lived prolonged lives.[180] Irenaeus' response comprises a complex assortment of no less than five plausible interpretations of Gen 2:16–17 that prove God is true and the serpent is a liar, because Adam and Eve truly died the day they ate of the fruit. The first two concentrate on the relationship of disobedience and death and the legal nature of the penalty, while the latter three are successive attempts to interpret the timing of Adam's sin and death in relation to the meaning of "day" (*dies*). These interpretations are interrelated, and the distinctions between them largely depend upon the variety of reading strategies he applies to these passages and the diversity of intertexts Irenaeus reads alongside Gen 2:16–17 (Gen3:4). For Irenaeus, any true reading of Gen 2:16–17 must account for the nature of divine veracity expressed in John 8:44.

First, Irenaeus interprets the nature of "death" in a spiritual sense and suggests that it is possible that they died the moment they sinned because they were handed over to the power of death.[181] In this reading, he assumes that disobedience against God is itself death. The eventual outcome of Adam's

179 *Haer*. 5.23.1. Orbe also suggests the background of Rom 3:4. Orbe, *Teología v.2*, 478.

180 *Cf*. Gen 5:5.

181 Steenberg identifies an immediate transference of the effects of death from Adam and Eve to all creation through the fruit, but Orbe rightly notes that the fruit is merely the vehicle for the act of disobedience that produces death. Steenberg, *Irenaeus*, 167. Orbe, *Teología v.2*, 478–80.

death (Gen 5:5) proves the veracity of their condemnation. For Irenaeus, the Gnostics misplace their emphasis on the prohibition and the nature of the tree of knowledge, rather than the nature of true Creator. Death in this sense does not necessarily imply immediate bodily death, but rather that Adam's disobedience and subjection to the corruptive power of death. Unlike his contemporaries, Irenaeus does not develop the distinction between bodily and moral or spiritual death, because he recognizes the potential in this argument to devalue the physical body and the importance of bodily resurrection. Rather he distinguishes between physical death and the ultimate death of the composite human person as result of sin.[182] They are corruptible and excluded from the kingdom of God with no hope for the incorruptible life. Nevertheless, he offers this as one option that makes sense of the ambiguities in the passage.

Second, rather than spiritualizing death, his second interpretation is literal reading that applies legal imagery to the penalty of the prohibition. Irenaeus uses the legal imagery to emphasize that through their disobedience Adam and Eve became "death's debtors" (*debitores mortis*).[183] The moment they transgressed the divine prohibition, death ruled over them and they were condemned to die by divine law. According to Orbe, Irenaeus preferred this second reading, which Orbe terms Irenaeus' "personal and spontaneous" view that developed in the midst of his debates with his Gnostic interlocutors.[184] As opposed to the first, this view holds the tension between the "spiritual" death, and the importance of the physical nature of the body. Thus, they died the moment they sinned because they were handed over to the power of death, and the eventual outcome of Adam's death in Gen 5:5 proves the veracity of the threat.[185]

Third, following his two explanations of the nature of "death," Irenaeus shifts his focus to the nature and timing of the "day" Adam sinned and subsequently died. In contrast to the first two interpretations, he provides more commentary and explanation of these views, because the nature of "day" is truly the crux of the issue of the Creator's apparent deception. No one disputes that Adam died (Gen 5:5), but disagreement abounds over the meaning of "day" in Gen 2:16–17 with regards to the length of Adam's life, but he must explain how the final death transpired on the same day as the disobedience.

---

182 *Haer*. 4.37–39. Orbe, *Antropologia*, 450–57; Donovan, *One Right Reading?*, 159–60.

183 *Haer*. 5.23.2.

184 Orbe, "Cinco Exegesis," 89. He goes on to summarize this view succinctly saying "They made themselves mortal" (Hiciéronse mortals).

185 *Haer*. 5.23.2. *Cf. Haer*. 3.19.1 and *Haer*. 4.22.1.

Irenaeus' third interpretation begins with the observation that in Gen 1:5 a day of creation comprises evening and morning. He follows the Septuagint closely and notices that Gen 1:5 contains the cardinal number "one day" (*dies unus*) of creation as opposed to the ordinal number "first day" (*dies prima*). The remaining days of creation after Gen 1:5 all use the ordinal numbers and portray the beginning of the natural cycle of days in creation. In this sense, the "day" (*dies*) of Gen 2:16–17 is the same single "day" (*dies*) of creation in Gen 1:5. In other words, the "day" of creation is the perpetual existence of the life in the created cosmos. If Adam and Eve eat from the forbidden fruit at any point in the life of this created order they would die. It matters not how long they lived because eventually they will die before the cessation of the created world.[186] This view is not identical to the Philo and Origen who interpret Gen 1:5 in a Platonic sense as the world of ideas, because for Irenaeus this is the sensible world of creation understood from a cosmic perspective as the great "day of creation" (*conditionis dies*).

Fourth, Irenaeus also provides a highly literal interpretation of day that emphasizes the particular day of the week that Adam sinned, but he also applies it typologically. He observes that all events are bound by time and the regular weekly cycle of days, and given the repetition he offers a solution based upon a finely tuned understanding of the divine economy. This interpretation assumes the literal or normative sense of "day" (*dies*) as a twenty-four hour period within the weekly cycle of days. This reading also unites the intertextual echoes of Irenaeus' theology of recapitulation (Eph 1:10), the general references to sixth day of creation (Gen 1:24–31), and the death of Christ on the sixth day of the week or "the day before Sabbath" (*pridie ante sabbatum*). The references to Christ's death on the day before Sabbath are found in all three Synoptic Gospels (Matt 27:62, Mark 15:42, Luke 23:54).

186 Steenberg misreads Irenaeus' use of Gen 1:5 in this context and conflates Irenaeus' first and second attempt to interpret "day" in Gen 2:16–7. According to Steenberg, a "day" of creation, reflected in Gen 1:5, implies "God's creative activity began at a specific moment . . . and progressed in a series of distinct stages defined as 'days.' " These days, according to Steenberg, are predictive for Irenaeus of the phases in the economy of salvation reflected in his chiliastic vision. While there is no doubt that Irenaeus presents a chiliastic vision of the economy, Orbe is correct to distinguish Irenaeus' first interpretation of the *magna dies* of creation that perceives the existence of all creation as "one day." This is clear in Irenaeus' transition from speaking about the (or The) "one day" (*dies unus*) in terms of cardinal numbers in his first interpretation to contemplating the succession of days as ordinal numbers (*prima . . . secundum . . . tertia . . .*) Steenberg's point applies to Irenaeus' second interpretation of "day" (*dies*) mentioned below, not his uses of Gen 1:5. Steenberg, *Irenaeus*, 85–6.

In Irenaeus' accounting, the formation of Adam and his disobedience transpired on the sixth day of creation (Gen 1:24–31), which is the present dispensation following Adam's disobedience. He only interprets the seventh day of creation in an eschatological sense, like other chiliasts such as Barnabus, and supplied with all the New Covenant imagery in the prophets. This locates the disobedience on the same day as Adam's formation. This is also implicit in the text where there is no mention of the conclusion of the seventh day. Reading these passages alongside Gen 2:16–17 and Gen 3:1–6, Irenaeus links Adam's disobedience on the sixth day of the week, with Christ's death on the sixth day of the week. Ultimately this economic continuity confirms the truthfulness of the Lord's command in Gen 2:16–17, because in the same day of the week that Adam sinned, Christ, who recapitulated Adam in himself and dies on the same sixth day of creation. In this sense, Adam is subject to mortality when he disobeys the command, but the condemnation to death ultimately anticipates the death of the one who recapitulates Adam in himself. Just as Adam was created on the sixth day of creation, Christ's death on the sixth day of the week provides salvation and resurrection, or a "second creation" (*secundam plasmationem*) out of death.

Finally, Irenaeus completes his interpretations of "day" (dies) with an intertextual correspondence between Psalm 89(90):4 (2 Pet 3:8) that states a day of the Lord is as 1000 years. Since Adam only lived 930 years (Gen 5:5), he did not live beyond 1000 years and did not surpass a "day" from the perspective of the Lord. While Irenaeus accepts the legitimacy of this interpretation, he does not seem to prefer it since he qualifies it as the perspective of others. No doubt he at least has Justin in view given that Justin defends this view in *Dial* 81.3, though he could also be refereeing to Barnabus, Polycarp, or Papias, from whom he drew his millennial views. This intertextual and eschatological reading, however, takes into account the theological correspondence between the "day" in Gen 2:16–17 and "day" in Psalm 89(90):4 (2 Pet 3:8), alongside the length of Adam's life in Gen 5:5. Irenaeus will use this same passage (Psalm 89(90):4 (2 Pet 3:8)) to support a chiliastic reading of the days of creation, where each day corresponds to a one thousand-year period with the eschatological Sabbath coming at the consummation of the 6,000 years. Daniélou terms this reading of creation as a week of ages, "paradisal millennialism." The true Sabbath is the eschatological "day" of the renewed temporary earthly kingdom, when righteous "shall not be engaged in any earthy occupation; but shall have a table at hand prepared for them by God, supplying them with all sorts of dishes."[187] In this context, however, Irenaeus applies this paradisiacal millennialism to the

187 *Haer*. 5.33.2.

nature of day in correspondence to the fact that Adam's age did not supersede 1000 years.

In the closing lines of *Haer*. 5.23.2 Irenaeus, once again, summarizes these views in succession to reinforce the point that all these interpretations prove that God is true and the serpent is a liar. Irenaeus is willing to permit a spiritual interpretation of death in either a moral sense or in the more literal sense of the subjection to the power of death. He will entertain eschatological interpretations of "day" in Gen 1:5 and Gen 2:6–17 as one cosmic day of creation. Or he can interpret "day" in a highly literal and typological sense as the day before Sabbath when Adam was created in Genesis and recreated though Christ's death on the cross. Finally, he is also willing to accept the intertextual reading of "day" as a week of ages spanning 1000 years, so that Adam died before the end of the first "day" of creation. Each of these interpretations is dependent upon different reading strategies and different intertexts including: Gen 1:5, Gen 1:24–31, Gen 5:5, Psalm 89(90):4 (2 Pet 3:8), Matt 6:12, Matt 27:62 (Mark 15:42, Luke 23:54), and Eph 1:10. At the same time, the most essential intertextual relationship is the correspondence between the words of the Lord in John 8:44 and the prohibition in Gen 2:16–17. Divine veracity expressed in the words of the Lord is the hermeneutical control for all readings of the prohibition. While the nature and timing of the day Adam and Eve died are debated, the Gnostic attempts to repeal prohibition are rejected because they subvert this basic apostolic truth that God is true and the serpent is a liar.

6.11 Creation and Eschatology in Irenaeus: *Haer*. 5.26.2, *Haer*. 5.28.3–4, *Haer*. 5.30.4, *Haer*. 5.33.1–4, *Haer*. 5.34.2, and *Haer*. 5.36.3

The chiliastic focus of *Haer*. 5.25–35 has long puzzled Irenaean scholars. This closing portion is often ignored, ridiculed or, as Steenberg remarks, simply set off as a kind of "chiliastic appendage."[188] However, Smith's essay "Chiliasm and recapitulation" argues that this section has an important relationship to the broader contours of Irenaeus' thought. Smith notes that this last portion completes the "essential harmony of the true soteriological task," thereby linking the protological and eschatological events of creation.[189] I find much agreement with Smith and Steenberg and this study of the intertextual use of Gen 1–3 supports the renewed appreciation for the full re-unification of Irenaeus' theology and exegesis. In *Haer*. 5.26.2 he, once again, reminds his readers that

188 Steenberg, *Irenaeus*, 50.

189 Smith, "Chiliasm," 329.

the actions of the serpent are made manifest in the Gnostics. Then, in *Haer*. 5.28.3–4, Haer. 5.30.4, *Haer*. 5.33.1–4, and *Haer*. 5.34.2 he articulates his chiliastic vision carefully in light Gen 1–3 including the destruction of the Antichrist, the resurrection of the faithful, and the restoration of creation.

6.11.1 *The Serpent and the Secrecy of Gnosis*: Haer. *5.26.2* (*Gen 3:1–6*)

In the midst of his eschatological reflection, there is another echo of the disobedience of Adam and Eve in Gen 3:1–6. While explaining some of eschatological prophecies from Revelation and Daniel, Irenaeus inserts a polemical argument concerning prophecy that uses the illustration linking Satan's deception in the garden with the activity of the heretics. According to Irenaeus, those who reject the clear teaching of the prophets blaspheme their Creator. They may do so openly like Marcion or by perverting scripture like the Valentinians, but whatever the case may be they are all, like the serpent in the Garden, the "instruments of Satan" (*organa Satanae*).[190] Irenaeus draws on the imagery of Gen 3:1–6 and interprets Satan's use of the snake as a means to conceal himself from God's awareness and seduce Adam and Eve into disobeying God's command. He would never challenge God directly or openly. This same secretive and deceptive behavior continued throughout the course of the Old Testament, and in every instance Satan believes his actions escaped the knowledge of God. Appealing explicitly to Justin, Irenaeus argues that the reason Satan continued to deceive God's creatures in secret was because he was unaware of his fate, since it was only prophesied enigmatically in the Old Testament.[191] The words of Christ, however, made explicit that God the Father has prepared an eternal fire for Satan and his agents (Matt 25:41).[192] So while Satan never blasphemed God openly, upon learning his fate, he now openly (though not directly) blasphemed God.[193]

---

190 *Haer*. 5.26.2. *Cf*. 2 Cor 11:3; Rev 12:9, 15.

191 *Cf*. Gen 3:14. *Haer*. 3.23.3. This thought is only implicit in Justin's extant works (*1 Apol*. 28.1–2; *2 Apol* 8.3–5); Orbe suggests the source as his lost refutation against Marcion (*cf. Haer*. 4.6.2). Orbe, *Teología v.3*, 96.

192 *Haer*. 5.26.2.

193 Rousseau and Orbe prefer the present tense reading of *audet* rather than the imperfect *audebat*, because he never discusses Satan *directly* challenging God. The perfect implies that in the New Testament, after learning his fate (Matt 25:41), Satan blasphemes openly but not directly, while the imperfect implies that Satan blasphemed indirectly until he learned his fate and now blasphemes openly *and* directly. Orbe, *Teología v.3*, 93.

6.11.2 *Irenaeus and the Seventh Day of Creation*: Haer. *5.28.3–4* (*Gen 1:26, Gen 2:1–2, Gen 2:7*)

In *Haer*. 5.28.3–4, Irenaeus details the nature of his chiliastic vision of salvation history. The function of Gen 1–3 serves as the essential framework for the eschatological Edenic state. Not only does the chiliastic portion reflect the *telos* of the eschatological advancement from creation to the eternal kingdom, it holds together the poles of the scriptural material by means of the trajectory of the divine economy. This eschatological kingdom is not a pure mystical or spiritual union with Christ, but an earthly, physical kingdom reflected in the prophecies of the Old Covenant.[194] As Steenberg observes, this eschatological reading of Genesis is supported by the "revealed images of the millennial kingdom, as in Jeremias, Isaias, Ezekiel, and John's Apocalypse," though he does not examine the nature of the relationships with Gen 2:2–3.[195] Irenaeus turns to the imagery of the prophets to illustrate the nature of the eschatological Sabbath predicted Gen 2:1–2.[196]

The revelation of the Antichrist in 2 Thess 2:3–4 orients the broader section of *Haer*. 5.25.1–30.4.[197] According to Irenaeus, the coming of the Antichrist results in the adoration and elevation of apostasy that culminates in the Antichrist's desecration of the Temple and the manifestation of his powers (Rev 13:2–18). The closing lines of *Haer*. 5.28.2 cite Rev 13:14–18, which mentions the number of the beast (Rev 13:18). He identifies the number of the beast, or six hundred and sixty-six, as the name or title of the Antichrist who recapitulates the whole apostasy.[198] The number, therefore, refers to both the individual and the arrangement and extent of the divine economy. Irenaeus uses this allusion to the number six that linked with the creation narratives to construct a Millenarian eschatological framework. Instead, Irenaeus unites Rev 13:18 with Gen 2:2–3 and the imagery of 1,000 years to a day in Psalm 89(90):4 (2 Pet 3:8). Through his appeal to the conclusion of creation (Gen 2:2–3), he interprets the "days" (*dies*) of creation as six one thousand-year periods with the consummation of creation coming at the conclusion of the 6,000 years and the institution

194 Behr, *Asceticism*, 80. The mystical nature of the eschatological quickly became prominent in Origen and Dionysius of Alexandria. Ibid., 80–2. Orbe, *Antropologia*, 25–7.

195 Steenberg, *Irenaeus*, 60.

196 Ibid., 98. Although Steenberg is, by all appearances, correct to say that Irenaeus only uses this passage in exegetical contexts. The expressed duel sense (literal and prophetic) of Gen 2:1 in this context suggests that Irenaeus does not *merely* read this text eschatologically.

197 *Haer*. 5.25.1.

198 *Haer*. 5.28.2.

of the eschatological Sabbath.[199] As Steenberg concludes, "Irenaeus follows the Asiatic chiliastic tradition in asserting a relationship between the timing or chronology of the Genesis creation narrative (read through the interpretive lens of Apoc 19:11–21:27) and the whole economy."[200] In the same number of days that the world was created, in that same number of millennial periods will the world be consummated (*consummatur*).[201] While he reads Gen 2:1–2 literally as the description of the cumulative work of God's creative activity, it is also a prophecy pointing toward the final consummation of all things. He describes the dual sense of reading Gen 2:1–2 saying: "This is a narrative of things formerly created, as also it is a prophecy of what is to come" (*Hoc autem est et ante factorum narratio quemadmodum facta sunt et futurorum prophetia*).[202] Thus, God has created all things with a purpose and trajectory oriented toward consummation, and there is a dialectical tension between narrative and prophetic aspects of Gen 2:2–3.

However, the timing of the divine economy is not the only reason for Irenaeus' appeal to Gen 2:2–3. He focuses on the language of *consummare* in Gen 2:2–3 as the fulfillment of God's eschatological trajectory. He correlates this concept with the previous works of creation (*fecit*) in the same passage (and the earlier descriptions of God's creative acts). The contrast between *fecit* and *consummavit* reflects the distinction between the literal, or narratival, and prophetic readings of Gen 2:2–3. In *Haer*. 5.28.4 he develops these connections between the creation of Adam on the sixth day and the consummation of humankind at the conclusion of the sixth thousandth year. He mentions that the same "hands of God" (the Son and the Spirit), who fashioned Adam in the beginning in the image and likeness of God (Gen 1:26), are also molding the faithful throughout the progression of the economy. Orbe notes that unlike Philo and Origen, Irenaeus does not conceive of two creations (Gen 1:26; Gen 2:7), but of one creation with two aspects.[203] Gen 2:7 depicts the formation from the earth, while Gen 1:26 relates the continual formation throughout the unfolding economy that prepares the faithful to receive immortality.[204] From the very beginning the creation is fixed on an eschatological course toward

199 *Haer*. 5.28.3. Smith, "Chiliasm," 315. *Cf. Haer*. 4.16.1 and *Epid* 96.

200 Steenberg, *Irenaeus*, 52.

201 *Haer*. 5.28.3.

202 *Haer*. 5.28.3. Behr, *Asceticism*, 82. In classical rhetoric a *narratio* is second stage of oration where the orator gives a narratival account of the nature of the case. *Quin* 4.2.

203 Orbe, *Teología v.3*, 192.

204 This perspective is supported by a number of passages discussed previously that conflate allusions to Gen 1:26 and Gen 2:7.

the consummative fulfillment in the kingdom of God. He links this discussion with the separation of the wheat and the chaff in Matt 3:12, which is the faithful and the apostate, and the theme of martyrdom, where the suffering of the faithful prepares them for the resurrection. He argues that the tribulation will purify the faithful and prepare them to be formed once again in the image and likeness of God.[205]

6.11.3 *The Destruction of the Antichrist*: Haer. *5.30.4* (*Gen 2:2–3*)

In continuity with the previous section, *Haer*. 5.30.4 considers the Antichrist's revelation and subsequent destruction. Irenaeus crafts a succinct eschatological outline beginning with the reign of the Antichrist that lasts three and a half years. His reign is interrupted by the Parousia (Matt 16:27), and three concurrent events accompany this event: Satan will be cast into the Lake of Fire (Rev 19:20), the righteous will be gathered into the kingdom on the hallowed seventh day (Gen 2:2–3), and the just will receive the Abrahamic promises (Matt 8:11).[206] His allusion to the ingathering of the just includes mention of the eschatological "rest" (*requietionem*, Gen 2:2) when the faithful will recline at the Father's table and feast with Abraham and all the faithful (Matt 8:11). Therefore, with these texts, Irenaeus weaves an eschatological cento, the climax of which is the restoration of the "hallowed seventh day" (*septimam diem sanctificatam*) of Gen 2:2–3.

6.11.4 *Resurrection of the Faithful and Restoration of Creation*: Haer. *5.33.1–4* (*Gen 1:6–25, Gen 1:27–28, Gen 1:30, Gen 2:2–3*)

In continuity to the previous discussion, in *Haer*. 5.33.1–4, Irenaeus illustrates the nature of the eschatological seventh day of creation with a series of interrelated prophetic passages. Steenberg suggests this section summarizes Irenaeus' chiliastic vision of creation, where the creation narratives find their *telos* in the "cosmic 'Sabbath' "[207] Irenaeus speaks of this Sabbath in terms of the Abrahamic blessing and then reminds his readers of Christ's words at the

205 Irenaeus turns to the martyrdom of Ignatius for an example of this purification. He cites Ignatius' words illustrate his point, "I am the wheat of Christ, and am ground by the teeth of the wild beasts, that I may be found the pure bread of God." (*frumentum sum Christi, et per dentes bestiarum molor, ut mundus panis Dei inveniar*). Ign, *Rom* 4.1.

206 *Haer*. 5.30.4. Orbe, *Teología v.3*, 282. *Cf. Haer*. 4.16.1, *Haer*. 5.28.3, *Haer*. 5.32.2, and *Haer*. 5.30.1. He suggests Titan (*Teitan*), Euanqas (*Evanthas*) and Lateinos (*Lateinos*), and also concludes the name was suppressed in preference for the number, because the name is not worthy to be proclaimed by the Holy Spirit.

207 Steenberg, *Irenaeus*, 53.

last supper where he proclaimed to his disciples that he would drink wine again with them in the renewed kingdom of God (Matt 26:27–28). This kingdom would be a renewed earth enjoyed by the faithful who are raised to new life (Psalm 103(104):30).[208] In contrast to his Gnostic opponents, this earth and wine is not a celestial place where wine is consumed spiritually without a body, but the renewed earth that produces wine for those resurrected in flesh.

In *Haer*. 5.33.2 he describes the nature of life in the eschatological seventh day (Gen 2:2–3) with the imagery of Christ's invitation of the lame, blind, and poor to dinner, rather than friends and neighbors (Luke 14:12–13), and proclaims recompense for those who abandon their earthly possessions for the sake of Christ (Matt 19:29). Alluding to Gen 2:2–3, he describes how the seventh day of creation was sanctified when "God rested from all the works He created" (*requievit Deus ab omnibus operibus quae fecit*).[209] Thus, the same will be true of the faithful who dwell in the kingdom of God. They will not engage in any work, but God will prepare them a lavish table overflowing with all kinds of foods.[210] The episodes of Luke 14:12–13 and Matt 19:29 are the "times of the kingdom" (*regni temporibus*) reflecting the nature of the cosmic seventh day of creation, which he interprets literally and emphasizes the corporeal and material aspects.

In continuity with the nature of life in the eschaton, in *Haer*. 5.33.3–4, Irenaeus discusses the nature of creation in eschatological seventh day. Irenaeus uses intertextual connections to illustrate the nature of life in the kingdom and confirm the eschatological imagery of the fecundity of the earth. This imagery reflects the original divine intention for creation where Adam lives in obedience to God and creation is peacefully subject to Adam.[211] This line of argumentation links Gen 1:27–28 and Gen 1:30 with Isa 11:6–9 and Isa 65:25. The texts from Isaiah depict the apocalyptic imagery of a harmonious creation where the wolf and the lamb lie down together, the lion eats straw, and the serpent does not even harm an infant. Irenaeus recognizes that some of his contemporaries interpret this imagery allegorically as the conversion of the pagans who come into harmony with righteous faith and, though he agrees that this rendering is plausible, he prefers a literal reading depicting the

208 *Haer*. 5.33.1.

209 *Haer*. 5.33.2.

210 *Haer*. 5.33.2. *Cf. Haer*. 5.30.4. On this day Abraham received his promised inheritance as cited in Matt 8:11. Irenaeus will support these texts with additional passages in *Haer*. 5.34.1–4.

211 Steenberg, *Irenaeus*, 55. Orbe, *Teología v.3*, 442.

fulfillment in the eschatological kingdom.[212] This harmonious creation is more consistent with the divine intention for creation to be in subjection to humankind (Gen 1:27–28). This also entails that the animals return to the original vegetarian diet (Gen 1:30) they enjoyed before Adam's disobedience.[213] Thus, in Irenaeus' perspective, the harmonious nature of the original pre-lapsarian creation of Gen 1:27–30 is restored in the eschatological kingdom mentioned in Isa 11:6–9 and Isa 65:25. However, the relationship is difference of degree not kind, because the state of creation illustrated in Isa 11:6–9 and Isa 65:25 is a more rich and bountiful creation. He even reflects upon the quality and magnitude of the fruit in the kingdom where a lion can be satisfied by such a meager meal.[214] Interestingly, Irenaeus nowhere mentions the texts of Gen 1:6–25 except in his discussion of Marcosian interpretations. In the present context, however, it is possible to infer his views of the nature of the original creation in Gen 1–2.[215]

6.11.5 *The Restoration of Inheritance*: Haer. *5.34.2* (*Gen 3:6*)

Like previous sections, this portion also presents a separate network of texts depicting the nature of the eschatological earthly kingdom following the resurrection. To illustrate this new creation, Irenaeus cites Isa 30:25–26 that concludes with the description of the Lord promising his people that he will heal the "pain of the stroke" (*dolorem plagae*). He links the "pain of the stroke" (*dolorem plagae*) to Adam's disobedience and the death inflicted upon him as a penalty of his sin (Gen 2:17, Gen 3:6).[216] The mode of healing is, of course, the resurrection of the faithful who are granted the "inheritance of the fathers"

---

212 *Haer*. 5.35.4. In *Haer*. 5.35.1, Irenaeus notes those who allegorize these prophecies are inconsistent with themselves.

213 *Haer*. 5.33.4.

214 The first citation in *Haer*. 5.34.1–4 is Isa 26:19, which describes the joy of creation at the resurrection of the just, but the rest of the passages more specifically describe the promise and nature of the physical resurrection: Ezek 37:12–14, Ezek 28:25–26, Matt 3:9/Luke 3:8, Jer 16:14–15, 23:7–8, Isa 30:25–26, Gen 9:27, Isa 58:14, Luke 12:37–38, Rev 20:6, Isa 6:11–12, Dan 7:27, Dan 12:13, Jer 31:10, Matt 12:5, Isa 31:9–32:1, Isa 54:11–14, and Isa 65:18–22.

215 This is Steenberg's suggestion when he cites Irenaeus' reading of Gen 1:11–12 and Gen 1:24–25. Steenberg, *Irenaeus*, 55–6. *Cf.* Orbe, *Teología v.3*, 443. In *Haer*. 5.22.4 Irenaeus also references Papias as his source for this material, which implies Papias is the conduit through which the Asiatic chiliastic tradition came to Irenaeus and disseminated to the later tradition. Danielou, *Theology of Jewish Christianity*, 382.

216 Orbe points to the common vocabulary in Rev 13:3, 12 and also suggests the background of Num 21:8. Orbe, *Teología v.3*, 458. *Cf. Haer*. 5.28.2.

(*patrum hereditatem*) and the blessing of Japheth (Gen 9:27).[217] This reference to inheritance also accompanies an allusion to the earth as the inheritance of those who are resurrected from the dead (Isa 58:14).[218] Together these texts remind the reader that the penalty of death imposed in Gen 1–3 is healed by means of the resurrection and the faithful, once again, receive the inheritance that was lost through Adam's disobedience.

6.11.6 *The Resurrection of the Just and the Final Consummation*: Haer. 5.36.3 (Gen 1:26, Gen 1:31–2:1, Gen 2:2–3, Gen 2:7)

In the closing paragraph of *Haer*. 5, Irenaeus brings his argument for the physical resurrection to a close. He appears confident that he has demonstrated his eschatological vision for the salvation of the flesh that has dominated the work as a whole. In his final statements, Irenaeus carries on the same intertextual practice that has characterized his exegesis to this point. He continues his strong literalist understanding of the eschatological kingdom with a commentary on the blessings imparted to the faithful. These texts center upon the one Father, the one Son, and the one human race that experiences the promise of bodily resurrection and recreation in the image and likeness of God.[219]

A portion of this section survives only in a late Armenian manuscript. Rousseau considers it original and suggests it brings more clarity to the thought of this section. Orbe, on the other hand, evaluates the section and raises some significant questions about its authenticity. He also suspects that the insertion is the result of a scribal addition in order to clarify Irenaeus' chiliasm and early Christian debates over the nature of the resurrection(s) in relation to the future earthly kingdom. He compares this insertion with a similar one from Hippolytus' commentary on Daniel that is also apparently inauthentic, and concludes that Irenaeus was subjected to a similar manner of correction. Nevertheless, the tone is Irenaean, which suggests a close relationship to Irenaeus himself. The intertextual use of scripture also parallels his use of scripture in previous section, though, the intertexts are different than previous sections.[220] In my view, these stylistic similarities present a good argument for its authenticity.

---

217 *Haer*. 5.34.2. The citation of Gen 9:27 is absent from the Latin mss, although Rousseau believes it is original. *SC* 152.342.

218 Smith, "Chiliasm," 318.

219 Donovan, *One Right Reading?*, 169.

220 Compare, for example, the closing lines of Irenaeus' *Epideixis* (*Epid* 97–100) that are also debated. A key objection to its authenticity is the lack of any scriptural reference, which is not the case for this insertion. For Orbe, the introduction seems to break to flow of

In relation to Gen 1–3, the insertion is important because it contains another citation of Gen 1:31–2:2. It speaks of the consummation of creation on the sixth day of creation, or the 6000 years, and the eternal rest that proceeds on the seventh day (Psalm 89(90):4 and 2 Pet 3:8). Here these texts are interpreted in the same manner as *Haer*. 5.28.3, but the intertexts are different. The insertion begins immediately following an allusion to the resurrection of the faithful who dwell in the future earthly kingdom and eat and drink with Christ (Matt 26:29). In connection to this imagery, Irenaeus appeals to Christ's words in John 5:25, 28–29 and the Psalmist's description of the Lord's rest (*requies*, Psalm 131(132):14/Psalm 117:20(118:19)) in order to communicate the nature of the "first resurrection" (*primos resurgere*), or the resurrection to life prior to the earthly kingdom. This is set in contrast to the final resurrection to judgment at the consummation. In this section, Gen 1:31–2:2 and Psalm 131(132):14/Psalm 117:20(118:19) confirm the nature and timing of the two resurrections mentioned in John 5:25, 28–29 in relation to the Millennial kingdom. This is a distinctly Irenaean way of reading texts, and suggests that if this section is not original, the author was well acquainted with Irenaeus' style of exegesis.[221]

Having summarized this intertextual Millenarian presentation, the remaining portion of *Haer*. 5.36.3 depicts the nature of the resurrection of the just (Rev 20:5–6) and their inheritance of a restored earthly kingdom (Rom 8:21). He describes how the prophets "harmoniously" (*consonanter*) prophesy this resurrection of the faithful and restoration of the earth.[222] These things, Irenaeus concludes, are the work of the same God and Father, who "fashioned humankind" (*plasmavit hominem*, Gen 2:7) in the beginning and gave them the promises of the future resurrection and the inheritance of the kingdom of God. The same Father, who by means of the Word, forms humankind throughout the unfolding of the divine economy and prepares the faithful for resurrection.[223] The fulfillment of these promises, Irenaeus assures the reader, is something that remains unseen (1 Cor 2:9). Orbe provides an extended commentary on the vision of God with respect to 1 Cor 2:9 and in relation to *Haer*. 4.20.5.[224]

---

argument, however, given the Irenaean tone and dependence on scripture, he also suggests that this could be an authentic Irenaean insertion in a later draft. Orbe, *Teología v.3*, 618.

221 It is also important to note that Psalm 131(132):14/Psalm 117:20(118:19) appear nowhere else in Irenaeus and John 5:25, 28–29 is found only here and *Haer*. 5.13.1.

222 *Haer*. 5.36.3.

223 *Haer*. 5.14.1. *Haer*. 5.15.1–3.

224 Orbe, *Teología v.3*, 626–28. See also 628–33, 646–51. The use of *paternaliter* in *Haer*. 4.20.5 is a key link between these sections.

He speaks of three different graduated stages of seeing God (*prophetice, adoptive, paternaliter*) where the faithful, though subject to corruption, continue to advance toward the perfection of the Father by means of the prophetic Spirit in the Old Testament. At last they finally receive adoption mediated by the Son and the Spirit in the New Testament, and in the final consummation they will receive the Father's promised resurrection and restoration to eternal life. In a final rebuke of his opponents, Irenaeus suggests that not even the angels, who cannot fathom the mysteries of God, can spoil this divinely orchestrated economy of salvation (1 Pet 1:12).[225] This mystery is the actualization of God's "handiwork" (*plasma*) being conformed to the Son and brought to perfection (Gen 2:7).[226]

Irenaeus concludes his refutation by describing, once again, how the "handiwork" (*plasma*, Gen 2:7) of God, which is incorporated into the Son at the incarnation, will be made after the image and likeness of God (Gen 1:26).[227] This invokes an image where those who are raised ascend "beyond the angels" (*supergrediens angelos*). The recreation of humankind in the image of God characterizes the ultimate aim of salvation in Irenaeus.[228] At last, the handiwork that was fashioned from the earth in Gen 2:7, by means of the unfolding of the economy and the incarnation, is brought to share in the image and likeness of God (Gen 1:26) and partakes in the glory and immortality bestowed by the same Creator and Father.

6.12 Conclusion: Irenaeus' Intertextual Reading of Gen 1–3 in *Haer*. 5

With the closing allusion to Gen 1:26, Irenaeus rests his argument. From beginning to end, Irenaeus' hermeneutic of scriptural consonance integrates the

225 This use of 1 Pet 1:12 is obscure and Orbe points to at least four different interpretations reflected in parallels with Clement of Alexandria and *Epistola apostolorum*. Orbe, *Teología v.3, 640–41*.

226 The parallel use of *conformatum* and *concorportatum* are echoes of Phil 3:21 and Eph 3:6 (*Haer*. 1.10.3 and *Haer*. 5.13.3) and the use of *Primogenitus* must refer to Col 1:15, 18 and Rom 8:29 (*Haer*. 3.15.3, *Haer*. 16.6, *Haer*. 4.20.2).

227 *Haer*. 5.36.3. Both *Adversus Haereses* and the *Epideixis* conclude with allusions to Gen 1:26. It is not uncommon to read that the concept of recreation in the image of God is a theme that dominates both works as a whole. Wingren, *Man and the incarnation*, 213.

228 Steenberg, *Irenaeus*, 56. This imagery of ascending higher than the angels must allude back to Irenaeus' the envy of the angels in the original creation. See *Epid* 16. *Cf*. Behr, *Asceticism*, 85.

texts of Gen 1–3 into his theological reasoning, forming networks of texts in hermeneutically symbiotic relationships. He uses Gen 1–3 to interpret other passages, and brings together a variety of scriptural passages to interpret Gen 1–3. The extensive performance of Gen 1–3 in *Haer*. 5 offers the culmination of Irenaeus' intertextual resourcefulness of these creation texts. Like the previous books, his intertextual networking is expressed through a series of reading strategies including: structural uses, catchwords and verbal connections, illustrative uses, typological connections, prophecy-fulfillment, general-to-particular arguments, and the intentional connections between the words of the Lord, a prophet, and an apostle. These analytical descriptions support the classifications described in previous chapters, but these arguments utilize a number of unique textual relationships. Furthermore, the reading strategies mentioned below are not mutually exclusive. In many cases Irenaeus will use a combination of these strategies to support his general polemical arguments.

First, Irenaeus continues to use key texts from Gen 1–3 to structure his theological polemic. In this case, the second half of *Haer*. 5 is carefully arranged Adam-Christ typology that aims to unify the events in Gen 1–3 with the work of Christ. While the Christological events are the controlling texts for each unit, every section utilizes the narrative and imagery from Gen 1–3. The first is the healing of the man born blind in John 9:1–7 (*Haer*. 5.15–16.2), the second is the crucifixion (*Haer*. 16.3–20.2), and the third is the temptation account (*Haer*. 5.21–24.4). The arrangement of these events also elevates the importance of the temptation account in Irenaeus' thinking, because it exhibits the ultimate vanquishing of Satan in contrast to Adam's capitulation to the serpent in Gen 3:1–6. Each of these aspects of Christ's life are compared and contrasted to the events of Adam's creation (Gen 1:26, 2:7) and disobedience (Gen 3:1–6). In one particular instance, *Haer*. 5.23.1–2, Irenaeus presents several intertextual readings of Gen 2:17 that draw from a diverse set of texts including: Gen 1:5, Psalm 89(90):4, John 8:44, and Eph 1:10. Thus, the structure of the whole chapter is organized around different interpretations of the divine command given to Adam. While he is comfortable with a variety of intertexts, he is principally concerned with the theological validation that God was proved true and the serpent a liar (John 8:44) when Adam disobeyed God's command in Gen 3. The final section of *Haer*. 5.25–35 arranges a series of eschatological events that illustrate the nature of the eschatological Sabbath predicted Gen 2:1–2. The final chapters of *Haer*. 5 continually return to this passage as he describes the destruction of the Antichrist, the resurrection of the faithful, and the restoration of creation. Finally, the whole work concludes with an allusion

to Gen 1:26 in *Haer*. 5.36.3. Irenaeus' final book, therefore, is oriented and structured by the narrative elements and imagery resident in Gen 1–3.

Second, Irenaeus uses a variety of verbal associations to link passages intertextually. In many cases the corresponding terms are identical, but other cases they are simply cognates or have general semantic connections between them. In every case, the catchwords allow for broader theological correspondence and reflection between the events where Irenaeus uses these passages to frame his theological arguments. Specific identical terms that unite passages include "paradise" (*paradisus*) in *Haer*. 5.5.1, which identifies the location and description of God's presence and threads together the experiences of Enoch (Gen 5:24), Elijah (2 Kgs 2:11), and Paul (2 Cor 12:4) who are all caught up to paradise. In *Haer*. 5.6.1 the language of "image" links Gen 1:26 and Rom 8:29 where Christ is the true image of God. In *Haer*. 5.12.2–6, Irenaeus corresponds Gen 2:7, Isa 42:5, Isa 57:16, Acts 2:17 and 1 Cor 15:45 with the imagery of "breath" (*adspiratio*), "Spirit" (*Spiritus*), and "earth" (*terra*). Isa 42:5, Isa 57:16, and Acts 2:17 confirm the economic change from the general enlivening through the breath to the particular enlivening by the Spirit. Similarly, in *Haer*. 5.14.1–2 Irenaeus reads the "flesh and blood" (*caro et sanguis*) in 1 Cor 15:50 in correspondence to the body formed in Gen 2:7 and the language of "flesh" or "blood" in Gen 4:10, Gen 9:5–6, Matt 23:35–36 (Luke 11:50–51) John 1:14, Luke 19:10, and Col 1:22. Finally, in *Haer*. 5.28.3–4 his intertextual logic and chiliastic perspective unites the references to the sixth "day" (*dies*) in Gen 2:1–2 with the theological link between 1,000 years and a day in Psalm 89(90):4.

In other cases, Irenaeus uses general connections between terms that are more conceptually related. These verbal correspondences often require more developed explanation. For example, in *Haer*. 5.6.1 he conflates Gen 1:26 and Gen 2:7 to argue that the plasma of Adam's formation is the substance molded after the image of God. He also conflates Gen 1:26 with Rom 8:29 to describe the anthropological activity of the Spirit. The "perfect" or "spiritual" person (1 Cor 2:6, 15), according to Irenaeus, is not the man formed in Gen 1:26 and Gen 2:7, but the person described in 1 Thess 5:23 comprising body, soul and Spirit. In *Haer*. 5.15.3, he also compares the original formation from the dust with Jer 1:5, Gal 1:15, and John 9:1 to exemplify how the Son of God formed Jeremiah, Paul, and the blind man in the "womb" (*venter*). In fact, the whole narrative of John 9 is linked through a variety of connections between the healing from the dirt on the ground and the creation from the dust. Then, in *Haer*. 5.17.1 he connects the sound of God walking in paradise in Gen 3:8 with the "voice" (*vocem*) proclaiming the forgiveness of sins in the Gospels.

Irenaeus will also use other corresponding passages to define terms and concepts in Gen 1–3. In *Haer*. 5.1.1–3 he provides a theological commentary on the nature of plasma as a way to identify the solidarity with the whole human race in the person of Adam. In the same context, he describes the motivation for creation by linking Gen 1:26 with allusions to the predestination and foreknowledge of God in Eph 1:11–12 and 1 Pet 1:2. Therefore, creation is a calculated divine decision that providentially unfolds throughout time. Then, in *Haer*. 5.7.1–2 presents an interesting case where Irenaeus uses the formation from the dust in Gen 2:7 to define the phrase "mortal bodies" (*mortalia corpora*) in Rom 8:11. In this sense, Gen 2:7 delineates the meaning and intention of the apostle. The "mortal body" is also the same body that dissolves back into the earth in Gen 3:19, or the animal body of 1 Cor 15:44, which is contrasted with the spiritual body that is raised to new life (1 Cor 15:42–44, John 20:20).

Third, closely associated to the verbal connection between passages, Irenaeus also utilizes the narrative and imagery in Gen 1–3 to *illustrate* his theological perspective. In these cases Irenaeus is not merely focused on the terms, but the procedures and activates of individuals in the creation passages. In several cases he will make a theological point based upon a separate scriptural passage, and then appeal to Gen 1–3 to *illustrate* this argument. He also regularly applies this same imagery to his own contemporary setting and the activity of his Gnostic opponents. In this way, Irenaeus views his setting as part of the scriptural world and continuation of the divine economy. Just as God and Satan are active in Genesis and throughout the working of the divine economy, so also are they active in his own setting. In this first case, there are particular aspects of the narrative that unite passages. For example, Irenaeus is attentive to the dialogical elements in Gen 1:26 and Gen 3:8, which he connects to Christ's speaking in John 9 (*Haer*. 5.15.4) and Matt 9:2 (*Haer*. 5.17.1–2). The same one "speaking" in Gen 1–3 is the same one conversing in John 9 and announcing forgiveness in Matt 9:2. In fact, the whole narrative of the healing of the blind man in John 9:1–7 is a procedural reenactment of the creation from the dust in Gen 2:7. Second, he uses Gen 1–3 to illustrate theological arguments in other passages. In *Haer*. 5.3.1, he describes the power of God to raise the flesh in Heb 11:19 and 1 Cor 15:53, and then exemplifies this power to raise the flesh with the demonstration of God's creative power in Gen 2:7. On the other hand, other passages illustrate a theological emphasis in Genesis. In *Haer*. 5.5.1–2, the imagery of the "hands of God" (Gen 1:26 and Gen 2:7) that is the Son and the Spirit, that form Adam also communicates the notion of preservation and protection of the substance of the flesh. The characteristics of the experiences

of Enoch (Gen 5:24), Elijah (2 Kgs 2:11), Jonah (Jonah 2), the longevity of the patriarchs (i.e. Gen 5:2–32, Gen 9:29), and Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego (Dan 3:19–25). As I observed in the previous section, he contrasts these experiences with Adam's expulsion in Gen 3:23. Third, Irenaeus uses the imagery of Gen 1–3 in polemical illustrations. In *Haer*. 5.1.1–3, he cites the bread-making imagery of 1 Cor 5:6–7 to interpret the "human-making" imagery of Gen 2:7 and Luke 1:35. The Gnostics remain in the "old leaven" of Adam's formation that was conquered and expelled from paradise. Then, in *Haer*. 5.20.2 Irenaeus combines the imagery of Gen 2:8, Gen 2:16–17, Rom 12:3, and Eph 1:10 to compare the Gnostics with deception of the serpent in the Garden. The faithful, for Irenaeus, find themselves in the same position as Adam and he encourages them to eat from all trees of the garden (the scriptures), but not of the tree of knowledge of good and evil (the teaching of the Gnostics).

Fourth, his intertextual reading of Gen 1–3 also uses general theological or typological connections. The primary typological connection is the Adam-Christ typology that structures the second half of the work as a whole, but other typological relationships also surface including: an Eve-Mary typology and a serpent-Satan typology. In fact the whole atmosphere of Gen 1–3 is used typologically and prophetically to interpret the work of Christ and the Antichrist. Beginning with the Adam-Christ typology Irenaeus continues to explain how the work of Christ compares and contrasts with the work of Adam through a variety of symmetrical and asymmetrical correspondence. For example, in *Haer*. 5.1.1–3 he reads the incarnation in Luke 1:35 in light of the creation in Gen 2:7, and these connections are substantiated by the Adam-Christ typology expressed in 1 Cor 5:7 and the reference to divine plural in Gen 1:26, so that the same divine persons creating in Gen 2:7 are also active in Luke 1:35. In *Haer*. 5.2.1 Irenaeus provides a sophisticated soteriological connection between the substance of Adam's formation and the substance of Christ's sacrifice. Even though Satan had taken God's creatures captive (Gen 3:1–6), Christ had come to retrieve "his own" (*ipsum*) creation (Gen 2:7, John 1:11), which is the ancient *plasma* of Adam, and redeem it by his own flesh and blood (Eph 1:7, 1 Tim 2:6). In *Haer*. 5.12.2–6, he utilizes a Pauline anthropological tension between the first Adam and the second Adam established in 1 Cor 15:45–46, and contrasts the temporal life given by the breath in Gen 2:7, with the eternal life given by the Spirit in 1 Cor 15:45. However, the most developed group of typological connections is located in *Haer*. 5:15.2–16.2. Irenaeus provides a complex method of theological argumentation that correlates John 9:1–7 with Gen 1–2 through a variety of texts including: Gen 1:26, Gen 2:7, Gen 3:6, Gen 3:9, Gen 3:19, Jer 1:5, Luke 15:4–6, Luke 19:10, John 1:14, John 5:14, John 9:1–7,

Gal 1:15, Phil 2:8, and Titus 3:5. He argues that Christ revealed himself as the one through whom all things were created in Gen 1–2, so that the healing of the blind man reenacts the creation from the dust in Gen 2:7. The mention of the "work of God" in John 9:3, the fashioning of the eyes from the dust in John 9:6, and the washing in John 9:7 all point to conceptual and theological connections with the creation of all things by means of the Word of God. The Adam-Christ typology surfaces again in *Haer*. 5.16.2 where he links Gen 1:26 with the incarnation in John 1:14 and a discussion of the passion in Gen 3:6 with Phil 2:8 to describe how the first Adam's disobedience in Gen 3:6 is overturned by the second Adam's obedience in Phil 2:8.

In other typological relationships that are closely tied to his Adam-Christ typology, he develops an Eve-Mary and serpent-Satan typology in *Haer*. 5.21.1–2 with his commentary on Gen 3:15 and Matt 4:2–10. The prophecy that the seed would be born of a woman overturns the nature and function of Eve in the Garden. Just as Eve was taken out of Adam and Satan deceived Adam by means of this woman, so also Christ was born of a woman so that he might vanquish the same enemy who ensnared Adam. Similarly his serpent-Satan typology is evident in the temptation account of Matt 4:2–10. Irenaeus argues that just as Adam was deceived though eating in Gen 3:6, now Christ, even in a state of hunger, vanquished the same enemy by abstaining from eating.

Fifth, in a method closely associated with his general Adam-Christ typology, he also uses a type of prophecy-fulfillment to interpret key texts in Gen 1–3. In the previous section, *Haer*. 5.21.1–2, Gen 3:15 is interpreted prophetically as anticipating the virgin brith of Christ and the destruction of Satan. The seed in Gen 3:15 is the seed in Gal 3:19 and the one born of a woman in Gal 4:4. He is also the Son of the Father who proclaims the command in Gen 3:15. The concluding chapters of *Haer*. 5 also reflect on the prophetic fulfillment of the kingdom of God and the "hallowed seventh day" of creation in Gen 2:1–2 (*Haer*. 5.28.3). He weaves an eschatological cento in *Haer*. 5.30.4 that concludes with the restoration of creation on the "hallowed seventh day" of Gen 2:2–3. This day is characterized by the restoration of the faithful sitting at the table of the Lord in Matt 8:11. The same perspective on the eschatological seventh day of creation is found in *Haer*. 5.33.1–4 where the faithful are raised to life on a restored creation (Gen 27:27–29, Matt 13:38, Luke 14:12–13, and Matt 19:29). In the same context, the passages of Isa 11:6–9 and Isa 65:25 describe the restoration of the kingdom to its original subjection and harmony in Gen 1:27–30. The future kingdom depicted in Isa 11:6–9 and Isa 65:25 will be even more fruitful and plentiful than the original creation in Gen 1:27–30. The same kind of eschatological intertextual weaving returns in the closing chapter of

Haer. 5.36.3, where Irenaeus connects a network of citations linked through a theological vision for the eschatological kingdom of God.

Sixth, Irenaeus continues to use the classical general-to-particular or parts-whole style of argumentation. In these cases he will use texts that make a particular theological point and bring other passages alongside that describe a more general premise. These arguments are usually differentiated along the lines of the economic unfolding of salvation history. In *Haer*. 5.8.1, the faithful received the Spirit as a pledge (Eph 1:14, Rom 8:9, 15) leading them to the fullness of the Spirit that is given in the final consummation (Gen 1:26, 1 Cor 13:12). Similarly, he argues that the breath is given to all, while the Spirit is given particularly. In *Haer*. 5.12.2, he develops the contrast between the universality of the breath and the particularity of the Spirit with allusions to Gen 2:7, Isa 42:5, Isa 57:16, 1 Cor 15:45. The breath is given to all, but the Spirit is only given to the faithful.

Seventh, there are a few instances of prosopological interpretation, though it is not nearly as prevalent as in other books, because the focus of this book is the resurrection, and not necessarily Christology. But the few instances of prosopological interpretation include the connection between Christ speaking in John 9 and the identity of the one speaking in Gen 1:26 and Gen 3:8 in *Haer*. 5.15.4. In the same general context, Irenaeus identifies the Son and the Spirit as the Image and Likeness of Gen 1:26, though he differentiates between the Image (personal) creating in Gen 1–2, and the Image (substantial) that is revealed in the New Testament (Rom 8:29). Then, in *Haer*. 5.17.1 he uses the verbal titles of "Maker" and "Framer" taken from Gen 1:26 and Gen 2:7 to identify the God that is active in Creation. He also draws connections between the Christ announcing the forgiveness of sins in the Gospels and the "Voice of God" (*Vox Dei*) active in creation and speaking the divine commands.

Eighth and finally, he intentionally connects passages from separate portions of scripture as a way to show the theological continuity of divine revelation. This includes the words of Moses, a prophet and an apostle, or the words of the Lord, a prophet, and an apostle. This canonical linkage allows Irenaeus to exhibit the theological continuity throughout the unfolding of the divine economy. For example, in the section discussed above, *Haer*. 5.12.1–2, he corresponds Gen 2:7 (Moses), Isa 42:5, Isa 57:16 (prophet), and 1 Cor 15:45 (apostle), as a means to explain the progression of the unfolding of the Spirit in relation to salvation history. Then, in *Haer*. 5.17.3 he links the words of the Lord in Matt 9:2 announcing the forgiveness of sins with the forgiveness of sins predicted in Psalm 31(32):1–2 (prophet), and confirmed in Col 2:14 (apostle).

Therefore, from the opening pages of his refutation in *Haer*. 1 to his closing citation of Gen 1:26 in *Haer*. 5, the decisive aspects of his theological argumentation includes the use and application of these early creation accounts that are read in continuity and harmony with the rest of the scriptural witness. Irenaeus is nowhere content to read Genesis apart from the rest of scriptural revelation, but following his intertextual perspective he applies a variety of reading strategies and theological perspectives that serve to unite a variety of texts within his argumentation. In the final chapter, I will summarize all the reading strategies applied to Gen 1–3 throughout *Adversus Haereses* and how they shape Irenaeus' intertextual approach to scriptural interpretation.

CHAPTER 7

Conclusion: Irenaeus' Intertextual Reception of Genesis 1–3 in *Adversus Haereses*

7.1 Introduction

For Irenaeus scripture reading is intertextual. It is like carefully placing tiles into a mosaic to reveal the image of a king (*Haer*. 1.1.8), or reading a Homeric poem in its proper narrative arrangement (*Haer*. 1.9.4), or listening to an orchestra of finely tuned instruments projecting a single melody to God (*Haer*. 2.28.3). Scriptural consonance guides his theological exegesis so that interpreting any one part of scripture requires the voices of other scriptures (*Haer*. 3.12.9, *Haer*. 5.13.2). For Irenaeus, the "proofs in the Scriptures cannot be shown except from the Scriptures themselves" (*ostensiones quae sunt in Scripturis non possunt ostendi nisi ex ipsis Scripturis*).[1] This penchant for scripture consonance stems from his doctrine of revelation and especially his doctrine of creation. He argues generally that God the Father has created all things by means of the Word and Wisdom and though the creation is composed of many and various elements, it is nonetheless uniformly harmonious. Likewise, the scriptures record the work of God from the beginning of creation and are given by the same God in many and various forms. Therefore, when interpreted properly all portions of scripture, beginning with Gen 1–3, are found perfectly consonant with the rest of scriptural revelation.

Irenaeus' hermeneutic of scriptural consonance, therefore, permits him to use any particular method of exegesis as long as that method proves the consonance of scriptural revelation. Irenaeus is not beholden to any particular method or style of interpretation, but instead demonstrates an enthusiasm for applying a variety of methods of textual integration that generate a great diversity of intertextual relationships from across the whole counsel of scripture. The complexity of these intertextual relationships communicates a mastery of the scriptural material and interpretive mind that is actively engaged in textual integration. To be sure, Irenaeus recognizes that scripture consonance does not solve all the ambiguities in the scriptures, because there is a natural limit to human reason, and, after all, some of the mysteries in scripture should be left to God. But when Irenaeus turns to Gen 1–3, he never offers an isolated

1 *Haer*. 3.12.9.

© KONINKLIJKE BRILL NV, LEIDEN, 2015 | DOI 10.1163/9789004294523_008

reading of these texts apart from the rest of scripture, but instead his reading of creation is consonant with the rest of divine revelation.

In order to study the complexity of Irenaeus' intertextuality, the previous chapters surveyed every verifiable citation, allusion, and echo of Gen 1–3 in *Adversus haereses*, as well as any text that Irenaeus reads alongside Gen 1–3. From this analysis, I detected a variety of reading strategies and provided analytical descriptions of these strategies, which delineate precisely how Irenaeus works scripture intertextually. These reading strategies include: a literary reading, prophetic reading, a typological reading, verbal connections or patterns, an organizational function, narratival or creedal arrangements, a prosopological reading, illustrative identification, and general-to-particular reasoning. While previous studies on Irenaeus' exegesis have observed the mosaic of scriptural passages that pervades his writings, this work advances the conversation by evaluating the way his intertextual reading is expressed in his applied exegesis.

This final chapter provides a comprehensive summary of all the reading strategies that developed through the preceding chapters and explains in more detail how Irenaeus uses these strategies to network scriptural texts. I begin with a summary of Irenaeus' presentation of Gnostic intertextual readings of Gen 1–3 discussed in *Haer*. 1–2. Certainly Irenaeus is not the only ancient interpreter networking scripture, and with the exception of their numerological interpretations, Irenaeus and his Gnostic opponents are employing similar reading strategies. From Irenaeus' perspective the distinction between his reading and that of his opponents is located in competing theological perspectives that inform their views on the authority of the Mosaic accounts and the particular intertexts or narratives they read alongside Gen 1–3. After summarizing Irenaeus' presentation of the Gnostic reading of Gen 1–3, the rest of this chapter details the key aspects and examples of Irenaeus' intertextual reading of Gen 1–3 based upon his applied exegesis assembled in the previous books. For the Bishop of Lyons, the creation accounts are only properly understood within carefully constructed intertextual relationships fashioned with other passages within scripture revelation that best serve to communicate his theological perspective.

7.2 Irenaeus on the Gnostic Reading of Gen 1–3

Irenaeus' account of Gnostic exegesis, described in *Haer*. 1–2 is, first of all, marked by a competing doctrines of revelation and creation. Both Irenaeus and the Gnostics read Gen 1–3 from different vantage points and with differ-

ent aims. These competing theological perspectives are evident in Irenaeus' defense of the Mosaic account of creation in *Haer*. 2.2.5. Irenaeus regards Moses as a faithful servant (Num 12:7, Heb 3:5) and argues that Gen 1–2 accurately recorded the creation of all things by means of the Word and Wisdom of God. This theology of creation expressed in the Mosaic account is the basis for Irenaeus' theology of scripture in particular and theology of revelation in general. In this context, Irenaeus briefly summarizes his theology of creation with an intertextual reading of Gen 1:3, John 1:3, and Psalm 32(33):9 that all testify of the creation of all things by means of the Word. This continuity between the Mosaic text, the psalmist, and the apostle shows the continuity across the scriptures of the work of God in creation.

Irenaeus then contrasts this continuity with the discontinuity of the Gnostic account. The Gnostic reading of creation purposes to amend and correct the Mosaic account based upon the revelation of their Gnostic myth. For the Gnostic, the revelation given to Moses was insufficient and unreliable in its present form. Thus, they disconnect and dissociate the creation accounts in accordance with the clearer revelation of the Pleromic system. They reinterpret characters and persons represented in the texts and recast the narratives in light the primordial events that occur even before the Genesis account begins.

Irenaeus and the Gnostics, then, are not arguing over the same *individual* passages, but over systems and networks of texts. For Irenaeus, there are clearly two contrasting systems of interpretation and two readings of creation. Irenaeus has no interest in debating the particular interpretations of *individual* texts, and even regularly ignores texts that are central to the Gnostics reading of Gen 1–3. For example, Gen 1:1–2 provides a seedbed of images and concepts that exemplify the nature of the Pleroma. Significant elements of the Gnostic myth are born out of these verses, but Irenaeus rarely comments on them in any significant way. The days of creation in Gen 1:3–27 also provides another example. Several streams of Gnostics apply numerological interpretations to the days of creation to validate their theological system. Another example is the act of covering with animal skins that were given to Adam and Eve in Gen 3:21. Gnostics use this text to explain their anthropological dualism and how the body of Adam was enwrapped in a fleshy covering. Irenaeus, on the other hand, never develops his reading of this passage, but in every case responds by explaining his own theological system through a series of textual networks that may or may not include passages important to the Gnostic reading. At the same time, the Gnostic system also assumes a detailed Pleromic system informing the events in Gen 1–3, which explains Irenaeus' own hesitancy

to comment on God's primordial activity prior to creation, since this is not revealed clearly in the scriptures.

Therefore, Irenaeus and the Gnostics read the same passages with similar reading strategies, but fashion distinctive relationships by connecting different texts through their competing theological frameworks. For Irenaeus, the Mosaic account of creation, not the Pleromic system of the Gnostics, is harmonious with the teaching of the apostles. The Gnostics, on the other hand, associate the passage of Gen 1–3 with the various figures and events in their myth, as well as other (especially Pauline) texts. This contrasting perspective is evident in the types of textual relationships that are formed through the various reading strategies. In his presentation of Gnosis, Irenaeus describes their exegesis of Genesis in ways that also reflects a series of reading strategies including: a literary reading, verbal connections, prosopological interpretation, illustrative application, and gematria. With the exception of gematria, he will employ all of these strategies and below I discuss each of these strategies.

First, the Gnostics offer a general literary reading of Gen 1–3 in the sense that they read texts in light of their immediate literary context. In other words, the Gnostics read elements of Gen 1–3 as descriptions of the events that transpire in creation. In many cases they also read the events in the general sequence as recorded in scripture. However, they are careful to amend the identity of the characters and the arrangement of events. The most developed literary readings of Gen 1–3 include the Valentinians (*Haer*. 1.5.1–6), Marcosians (*Haer*. 1.18.1–4), Saturninus (*Haer*. 1.24.1–2) and especially the Ophites (*Haer*. 1.30.1–9). The two essential passages in Gen 1 include Gen 1:2 and Gen 1:26. The key terms "Spirit," "water," "formless" and "abyss" correspond to the characters functioning in the opening scenes of their myth. The narratives in Gen 2–3 have particular explanatory power for clarifying their cosmological and anthropological dualisms through the actions of the Demiurge and his archons.

Second, the Gnostics use catchwords or linking terms to blend passages within scripture. These linking terms are not always explicit, but often implied or even supplied by other elements or persons in the Gnostic myth. This is not a widespread practice, since they are more interested in conforming the narrative to their specific cosmological systems, rather than harmonizing the scriptural narrative within itself. The Valentinians, for example, substitute the substance of Adam's formation with the language of "earthly" (*choicum*, 1 Cor 15:47), for the "dust" (*limus*) or "earth" (*terra*) in Gen 2:5–7 (*Haer*. 1.5.1–4). In *Haer*. 1.18.2 the Marcosians do the same, but add that his fleshy part was formed on the eighth day in Gen 3:21. Other images are taken from a variety of other texts including: Gen 1:26, Gen 2:7, Gen 3:19 and Gen 3:21. There is

anthropological focus to their use of catchwords and they cite the language of "image and likeness" in Gen 1:26, the "spirit of life" in Gen 2:7, the dissolution of the "flesh" in Gen 3:19, and the "skin-like garment" in Gen 3:21.[2]

Third, the Gnostics employ prosopological interpretation in which they identify the figures of their mythological system with different persons working in the Genesis narrative. This type of reading made an impression on Irenaeus and caused him to refine the way he read scripture prosopologically. This type of reading is especially prevalent in the Valentinian and Ophite readings that consistently deploy their own divine beings within the narrative. For example, the Demiurge and his archons are involved in the formation of Adam in Gen 1:26 and Gen 2:7.[3] After admiring his creation, the Demiurge proclaims Isa 45:5 as a declaration of his preeminence, which only exposes his ignorance and arrogance.[4] The most developed reading is found among the Ophites (*Haer*. 1.30.1–9). They utilize a variety of Genesis texts (Gen 1:26, Gen 2:7, Gen 2:17, Gen 2:22, Gen 3:1–6, Gen 3:7, and Gen 3:20), and identify Jaldabaoth and his sons as the divine beings working in these accounts. The dialogical portions, such as the divine proclamation in Gen 1:26, and the decisive actions, such as breathing the breath of life into Adam, are modified and applied to specific divine persons in the myth. These descriptions are also supplemented with other narrative elements that enhance the prosopological readings of Gen 1–3.

Fourth, the Gnostics also use a variety of texts that *illustrate* or serve as divine titles for deities who are active in the narrative. The most important illustrative text is Isa 45:5, which communicates the arrogance of the Demiurge. In a similar way, the Gnostic accounts link the titles of deities taken from other passages to describe the divine activity in creation. These titles include: "Father of all things" (*Patrem omnium*), "First-Man" (*Primum Hominem*), "Second-man" (*Secundum Hominem*) or "Son of Man" (*Filium Hominis*), and "First-Woman" (*Primam Feminam*). These titles are found in several New Testament texts such as Eph 4:6 and 1 Cor 15:47.

Finally, while Irenaeus is concerned to detail the views of their cosmological myth, he objects to their use of gematria, which is a numerological method of interpreting texts. This is an allegorical style of reading scripture that ignores the plain sense meaning of numbers, words, and terms and interprets them symbolically as representing aspects of their cosmology. For example, Marcus and the Marcosians are drawn to the "sixth" (*sexta*) day of creation in Gen 1:31, with other uses of the number six in Matt 17:1, Matt 27:45, and John 19:14. But

2 *Haer*. 1.5.5, *Haer*. 1.24.1, *Haer*. 1.28.1.

3 *Haer*. 1.5.5–6, *Haer*. 1.21.1, *Haer*. 1.24.1–2, *Haer*. 1.30.1–9.

4 *Haer*. 1.5.4, *Haer*. 1.30.6. *Cf*. Isa 46:9.

they also link together groupings of four, ten, twelve, and thirty found throughout Gen 1:1–27 (*Haer*. 1.18.1–2). There is even a general use of gematria in the Ophite account with the six sons of Jaldabaoth (Jao, Sabaoth, Adoneus, Eloeus, Horeus, Astaphaeus), which borrow from various Hebrew titles for God. These various numbers validate the Pleromic system of aeons, and in each case they connect these numerological groupings with other scripture passages. Contrasting the literary reading, this type of reading ignores the immediate context of the passages and the larger narratival framework of scripture. Instead, it focuses exclusively upon the numbers or quantities represented in a given passage, and their relationship to a mythological system distinct from scripture.

Therefore, when Irenaeus and the Gnostics spar over the interpretation Gen 1–3, they are using similar intertextual strategies, but offering up different networks of texts. Whereas Irenaeus' reading demonstrates continuity between Gen 1–3, the rest of the Old Testament and the apostolic witness, the Gnostics seek to amend and correct the Mosaic account based upon their system. The distinction between Irenaeus and the Gnostic intertextual reading of Genesis, therefore, is not truly located in the style of interpretation, but in the competing theological perspectives that inform their application of these reading strategies and the distinctive textual relationships that each of them produce.

7.3 Irenaeus' Intertextual Reading of Gen 1–3

Turning to Irenaeus' intertextual reading of Gen 1–3, this analysis reveals that his intertextual reception of Gen 1–3 is extensive and diverse. This includes the types of reading strategies he applies to Gen 1–3, and the diverse number of intertexts he reads alongside these creation texts. There are some repeated textual relationships, but these are rare and almost always found coupled with additional intertexts. Thus, he is not beholden to any particular sets of texts and the diversity of texts cited in connection to Gen 1–3 is wide-ranging.[5] At the beginning of this study I expected to find particular groupings of texts that were tailored for his Gnostic polemic, but every successive analysis of the use of Gen 1–3 within his argument contributed fresh intertextual relationships. Through his theological argumentation, he freely forms and re-forms interrelated networks of texts. The sophistication of these intertextual networks and the diversity of scriptural passages involved communicate a mastery of the scriptural material that cannot be assumed as mere received traditions.

5 For a summary see list of texts in appendix.

As a result, it is also improper to conclude that Irenaeus is particularly Pauline or Johannine in his reading of creation texts. He never relies upon a singular author or genre and, in fact, in many cases his argument specifically rests on the continuity between Gen 1–3, the prophets, and the apostolic writings.

At the same time, by his own admission Irenaeus reading of Gen 1–3 is not entirely unique. Several allusions to Gen 1–3 mention his dependence on his predecessors. These include references to *1 Clement* (*Haer*. 3.3.3), Justin (*Haer*. 4.6.2), and the unnamed Presbyter (*Haer*. 4.32.1). Each of these sections, furthermore, indicates different reading strategies and draw upon different Genesis passages. His summary of *1 Clement* is a narrative account of the history of the divine economy beginning with creation. The sections on Justin and the Presbyter evidence his style of prosopological interpretation. This suggests that the reading strategies Irenaeus employs are common and essential to hermeneutical discussions and catechetical training in the early church. Certainly, these are not the only places that Irenaeus' draws on the thought of his predecessors, but they are a few instances where his intertextual reading of Gen 1–3 shares similarities with some of those under whom he studied.

Irenaeus' use of these reading strategies, however, is much too diverse and complex to be dependent upon these or other sources. Instead this study has shown that when Irenaeus reads Gen 1–3, his mind is actively engaging the entire corpus of scriptural material as he employs a variety of reading strategies and unites scripture together in his theological polemic. Below I define and characterize each of the particular reading strategies that Irenaeus' applies to Gen 1–3, as they have developed throughout his argument in *Adversus Haereses*.

7.3.1 *Literary Reading of Gen 1–3*

The first of reading strategies is the simple literary interpretation of Gen 1–3 that reads these texts within their literary context as a historical narrative referring to the original formation and creation of all things. Irenaeus takes the historical context of creation in Gen 1–3 seriously, and assumes the events are an accurate and authoritative representation of the formation and creation of all things. Irenaeus' literary reading is expressed when he interprets the texts of Gen 1–3 internally among themselves. He often cites clusters of texts from Gen 1–3 and then reads them in concord and harmony among themselves as a consistent and accurate description of the work of God in creation. In this sense, the immediate literary context is certainly one important context for Irenaeus' understanding of the creation accounts, though by no means the only context. In *Haer*. 5.28.3, he makes this explicit when he states clearly that he reads the completion of creation in Gen 2:2–3 in two senses saying, "This is a narrative of

things formerly created, as also it is a prophecy of what is to come" (*Hoc autem est et ante factorum narratio quemadmodum facta sunt et futurorum prophetia.*). In this commentary on the completion of creation in Gen 2:2–3, Irenaeus is not choosing between an ancient and future referent, but rather affirming the *continuity* between creation and eschatology within the ordering of the divine economy established plainly in Moses' narrative of creation.

Irenaeus literary reading of Gen 1–3 can also draw on references outside of Gen 1–3 are serve to clarify the meaning of key terms or concepts within the creation accounts. In other words, Irenaeus marshals as variety of intertexts to illuminate the meaning or background of the historical narrative of Gen 1–3. For example, Irenaeus derives intertextual references between the activity of the Word of God and the Father in creation. In *Haer*. 4.14.1, the common glorification reflected in John 17:5 is a means to interpret the motivation for God's creative acts in Gen 1–2. The Creator-creature distinction established in Gen 2:7 communicates the sufficiency of the Creator and the need for humanity to be glorified by the Father. Irenaeus also discusses the knowledge of God and its limits in *Haer*. 2.26.1 with the intertextual use of Gen 1:26, Gen 2:7, 1 Cor 8:1, John 15:9–10 and 1 Cor 2:2. He argues his opponents reflect the puffed up knowledge of 1 Cor 8:1 that is contradictory of the Creator-creature relationship established in Gen 1–2. The focus of interpretation in these instances are the creation narratives and the intertexts, drawn principally from the New Testament, function as commentary on these events.

Amid these literary readings, Irenaeus gives special attention to the nature of the human person formed in Gen 1–2 and the relationship between the body and soul especially as it applies to the bodily resurrection. Two pivotal creation texts are Gen 1:27 and Gen 2:7 and he frequently conflates these into a single creation account of humankind in two aspects: the creation from the dust and creation in the image of God.[6] This harmonious reading focuses on the act of Adam's creation, and the theological nature of this divine decision described in both texts. In *Haer*. 2.34.3–4 he addresses the basic anthropological connection between the soul and the body through the harmonization of Gen 2:7, Psalm 20:5(21:4), Psalm 32(33):9 (Psalm 148(149):5–6) and Luke 16:10. He argues that the soul does not have life naturally, but partakes of life from God. In this sense, the extent of life is dependent upon the will of the Creator. In *Haer*. 5.1.1–3, he provides a theological commentary on the nature of Adam's *plasma* in Gen 2:7 as a way to identify the solidarity with the whole human race in the person of Adam. In the same context, he describes the motivation for creation by linking Gen 1:26 with the allusions to the predestination

6 *Haer*. 4.pf.4.

and foreknowledge of God in Eph 1:11–12 and 1 Pet 1:2, which envisions that the creation of humanity is a highly calculated divine decision. In *Haer*. 5.6.1, he again conflates Gen 1:26 and Gen 2:7 to argue that the *plasma* of Adam is the substance molded after the image of God and specifically conflates Gen 1:26 with Rom 8:29 to describe the anthropological activity of the Spirit leading the human person toward perfection. The "perfect" or "spiritual" person (1 Cor 2:6, 15) is not the man formed in Gen 1–2, but the person described in 1 Thess 5:23 comprising body, soul, and Spirit. Similarly, in *Haer*. 2.28.1 Irenaeus describes a view of progressive sanctification from creation toward the perfection in the divine likeness through an interlocking set of textual references including: Gen 1:1, Gen 1:26/2:7, Gen 1:28, Heb 7:7, Job 3:16, and Matt 3:12.[7] This is also exemplified by a series of conceptually and linguistically connected texts including: John 17:24, Isa 43:5–7, and Matt 24:28.

However, the most intricate literary reading of Gen 1–3 is found in *Haer*. 3.23.1–8. In addition to Gen 1:26, Irenaeus alludes to significant portion of Gen 3–4 (Gen 3:7–8, Gen 3:10, Gen 3:13, Gen 3:14, Gen 3:15, Gen 3:16, Gen 3:17–19, Gen 3:21, Gen 3:23–24, Gen 4:7–8, Gen 4:9, and Gen 4:11). The texts are not arranged chronologically, but rather crafted into a chiasm with several other intertexts as the theological conclusion to his recapitulation argument spanning *Haer*. 3.18.1–3.23.8. The allusion to the serpent's deception in Gen 3:5 frames the whole chiasm, and the centerpiece of the structure is the contrasting responses of Adam and Cain toward God in light of their sin. The rest of the exposition interprets the judgment episode of Adam, Eve, and serpent, as well as the Christological fulfillment of Gen 3:15, and the polemical application of Gen 3:5 as the deception of the heretical doctrines of the Gnostics. These instances prove that Irenaeus reads the texts of Gen 1–3 in accordance with its literary structure as a historical narrative, but he also utilizes a variety of other methods to interpret these creation texts.

7.3.2 *Prophetic Reading of Gen 1–3*

While Irenaeus reads creation texts in their literary context, he also applies a prophetic reading that interprets passages in light of future fulfillment.[8] These uses of prophecy and fulfillment are less focused on the original referent, and give more attention to a referent discussed at a later stage of the divine economy. But following the citation of *Haer*. 5.28.3 mentioned above, Irenaeus views his prophetic readings as entirely continuous with his literal readings. These figurative intertextual connections signify a correspondence in

7 *Haer*. 2.28.1.

8 *Haer*. 5.28.3.

the referents of these passages that confirm the truthfulness of Moses' account through prophetic fulfillment. Proof from prophecy is a long standing tradition with roots in the New Testament and post-apostolic age, and in Irenaeus' the intricate tapestry of prophetic connections continues to flourish. To be sure, the prophecies in Gen 1–3 are relatively few and this reading strategy is obviously applied more frequently to the other prophetic section of scripture. These prophetic connections are also formed through verbal associations or patterns, many others are linked by more general conceptual or theological association. It is common for these connections to have some Christological influence that results in theologically symbiotic relationships between these Genesis passages and other scriptural references. Some aspects of his prophetic reading are discussed below as part of his typological use of scripture.

Irenaeus applies a prophetic reading to only two passages: Gen 3:15 and Gen 2:2–3. The discussion of Christ destroying the curse of Gen 3:15 is found in *Haer*. 3.23.7. The description of enmity between the serpent and the seed characterizes the nature of the postlapsarian economy (Gen 3:15). The enmity lasts until the appointed seed comes who has the power to overcome the enemy (Gal 3:16), which casts Gal 3:19 and Gal 3:16 as the fulfillment of the prophecy in Gen 3:15. He also adds a collection of theological, narratival, and linguistic intertextual references to confirm the fulfillment of Gen 3:15 in Christ (Psalm 90(91):13, Rom 5:12, 17, Rev 20:2/12:9, Luke 10:19–20, 1 Cor 15:26 and 1 Cor 15:54–55). A similar discussion is located in *Haer*. 5.21.1–2, where he again reads Gal 3:19 and Gal 4:4 as the fulfillment of the birth of Christ and the vanquishing of Satan in Gen 3:15.

The fulfillment of Gen 2:2–3, on the other hand, is the hallowed seventh day of creation. This passage functions as a general summary description of the blessedness of the eschatological state that is detailed in various prophetic and apostolic texts. In *Haer*. 4.16.1, the completion of creation in Gen 2:2–3 is a sign (Exod 20:12, Exod 31:13) that anticipates the expectation of God's people eternally dwelling in God's presence (Matt 6:19, Rom 8:36). He extends this eschatological vision in *Haer*. 5.30.4 and *Haer*. 5.33.1–4 with descriptions of the restoration of the faithful sitting at the table of the Lord in Matt 8:11 and enjoying life in a restored creation (Gen 27:27–29, Matt 13:38, Luke 14:12–13, and Matt 19:29). In the same context, the passages of Isa 11:6–9 and Isa 65:25 depict the restoration of creation to its original subjection in Gen 1:27–30, although the future kingdom will be even more fruitful and plentiful than the original creation. The same eschatological intertextual weaving returns in *Haer*. 5.36.3, where Irenaeus connects a network of citations depicting the eschatological kingdom of God.

7.3.3 *Typological Reading of Gen 1–3*

Woven among his literary and prophetic readings, Irenaeus also offers a series of typological relationships that influence his intertextual reading of Gen 1–3 including: Adam-Cain, Adam-Jonah, Adam-Christ, and Eve-Mary. According to Irenaeus, the theological basis for his concept of recapitulation is the "similitude" (*similitudinem*) between Christ and Adam, both in terms of substance and action.[9] Thus a "type" has a mimetic quality expressed in the correspondence between two textual events or persons. For Irenaeus, the integrity of each person or event is retained in order to reinforce the continuity and discontinuity between type and antitype. His Gnostic polemic makes this point often, given that the effectiveness of Christ's incarnation turns upon his continuity with the substance of Adam's formation. Frequently Irenaeus will discuss these typological relationships in the context of similar Pauline texts, but Irenaeus presses the personal and environmental similitude between Adam and Christ beyond what is recorded in Paul's writings. In this sense, he is not content with merely restating apostolic sayings, but given his polemical context he applies the intertextual logic of the apostle and extends the typological connections between creation and the Christ event. Below I describe each of these typological relationships in succession and how they contribute to the complexity of Irenaeus' intertextuality.

First, the Adam-Cain typology in *Haer*. 3.23.4–5, as I discussed above, serves as the centerpiece of a larger chiasm in *Haer*. 3.23.1–8. Whereas Cain was murderous and insolent, Adam's actions were "in every way contrary" (*omnia in contrarium*). Irenaeus contrasts the murderous actions of Cain and his haughty attitude to God in Gen 4:7–8, Gen 4:9, and Gen 4:11 with Adam's humbling actions in Gen 3:8, Gen 3:7, Gen 3:10, Gen 3:21, and Gen 3:13. While Cain was insolent before God, Adam was contrite, and Adam's contrition is aptly described as the proper example of the fear of God (Prov 1:7). He implores the faithful to reject the model of arrogance of Cain, and follow the example of Adam's penitence before the Father.

Second, in *Haer*. 3.20.1 Irenaeus describes an Adam-Jonah typology, and reads Jonah 1:9, Jonah 2:1–2, and Jonah 3:1, 8–9, alongside Gen 3:5–8, 1 Cor 1:29, and the "sign of Jonah" in Matt 12:39–40. He imagines Satan as the "great whale" (*magna ceto*), who overpowered the first couple in the Garden. Nevertheless, just as Jonah received an unexpected salvation from the belly of the whale, so also did Adam receive an unexpected salvation from sin and death. The typological connections are bound through the illustrious patterning of each man being overtaken by an animal, except in the case of Jonah the animal is the

9 *Haer*. 3.21.9.

means of salvation not condemnation. Like Jonah, Adam would experience resurrection and salvation through the work of Christ (Matt 12:39–40). He also extends the connections by contrasting Jonah's cry from the belly of the fish with Adam's pride in his disobedience in Gen 3:5. In the same way as Adam and Jonah, the faithful will receive an unexpected salvation and rising from the dead and praise God (1 Cor 1:29).[10]

Third, the most extensive and consistent typological relationship is the Adam-Christ typology, and this brief summary only begins to capture the intricacies of the textual networking involved. Every phase of Christ's life from his birth to death and resurrection are woven together with intertextual references to Adam. To begin with, many typological discussions address the continuity and discontinuity surrounding Adam's original formation and Christ's incarnation. For example, in *Haer*. 4.33.4, he conflates Gen 1:26, Gen 2:7, Isa 7:14, and John 1:14 to describe similar soteriological effects of the incarnation. He argues that Christ must be greater than David, Solomon, Jonah, and even the evil one who subdued humanity (Matt 12:41–42, Matt 22:43, Matt 12:29), because humankind was formed in his image (Gen 1:26). When the Word became incarnate and was made man (John 1:14), he recapitulated humanity in himself (Eph 1:10) and recovered the image and likeness of God that was lost in Adam (Gen 1:26).[11] There is a similar soteriological summary in *Haer*. 3.18.1, where he binds the imagery of John 1:14, Eph 1:10, and Gen 1:26. In *Haer*. 3.18.7, he links Gen 2:5 in a description of Adam as fashioned from the "virgin earth" (Gen 2:5, 7) with Christ as "born first of the Virgin." He conflates these references with Rom 5:12 and Rom 5:19, which extend Paul's asymmetrical relationship with symmetry between the births of Adam and Christ. In *Haer*. 3.21.10 he describes the similitude between Adam and Christ with a summary of Christ's recapitulation of the ancient substance of Adam's formation.[12] This Pauline imagery introduces a network of texts including: Gen 2:5, Gen 2:7, John 1:3, Rom 5:12, 19. This intricate tissue of texts focuses on the recapitulation of all things in Eph 1:10 with special attention given to the role of human nature in Rom 5:12 and 5:19. He conflates these passage with reference to the virgin soil of Gen 2:5 and act of creation through the Word in John 1:3, to explain the process of Adam's formation in Gen 2:7. In *Haer*. 5.1.1–3, Irenaeus also interprets the incarnation in Luke 1:35 in a typological relationship with the formation of Adam in Gen 2:7. In *Haer*. 5.2.1, he argues that though Satan took God's creatures captive (Gen 3:1–6), Christ came to retrieve his own creation (Gen 2:7, John 1:11), which

10 *Haer*. 3.20.1.

11 *Haer*. 3.18.1.

12 *Haer*. 3.21.9.

is the ancient substance of Adam's formation, and redeem it by his own flesh and blood (Eph 1:7, 1 Tim 2:6).

In these cases, Irenaeus' typological framework can pervade several chapters and comprises a seemingly endless assortment of textual relationships. For example, the whole section of *Haer*. 5:15.2–16.2 that offers a complex intertextual correlation of Gen 1–2 with John 9:1–7 through a variety of texts including: Gen 1:26, Gen 2:7, Gen 3:6, Gen 3:9, Gen 3:19, Jer 1:5, Luke 15:4–6, Luke 19:10, John 1:14, John 5:14, John 9:1–7, Gal 1:15, Phil 2:8, and Titus 3:5. Irenaeus believes Christ revealed himself as the one through whom all things were created in Gen 1–2. When he heals the blind man in John 9:1–7, this becomes a reenactment of the creation from the dust in Gen 2:7. Furthermore, the mention of the work of God in John 9:3, the fashioning of the eyes from the dust in John 9:6, and the washing in John 9:7 all point to conceptual and theological connections with the creation of all things by means of the Word of God, while anticipating the future bodily resurrection and restoration of the faithful. The Adam-Christ typology is especially prominent in *Haer*. 5.16.2 where he links Gen 1:26, John 1:14, Gen 3:6, and Phil 2:8 to describe how the first Adam's disobedience in Gen 3:6 is overturned by the second Adam's obedience in Phil 2:8.

This last typological association exemplifies several other discussions that compare and contrast the nature and effects of Adam's disobedience and Christ's obedience. For example, in *Haer*. 3.23.1 the bishop of Lyons describes how through the tantalizing propositions of Serpent, Adam became a possession of the Serpent. The lost sheep of Luke 15:4–7 is, for Irenaeus, human nature that was lost in Adam. Responding to Adam's predicament, the Lord has come to seek out and save lost humanity (Luke 19:10), and the Father so precisely arranged the divine economy to ensure the Word of God would successfully reverse the effects of Adam's disobedience. Like the imagery of the lost sheep, the strong man of Matt 12:29 is Satan who has captured the "vessel" (uasa) of humankind and subjected them to the power of death. There is no question that God was patient in the recovery of Adam, but the recapitulation of Adam was fully realized when at last the second man (1 Cor 15:47) bound up the strong man who had ensnared Adam (Gen 3:5), and spoiled his goods (Matt 12:29, 2 Tim 1:10). In addition, the vanquishing of Satan is linked to the first temptation of Matt 4:2–10. Just as Adam was deceived through eating in Gen 3:6, now Christ, even in a state of hunger, vanquished the same enemy by abstaining from eating in Matt 4:3.

Finally, as a means of extending the connections between Adam and Christ, Irenaeus applies an Eve-Mary typology. Like the Adam-Christ typology, the Eve-Mary typology depends upon several corresponding and contrasting characteristics recorded in their respective narratives and expressed through

reflection on a network of texts. In *Haer*. 3.22.4 he interprets the actions of Eve in correspondence to those of Mary with reference to: Gen 1:28, Gen 2:25, Gen 3:6, Deut 22:23–24, Psalm 44:17(45:16), Matt 19:30, Matt 20:16, Luke 1:38, Luke 3:23–38, Col 1:18, and Heb 5:9. Whereas Eve became the cause of death in Gen 3:6, Mary is the cause of salvation and resurrection in Luke 1:38, Heb 5:9, and Eph 4:16/Col 2:19. This logical set of conceptual and textual interconnections, including obedience/disobedience, virginity, and betrothal reinforces the aesthetic and theological stability of the general Adam-Christ typology. Extending his analysis of Gen 3:15 and Gal 4:4 in *Haer*. 5.21.1–2, the notion of being born of a woman overturns the nature and function of Eve in the Garden. Just as Eve was taken out of Adam and Satan deceived Adam by means of this woman, so also Christ was born of a woman so that he might vanquish the same enemy who ensnared Adam.

In sum, these literary, prophetic, and typological readings introduce the nature of Irenaeus' intertextuality and explain some of the important ways that Irenaeus' works scripture intertextually. These are, however, not the only ways that Irenaeus' textual networking is expressed. He also utilizes a variety of other verbal, organizational, narratival, illustrative, prosopological, and rhetorical strategies that conflate a variety of texts.

7.3.4 *Verbal Connections and Patterns with Gen 1–3*

Irenaeus intertextual networking frequently assembles passages through a variety of verbal associations or patterns. The imagery of Gen 1–3 provides Irenaeus a fertile seedbed of terms and concepts that produce a wide range of scriptural references. These can be identical catchwords that unite passages, although in many instances they are simply cognates or conceptually related terminology. These catchwords serve to qualify or define the meaning of related terms in other scriptural contexts. These catchwords may be a single term threading together a series of texts that emphasize a single theological concept, or a cluster of interrelated terms that binds together a grouping of texts to show the continuity of God's activity throughout the unfolding of the divine economy.

First, the simple catchword "all things" (*omnia*) binds together a series of texts in *Haer*. 4.20.1–4a (*Mand* 1, Mal 2:10, Eph 4:6, and Matt 11:27), all of which serve as commentary on creation in Gen 1:26 and Gen 2:7. Likewise, God speaking creation into existence in Gen 1:3[13] corresponds to God speaking in Psalm 32(33):9 and God creating by means of the Word in John 1:3.[14] In *Haer*. 3.11.5

13 Gen 1:3, 6, 9, etc.

14 *Haer*. 2.2.5.

he draws together a series of creation texts including Gen 1:1, Gen 1:9, Gen 1:11, and Gen 2:6 and joins these with the miracle at the wedding feast in John 2:1,6 and the feeding of the 5,000 in John 6:11. The particular linking terms and concepts include: "earth" (terra), "water" (aqua), "fruit" (fructus), "fountain" (fons), "good" (bonus), "wine" (vinum), "food" (esca) and "drink" (potus).[15] The linking terms support the identity of the continuity of the Father working through the Son from creation to incarnation.

The most common linking term is the substance of Adam's flesh or "formation" (*plasma*) and a host of similar images analogous to this substance. These linking terms substantiate the formal connection between the body that is fashioned from the dust in Gen 2:7, the incarnate Christ, and the resurrected and glorified body. For example, in *Haer*. 1.9.3 and *Haer*. 3.18.1, the imagery of "flesh" (*caro*) in John 1:14 parallels the substance of Adam's formation in Gen 2:7.[16] Similar imagery is found in *Haer*. 3.18.7, but he adds the allusion to the "virgin soil" (*terra rudis*) in Gen 2:5. In *Haer*. 3.19.3 he associates Adam's "formation" (*plasma*) to the lost "sheep" (*ouem*) of Luke 15:4, and the "earth" (*terra*) of Eph 4:9. These passages are also bound together with Isa 7:11 through the "descending" and "ascending" illustrative patterning, which imagines the Word of God descending and ascending to recover the lost substance (or sheep) of Adam's formation (Gen 2:7).

In the same context the "body" imagery is connected with a host of texts referring mostly to the Pauline imagery of the body and resurrection including: Eph 1:22/Col 1:18, Phil 3:9, 1 Cor 15:23, Col 2:19, Eph 4:16, John 14:2, Rom 12:4/1 Cor 12:12, 20. In *Haer*. 3.21.10 also follows with similar connections of Adam's "formation" (*plasma*) with the "untilled earth" (*rudi terra*) of Gen 2:5, the Word of God who forms all things (John 1:3) and the Adam-Christ typology of Rom 5:12, 19. In *Haer*. 3.22.1, when the Word of God recapitulated himself in the form of his own handiwork, he received a body from Mary that connected him to the substance of Adam's body fashioned from the "earth" (*terra*). The earthly substance that was used to fashion Adam is characteristically ignoble or "meek" (*mites*), but when the Word assumes flesh he blesses the meek, because they shall inherit the "earth" (*terra*, Matt 5:5 Gen 2:7). In the same context, the emphasis of being "made" (*facio*) combined with the connections with being born of a woman and the seed of David according to the "flesh" unites this with the "earth" imagery in Matt 5:5, and the same concepts in Gen 1:26, and Gen 2:7. Then, in *Haer*. 3.22.2 Irenaeus explains the nature of Christ's incarnate flesh. As characteristic of a body from the earth (Gen 2:7), Christ required food, grew

15 *Haer*. 3.11.5.

16 *Haer*. 1.9.3; *Haer*. 1.22.1.

tired, was wounded, grieved, sweat blood, and was pierced, revealing blood and water (Matt 4:2, John 4:6, Psalm 68:27(69:26), John 11:35, Luke 22:44, Matt 26:38, and John 19:34). These bodily experiences of Christ form an extended commentary upon the nature and weakness of the flesh formed from the dust in Gen 2:7.

In *Haer*. 5.7.1–2 he focuses on the Pauline phrase "mortal bodies" (*mortalia corpora*) in Rom 8:11 and uses this to describe the nature of the body formed from the earth in Gen 2:7. He distinguishes the mortal body from the souls, and interprets it in relationship to the body that is fashioned from the earth in Gen 2:7 and dissolves back into the earth in Gen 3:19. This is also the animal body of 1 Cor 15:44 that is contrasted with the spiritual body that is raised to new life (1 Cor 15:42–44, John 20:20). In *Haer*. 5.14.1–2, Irenaeus reads the "flesh and blood" (*caro et sanguis*) in 1 Cor 15:50 in correspondence to the body formed in Gen 2:7 and references to "flesh" or "blood" in Gen 4:10, Gen 9:5–6, Matt 23:35–36,[17] John 1:14, Luke 19:10, and Col 1:22. He argues that Christ's advent involved the assumption and salvation of flesh and blood. In a final instance, he compares the original formation from the dust with Jer 1:5, Gal 1:15, and John 9:1 to describe how the Son of God formed Jeremiah, Paul, and the blind man in the "womb" (*venter*).[18]

A number of related anthropological imagery also accompanies the emphasis on the body. In *Haer*. 2.34.3–4, the language of "life" (*vitae*) and "forever" (*saeculum*) connects Gen 2:7, Psalm 32(33):9, Psalm 20:5(21:4), and Luke 16:10. Elsewhere, he threads Gen 2:7, Isa 42:5, Isa 57:16, Acts 2:17 and 1Cor 15:45 with the imagery of "breath" (*adspiratio*), "Spirit" (*Spiritus*), and "earth" (*terra*).[19] Isa 42:5 and Isa 57:16 confirm an economic change from the enlivening strength of the breath to the Spirit, while Acts 2:17 examples this new administration of the Spirit. He also unites the imagery of "life" (Gen 2:9, Rom 6:10), "serpent" (*serpentem*, Gen 3:15, Psalm 90(91):13, Rev 12:9/20:2), "seed" (*semen*, Gen 3:15, Gal 3:16, 19), and the verb "to tread upon" (*calcare*, Gen 3:15, Luke 10:19) in *Haer*. 3.23.6–8. This verbal association communicates the theological complexity of the fulfillment of Gen 3:15 in Christ.

Alongside the anthropological imagery, the language of "paradise" (*paradisus*) unites 2 Cor 12:4 with God placing Adam in paradise in Gen 2:15.[20] As discussed above the imagery of Adam's formation, also joins Paul's assumption in the body and in *Haer*. 5.5.1 the location and description of "paradise" unites

17 Luke 11:50–51.

18 *Haer*. 5.15.3.

19 *Haer*. 5.12.2–6.

20 *Haer*. 2.30.7.

the experiences of Enoch (Gen 5:24), Elijah (2 Kgs 2:11), and Paul (2 Cor 12:4). In *Haer*. 5.17.1, the sound of God walking in paradise in Gen 3:8 is associated with the "voice" (*vocem*) proclaiming the forgiveness of sins in the Gospels. In *Haer*. 3.23.2 he describes the condemnation of the serpent, or Satan, with the links between the curse of Gen 3:14 and the eternal fire in Matt 25:41 that prepared for those who are "accursed" (κατηραμένοι).[21] Finally, in *Haer*. 5.28.3–4 Irenaeus' intertextual logic and chiliastic perspective unites these eschatological references to the seventh "day" (*dies*) in Gen 2:1–3 with Psalm 89(90):4 (2 Pet 3:8).

Besides explicit verbal connections, Irenaeus also uses conceptual patterns to relate texts. I have already mentioned the descending and ascending pattering that summarizes the salvific work of Christ and incorporates a collection of texts including Isa 7:11, Luke 15:5–6, and Eph 4:9–10.[22] Other examples of patterning include *Haer*. 3.24.1 that describes the pneumotological conclusion to Christ's recapitulative work, and imagines the human person as a "vessel" (*vaso*, Matt 12:29) containing the "precious deposit" (*eximium . . . depositum*) of the faith of the church. Conflating the language of the "gift of God" (*Dei munus*) from Eph 2:8 with the creation scene of Gen 2:7, he compares the breath of God imparted to Adam in Gen 2:7 with the gift of the Holy Spirit imparted to the church. Just as the breath of God enlivened the formation of Adam in Gen 2:7, the gift of faith entrusted to the church enlivens the faithful. Thus, he forms a patterned connection between the impartation of the breath and the impartation of the Spirit.

7.3.5 *Organizational Use of Gen 1–3*

Alongside Irenaeus' intensive focus on particular terms and concepts, he also frequently organizes or structures his work generally with the contents of Gen 1–3. These organizational functions repeatedly unite passages in Irenaeus' exegetical logic and expose the way his arguments are naturally guided by the conceptual imagery inherent to scripture. First, Irenaeus uses Gen 1–3, especially Gen 1:26, to frame his work on both the general and particular level. While Genesis imagery surfaces early and often, the whole work concludes with a citation of Gen 1:26.[23] In addition, based upon Migne's chapter and paragraph divisions, which are standard among scholars, approximately fifty-nine percent of the references to Gen 1–3 are contained in the opening section of any given chapter. If I included the final paragraph of any given chapter the

21 *Haer*. 3.23.3.

22 *Haer*. 3.18.7.

23 *Haer*. 5.36.3.

percentage is greater than seventy. This means that the vast majority of Irenaeus' uses of Gen 1–3 are found in the opening or closing portions of the structure of his argument. To put it another way, the contents of Gen 1–3 are key transitional texts that are essential to the flow of his thought and argumentation. He is constantly cycling back to Gen 1–3 to incorporate these texts into his polemical theology.

Second, the texts of Gen 1–3 participate in specific organizational schemes such as chiasms, supportive texts, or controlling texts. First, while they are essential to his polemical representation of Gnosis in *Haer*. 1–2, in *Haer*. 3 the organizational function comes to the forefront in the chiastic arrangements of *Haer*. 3.18.1–18.7, *Haer*. 3.19.1–21.10, and *Haer*. 3.23.1–8. The parallel allusions to Gen 2:5 in *Haer*. 3.18.1–2 and *Haer*. 3.18.7 frame the chiasm as a means of extending the Adam-Christ typology. The allusions to Gen 2:5 and Gen 3:5 construct the first half of his anti-docetic argument in *Haer*. 3.19.3–20.1. The culmination of his recapitulative argument is found in *Haer*. 3.23.1–8 with the theological arrangement of the narrative of Gen 3–4. Gen 3:5 frames this chiasm as a whole, but he also alludes to an array of Genesis texts including: Gen 1:26, Gen 3:7–8, Gen 3:10, Gen 3:13, Gen 3:14, Gen 3:15, Gen 3:16, Gen 3:17–19, Gen 3:21, and Gen 3:23–4. In addition, Irenaeus uses a host of intertexts to interpret these passages including: Gen 4:7–8, Gen 4:9, Gen 4:11, Matt 12:29, Matt 25:41, Psalm 90(91):13, Prov 1:7, Luke 10:19, Rom 5:12, 17, Rom 6:2, 10, 1 Cor 15:26, 54–55, Gal 3:16, and Rev 20:2. The whole arrangement completes Irenaeus' theology of recapitulation, and reveals the Christological fulfillment of the prophecy of Gen 3:15.

Third, in terms of his intertextual focus, Gen 1–3 serves as both a supportive and/or controlling texts within the structure of his arguments. In the former instances, the scripture is a simple means to support the theological point derived from another passage of scripture, while in the later instance he uses other texts to support his interpretation of Gen 1–3. These connections may use verbal associations or patterning, but most often simply confirm the theological point made elsewhere. For example, in *Haer*. 4.34.4, *Haer*. 4.36.2–6, and *Haer*. 4.40.3, he comments on a series of parables that incorporate simple allusions to Gen 1:26, Gen 2:7 or Gen 3:15 to support his reading of these parables. On the other hand, in *Haer*. 4.38.1–4 the texts of Gen 1:26, Gen 2:7, and Gen 3:5 are drawn to the forefront and become controlling texts arguing for perfection in the image of God, and other texts are brought alongside Gen 1–3 to clarify the interpretation of these passages.

Fourth, the most complex structural function of Gen 1–3 occurs in *Haer*. 5. While texts throughout *Haer*. 5 continue to serve in a supporting role, the entire section of *Haer*. 5.15.1–24.4 is an organized attempt to re-read the events

of Gen 1–3 in light of three principal features of the Christ event: incarnation, crucifixion, and temptation. Each of these episodes of Christ's life is read with Gen 1–3 in one hand and the Gospels in the other. In *Haer*. 5.15.2–16.2, in particular, there is a complex method of theological argumentation that is arranged around the connections between John 9:1–7 and Gen 1–2. In *Haer*. 5.23.1–2, Irenaeus presents several intertextual readings of Gen 2:17 that draw from a diverse set of texts including: Gen 1:5, Psalm 89(90):4 (2 Pet 3:8), John 8:44, and Eph 1:10. While he provides a series of intertexts alongside Gen 2:17, in each case he is concerned principally with the theological demonstration that God was proved true and the serpent a liar (John 8:44) when Adam disobeyed God's command in Gen 3. Finally, the allusion to the Sabbath day of rest in Gen 2:1–2 is a general organizational reference to the whole eschatological picture of the kingdom of God in the closing chapters *Haer*. 5.28–36.

7.3.6 *Narratival or Creedal Reading of Gen 1–3*

In addition to these other reading strategies, Irenaeus also coordinates texts in a narratival or chronological relationship. Frequently this takes the form of a summary of the covenants or decisive events in the divine economy surrounding these episodes. These narratival summaries can also assume a creedal form that provides a more detailed theological explanation of the trinitarian nature of God. Another specific subset of these narratival connections is an argument that intentionally coordinates a passage drawn specifically from the law, the prophets, and the apostolic writings in order to prove the consistency of divine revelation. In most cases, there is little or no substantive commentary on these texts, Irenaeus simply arranges scriptural echoes or allusions to portray the continuity of God's action in salvation history, though he does not always cite these passages in chronological order.

First, Irenaeus describes the spiritual mysteries that Paul witnessed in his rapture to paradise (2 Cor 12:3–4) with a narrative of the creative acts of God in Gen 1:1, Gen 2:7, and Gen 2:15.[24] In *Haer*. 2.30.9, he uses God's economic activity in Gen 2:7 and Gen 2:8 to frame certain events of salvation history including allusions to Noah, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, the Law, Prophets, and Christ. In *Haer*. 3.3.3, he provides a similar telescoped outline of salvation history, and in *Haer*. 3.11.8 he summarizes the covenantal structure in a progressive fashion beginning with the Adamic Covenant, Noahic Covenant, Mosaic Covenant, and culminating in the New Covenant that sums up all things in Christ (Eph 1:10). The commandment of God in the Adamic covenant and the vision of the Lord walking and conversing with Adam exemplifies and prefigures the New

24 *Haer*. 2.30.7.

Covenant that renews the harmony of this paradisiacal relationship between God and humanity through the work of Christ. In *Haer*. 4.6.2, he reads a summary of the acts of God in succession beginning with allusions to Gen 1:26, Gen 2:7, and Gen 1:28. Finally, in *Haer*. 4.11.2 Irenaeus reads Gen 1:28 as a paradigm for human growth that is realized in the unfolding of salvation history.

Second, he also presents canonical arrangements of texts that intentionally unite passages from the prophets and apostolic writings. The canonical linkage is a means for Irenaeus to marshal the entire corpus of divine revelation in one continuous witness to the Word working though the Father from creation to glorification. He demonstrates this style of intertextual argumentation in *Haer*. 4.20.1 where he draws together an Old Testament reference (Mal 2:10), an apostle (Eph 4:6) and the words of the Lord (Matt 11:27). In a similar fashion, in *Haer*. 4.16.1 he provides an eschatological reading of Gen 2:2–3 that links Moses (Exod 20:12, Exod 31:13), Christ (Matt 6:19), and Paul (Rom 8:36).

Third, Irenaeus arranges texts in a creedal fashion that bears some resemblance to the narrative accounts above. For example, in *Haer*. 3.3.3 he summarizes the apostolic tradition of *1 Clement* with a narrative account of the history of salvation that includes, among others, echoes of Gen 1:1 and Gen 2:7. Unlike the rest of the summary the key verbs in these echoes function as verbal nouns that identify the nature of God as Creator all things and Maker of man. The remaining narratival arrangement is dependent upon these descriptions. It contains passages depicting God's activity throughout covenantal history, and culminating in the judgment of Satan (Matt 25:41).[25]

Finally, one qualification of the narrative function is that Irenaeus does not always cite the events according to the original sequence as presented in the text, but for theological purposes can report a narrative in an alternative progression. For example, in order to communicate that the fullness of the curse fell upon the serpent he discusses the curses of Adam, Eve, and the serpent in reverse order, beginning with Adam in Gen 3:17–19, then Eve, and then the serpent in Gen 3:14.[26] In another instance he cites the arrangement: Gen 1:1, Gen 1:11, Gen 1:9, and Gen 2:6, in order to connect the creation of flora in the former two passages, and the creation of water in the latter two texts.[27]

7.3.7 *Prosopological Reading of Gen 1–3*

Another style of intertextual reading is prosopological interpretation, which is a method of literary analysis that identifies the interlocutors within the

25 *Haer*. 1.10.1, *Haer*. 1.22.1.

26 *Haer*. 3.23.3.

27 *Haer*. 3.11.9.

fabric of the textual dialogue. Specifically, this style of exegesis focuses on the particular characters, speakers, titles, pronouns, or persons, who are active in the narrative of Gen 1–3, and connects these specific individuals with a particular person of the trinity. Often this takes the form of citing or conflating sets of scripture passages to prove the activity of the Word and Wisdom with the Father in creation.

In *Haer*. 1.22.1, he links the identity of the Creator in Genesis with the "Father" (*Pater*) of Abraham (Exod 3:6) and the "Father" (*Pater*) of Jesus (Eph 1:3), and this same Creator and Father fashioned all things by means of the Word (John 1:3). Irenaeus also assumes the act of creation involves not only the Father, but also the Word and Wisdom of God. Beginning in Gen 1:3, he describes how God created all things by means of the Word (John 1:3).[28] In *Haer*. 2.30.9 he conflates references to Word of God in Heb 1:3 and the Wisdom of God in *Mand* 1 in order to communicate the activity of the Word and Wisdom in creation. In *Haer*. 3.11.5, the connections between Gen 1–2 and John 2 are arranged to identify the Creator in Gen 1 with the one who performed the miracle at the wedding in Cana. In *Haer*. 3.21.10, he again links John 1:3 and Gen 2:7, and then in *Haer*. 3.24.2 he alludes to the Word of Psalm 32(33):6 and the Wisdom of Prov 8:30 in continuity with Gen 1:26, Gen 1:28, and Gen 2:7. In *Haer*. 4.pf.4, Irenaeus interprets the proclamation of Gen 1:26 as the two "hands of God," the Son and the Spirit, and then in *Haer*. 4.6.2 he converts the verbal forms of the acts of creation into titles for God as a means to identify the Creator. The same dialogical emphasis is found in *Haer*. 4.10.1, where Irenaeus alludes to the Son of God inquiring after Adam in Gen 3:9. In *Haer*. 4.20.4, Irenaeus uses Prov 3:19–20, Prov 8:22–25, Prov 8:27–31 in connection with Gen 1:26 to explain the trinitarian nature of God creating in Genesis. The same theological reading of creation is found in *Haer*. 4.32.1, where he alludes to John 1:3, Eph 4:5–6, 15–16, and Col 2:19. In *Haer*. 5.1.1–3, Irenaeus also interprets the incarnation in Luke 1:35 in a typological relationship to the formation of Adam in Gen 2:7, and the reference to divine plural in Gen 1:26. The same divine persons creating Adam in Gen 2:7 are also active in the incarnation in Luke 1:35. Finally, in *Haer*. 5.5.1–2 the "hands of God," drawn from allusions to Gen 1:26 and Gen 2:7, communicate the notion of preservation and protection of the substance of the flesh. All of these instances are derived from the literary analysis of the text and attention to the divine persons active in the narrative.

28 *Haer*. 2.2.5.

7.3.8 *Illustrative Application of Gen 1–3*

In a strategy that is similar to his prosopological reading, Irenaeus also applies the images and language of Gen 1–3 in an illustrative fashion. In these instances, either the images in Genesis exemplify a particular theological concept expressed elsewhere in scripture, or other scriptures are used to exemplify Irenaeus' reading of Gen 1–3. In many cases Irenaeus uses these textual images for polemical purposes and identifies those of his contemporary setting with particular characters and images in the Genesis creation accounts.

First, his most frequent application is the characterization of the Gnostics as contemporary manifestations of the serpent (*Haer*. 3.23.1, 8, *Haer*. 4.pf.4, and *Haer*. 5.26.2). Just as the serpent deceived Adam and Eve in Gen 3:1–5, the heretics are deceiving the faithful and leading them away from the true knowledge of God. Irenaeus encourages the faithful to learn from the example of Adam and Eve, and reject the teaching of the heretics. In *Haer*. 3.23.8 and *Haer*. 5.26.2 he also adds that the eternal fire of Matt 25:41 was not prepared for the faithful, but for Satan and his companions who continually deceive God's people. Similarly, in *Haer*. 5.1.1–3 he utilizes the bread-making imagery of 1 Cor 5:6–7 to interpret Gen 2:7 and Luke 1:35. The Gnostics, for Irenaeus, remain in the "old leaven," which is the "old" substance of Adam's formation that was conquered and expelled from paradise.

Second, he uses the imagery of Gen 1–3 to illustrate general aspects of his theological framework. In *Haer*. 3.24.1 he imagines the breath of God that is imparted to Adam in Gen 2:7 as the church, or the "vessel" of Matt 12:29, has received the precious deposit of the Spirit. In *Haer*. 5.20.1–2, Irenaeus describes the church as the manifestation of paradise in the present age and petitions the Gnostics to flee to the church and be nourished by the scriptures. Combining the imagery of Gen 2:8, Gen 2:16–17, Rom 12:3, and Eph 1:10, he imagines that the faithful find themselves in a position similar to Adam. Just as God commanded Adam, he encourages the faithful to partake from all the trees of the garden, or all the scriptures, but refrain from the tree of knowledge of good and evil, which is the teaching of the Gnostics. Finally, in *Haer*. 5.3.1, he alludes to the power of God to raise the flesh in Heb 11:19 and 1 Cor 15:53 and then illustrates this power with God's original creative work in Gen 2:7.

7.3.9 *General-to-Particular Reading of Gen 1–3*

The last of his reading strategies is the classical general-to-particular or part-whole style of argumentation. These texts are not united through their verbal connections or patterning, but the way they represent either the general or particular aspect of a specific theological term or concept. In *Haer*. 1.22.1 and *Haer*. 4.20.1–4 he binds general allusions to Psalm 32(33):6, John 1:3, Col 1:16,

and *Mand* 1.1 through the linking terms of "all things" (*omnia*), and contrasts these general references with the particular creation of humankind in Gen 1:26 and Gen 2:7. In *Haer*. 5.8.1 he contrasts the Spirit as a pledge given specifically to the faithful (Eph 1:14, Rom 8:9, 15) with the fullness of the Spirit given in the final consummation (Gen 1:26, 1 Cor 13:12). Then, in *Haer*. 5.12.2, he develops the contrast between the breath in Gen 2:7 and the Spirit in 1 Cor 15:45 with allusions to Isa 42:5 and Isa 57:16. Both of these passages confirm the universality of the breath given to all in creation and the particularity of the Spirit given to the faithful.

7.4 Conclusion

This survey of Irenaeus' reading strategies delineates the nature of his intertextual reading of Gen 1–3 in *Adversus Haereses*. Taken together these applied reading strategies explain how, for Irenaeus, the work of God in creation is entirely consonant with the unfolding events of the divine economy and the rest of divine revelation in scripture. These strategies are framed by a hermeneutical perspective that elevates the inspiration of scripture within his general view of divine revelation. In Irenaeus's scripture reading, it is only proper to interpret all portions of scripture in various methods of continuity and harmony beginning with creation. To be sure, not all of these reading strategies are mutually exclusive, but they often work in harmony as Irenaeus reads creation. Finally, I do not assume that this list of reading strategies is exhaustive. It is obvious that, for Irenaeus, Gen 1–3 is a pivotal piece within a larger exegetical and theological mosaic of textual relationships. I expect that as other portions of scripture are analyzed from the perspective of intertextuality, they will continue to reveal more of the complexity of Irenaeus' applied exegesis under the direction of his hermeneutical perspective of scriptural consonance.

Appendix

Genesis 1–3 and Related Intertexts in* Haer. *1–5

1	1.5.1–6	Gen 1:26, Gen 2:5, Gen 2:7, Gen 3:27	Isa 45:5, 1 Cor 15:47
2	1.9.3	Gen 2:7	John 1:14
3	1.14.6	Gen 1:31	Matt 17:1, Matt 27:45, John 19:14
4	1.18.1–4	Gen 1:2, Gen 1:26, Gen 2:10, Gen 3:21	Gen 6–50, Exod 26:1/36:8, Exod 28:17, Exod 24–36, Josh 3–4, 1 Sam 9:22, 1 Sam 20:1–42, 2 Sam 23:13, 1 Kgs 11:21, 1 Kgs 18:31, 1 Pet 3:20, John 20:24, 1 Cor 15:46–7
5	1.22.1	Gen 1:1, Gen 1:26, Gen 2:7	Exod 3:6, Psalm 32(33):6, Matt 22:32, John 1:3, 2 Cor 4:18, Eph 1:3, Col 1:16, *Mand* 1
6	1.24.1–2	Gen 1:26, Gen 2:7, Gen 3:19	
7	1.28.1	Gen 1:27–28, Gen 2:7	
8	1.30.1–3	Gen 1:2, Gen 1:7–8, Gen 3:20, Gen 1:3	1 Cor 15:47, Eph 4:6
9	1.30.4–5	Gen 1:1, Gen 1:2, Gen 1:26, Gen 3:1–6	Eph 1:21, Eph 6:12
10	1.30.6	Gen 1:26, Gen 2:7, Gen 2:16, Gen 2:22, Gen 3:20, Gen 6:2	Isa 45:5
11	1.30.7–9	Gen 2:7, Gen 2:17, Gen 2:16–17, Gen 3:1–6, Gen 3:7, Gen 3:20, Gen 3:23	Isa 45:5
12	2.2.5	Gen 1:1, Gen 1:3	Num 12:7, Psalm 32(33):9, John 1:3, Heb 3:5
13	2.26.1	Gen 2:7	Psalm 118(119):73, Job 10:8, 1 Cor 8:1
14	2.28.1	Gen 1:1, Gen 2:7, Gen 1:28	Gen 14:18–20, Job 3:16, Matt 3:12, Heb 7:7
15	2.30.7	Gen 1:1, Gen 2:7, Gen 2:15	2 Cor 12:2–4
16	2.30.9	Gen 1:1, Gen 2:7, Gen 2:8	Matt 11:27, Eph 1:21, Heb 1:3, *Mand* 1

© KONINKLIJKE BRILL NV, LEIDEN, 2015 | DOI 10.1163/9789004294523_009

17	2.34.3–4	Gen 2:1, Gen 2:7	Psalm 20:5(21:4), Psalm 32(33):9, Luke 16:10
18	3.3.3	Gen 1:1, Gen 2:7	Gen 6:17, Gen 12:1, Exod 3:4, Exod 3:10, Exod 20:1, Isa 6:8, Jer 1:7, Ezek 2:3, Matt 25:41
19	3.11.5	Gen 1:1, Gen 1:9, Gen 1:11, Gen 2:6	John 1:18, John 2:1, John 2:10, John 6:11, Matt 22:2–10
20	3.11.8	Gen 2:16–17	Gen 9:8–16, Exod 19–20, Eph 1:10, Rev 4:7
21	3.18.1	Gen 1:26	John 1:2–3, John 1:10, John 1:14, Eph 1:10
22	3.18.7	Gen 2:5	Rom 5:12, Rom 5:19
23	3.19.3	Gen 2:7	Isa 7:11, Isa 7:12, Isa 7:14, Luke 15:4–6, Luke 15:24, Luke 15:32, John 14:2, Rom 12:4/1 Cor 12:12, 1 Cor 15:20, 1 Cor 15:23, Eph 1:22/ Col 1:18, Eph 4:9–10, Eph 4:16, Phil 3:9, Col 1:18–20
24	3.20.1	Gen 3:1–8	Jonah 1:9, Jonah 1:17, Jonah 2:1, Jonah 2:2, Jonah 3:1, Jonah 3:8–9, Matt 12:39–40, 1 Cor 1:29
25	3.21.10	Gen 1:26, Gen 2:5, Gen 2:7	John 1:3, Rom 5:12, Rom 5:19, 1 Cor 15:45–47, Eph 1:10
26	3.22.1	Gen 1:26, Gen 2:7	Matt 5:5, John 1:3, Rom 1:3–4, Gal 4:4
27	3.22.2–3	Gen 2:7	Psalm 68:27(69:26), Matt 4:2, Matt 26:38, Luke 3:23–38, Luke 22:44, John 4:6, John 11:35, John 19:34, Rom 5:14, 1 Cor 15:46
28	3.22.4	Gen 1:28, Gen 2:24–25, Gen 3:6	Deut 22:23–24, Psalm 44:16(45:17), Isa 40:11, Matt 1:23–25, Matt 19:6, 30, Matt 20:16, Luke 1:27–34, Luke 1:38, Luke 3:23–38, Col 1:18, Heb 5:9
29	3.23.1	Gen 1:26, Gen 3:5	Matt 12:29, Luke 15:47, Luke 19:10, Acts 1:7, 1 Cor 15:47, Eph 1:5, 9, 2 Tim 1:10
30	3.23.2	Gen 1:26	Matt 12:29
31	3.23.3	Gen 2:16–17, Gen 3:5, Gen 3:14, Gen 3:16, Gen 3:17–19	Matt 25:41

32	3.23.4	Gen 4:7–8, Gen 4:9, Gen 4:11	
33	3.23.5	Gen 3:7, Gen 3:8, Gen 3:9–11, Gen 3:21	Prov 1:7
34	3.23.6	Gen 2:9, Gen 3:19, Gen 3:23–24	Rom 6:7,10
35	3.23.7	Gen 3:15	Psalm 90(91):13, Luke 10:19–20, Rom 5:12,17, 1Cor 15:26, 1 Cor 15:54–55, Gal 3:16, Gal 3:19, Rev 20:2/12:9
36	3.23.8	Gen 3:1–6, Gen 3:15	Matt 18:12–14/Luke 15:4–7, Rom 5:20
37	3.24.1	Gen 2:7	Matt 12:29, 1 Cor 12:11, 1 Cor 12:28, Eph 2:8
38	3.24.2	Gen 1:26, Gen 1:28, Gen 2:7	Psalm 32(33):6, Prov 8:30
39	4.pf.3–4	Gen 1:26, Gen 2:7, Gen 3:1–5	2 Cor 11:3, 2 Tim 2:23
40	4.6.2	Gen 1:26, Gen 1:28, Gen 2:7	Matt 11:27, John 5:31, Eph 1:10
41	4.10.1	Gen 3:9, Gen 3:6	Gen 6, Gen 18, Exod 3, John 5:39–40, John 5:46
42	4.11.1–2	Gen 1:28	Matt 13:17, Matt 25:21
43	4.14.1	Gen 2:7	Isa 43:5–7, Matt 24:28, John 15:16, John 17:24
44	4.16.1	Gen 2:2–3	Exod 20:12, Exod 31:13, Matt 6:19, Rom 8:36
45	4.20.1–4	Gen 1:26, Gen 2:7	Prov 3:19–20, Prov 8:22–25, Prov 8:27–31, Mal 2:10, Matt 11:27, John 1:3, John 1:14, Acts 10:42, Eph 4:6, Col 1:18, 1 Pet 2:23, Rev 3:7, Rev 5:2–3, Rev 5:9, *Mand* 1
46	4.32.1	Gen 1:3	John 1:3, Eph 4:5–6, Eph 4:15–16, Col 2:19
47	4.33.4	Gen 1:26, Gen 2:7, Gen 3:17–18	Isa 7:14, Matt 12:41–42, Matt 22:29, Matt 22:43, 1 Cor 2:15
48	4.34.4	Gen 2:7	Isa 2:3–4, Isa 57:1, Matt 5:39, John 4:37

49	4.36.2–6	Gen 2:7	Gen 6:2–5, Psalm 23(24):1, Matt 5:45, Matt 11:23–24, Matt 21:33–43, Matt 22:7, Matt 24:42, Luke 7:35–36, Luke 17:2–6, Luke 21:34–35, Rom 13:1–6
50	4.37.4	Gen 1:26, Gen 2:17–18	1 Cor 6:12, Eph 4:25, Eph 4:29, Eph 5:8, 1 Pet 2:16
51	4.38.1–2	Gen 2:7	Acts 8:17–19, 1 Cor 3:2–3, Heb 5:12–14
52	4.38.3	Gen 1:26, Gen 1:28, Gen 2:7	Wis 6:19
53	4.38.4	Gen 1:26, Gen 3:5	Psalm 81(82):6–7, 1 Cor 15:53
54	4.39.2	Gen 1:26, Gen 2:5, Gen 2:7	Exod 25:11, Psalm 44:12(45:11)
55	4.40.3	Gen 3:1–6, Gen 3:15	Matt 13:24–25, Matt 13:36–43, Matt 25:41, Gal 4:4
56	5.1.1–2	Gen 1:26, Gen 2:7, Gen 3:1–6, Gen 3:24	John 1:18, John 8:44, Rom 11:34, Eph 1:7, Eph 1:10, Eph 1:11–12, 1 Tim 2:6, 1 Pet 1:2, 1 John 1:6, James 1:22
57	5.1.3	Gen 1:26, Gen 2:7, Gen 3:6, Gen 3:23	Luke 1:35, John 1:13, 1 Cor 5:7, 1 Cor 15:22
58	5.2.1	Gen 1:26	John 1:11, Eph 1:7
59	5.3.2–3	Gen 2:7, Gen 2:8, Gen 3:23	Gen 5:24, Gen 9:9, 2 Kgs 2:11, Dan 3:19, Jonah 2, 1 Cor 15:53–54, 2 Cor 12:4, 2 Cor 12:7–9, Heb 11:19
60	5.5.1–2	Gen 2:7, Gen 2:8, Gen 2:15, Gen 3:23–24	Gen 5:24, 2 Kgs 2:11, Dan 3:19, Jonah 2, 2 Cor 12:4
61	5.6.1	Gen 1:26, Gen 2:7	Rom 8:29, 1 Cor 2:6–15, 1 Thess 5:23
62	5.7.1–2	Gen 2:7, Gen 3:19	Psalm 21:30(22:29), John 20:20, Rom 8:11, 1 Cor 6:14, 1 Cor 15:36,42–44,
63	5.8.1	Gen 1:26	Rom 8:9, 15, 1 Cor 13:12, 1 Cor 15:53, 2 Cor 5:4, Eph 1:14
64	5.10.1	Gen 1:26	Matt 7:9, Matt 13:25, Rom 11:17
65	5.12.1–6	Gen 1:26, Gen 2:7	Isa 25:8, Isa 42:5, Isa 57:16, Acts 2:17, Rom 6:11, 1 Cor 15:22, 45–46, Gal 1:15–16, Col 3:9–10, Phil 1:22

66	5.14.1–2	Gen 2:7	Gen 4:10, Gen 9:5–6, Matt 23:35–36, Luke 19:10, 1 Cor 15:50, Col 1:21–22
67	5.15.2	Gen 2:7	John 5:1–15, John 9:1–7, John 9:37–38, Luke 15:4–6, Luke 19:10
68	5.15.3	Gen 2:7, Gen 3:6	Jer 1:15, John 9:1–7, Gal 1:15, Titus 3:5
69	5.15.4	Gen 1:26, Gen 2:7, Gen 3:8–9	John 9:1–7
70	5.16.1	Gen 1:26, Gen 2:7, Gen 3:19	John 9:6
71	5.16.2	Gen 1:26, Gen 2:7, Gen 3:6	John 1:14
72	5.16.3	Gen 2:17, Gen 3:6	Rom 5:10, Phil 2:8
73	5.17.1–2	Gen 2:16–17, Gen 3:8	1Tim 2:5, Matt 6:12, Matt 9:2, Luke 1:78
74	5.17.3–4	Gen 2:17, Gen 3:6	2 Kgs 6:1–7, Psalm 31(32):1–2, Jer 23:29, Matt 3:10, Matt 6:12, Matt 9:2, Luke 5:24, Eph 3:18, Eph 4:6, Col 2:14
75	5.19.1	Gen 3:1–6, Gen 3:8	Matt 10:16, Luke 1:30–35, Luke 2:7
76	5.20.2	Gen 2:8, Gen 2:16, Gen 2:17, Gen 3:3	Matt 15:13–14, 2 Tim 3:7, Rom 12:3, Eph 1:10
77	5.21.1–3	Gen 1:26, Gen 2:5, Gen 2:7, Gen 3:6, Gen 3:15	Matt 4:2–10, Matt 12:29, Luke 4:6–7, Gal 3:19, Gal 4:4, Eph 1:10
78	5.23.1–2	Gen 1:5, Gen 2:16–17, Gen 1:24–31, Gen 3:1–5	Gen 5:5, Psalm 89(90):4, John 8:44, Eph 1:10, 2 Pet 3:8
79	5.26.2	Gen 3:1–6	Matt 25:41
80	5.28.3–4	Gen 1:26, Gen 2:2–3, Gen 2:7	Psalm 89(90):4, Matt 3:12, 2 Pet 3:8, Rev 13:14–18, Ignatius, *Rom* 4.1
81	5.30.4	Gen 2:2–3	Matt 8:11, Matt 16:27, Rev 19:20
82	5.33.1–4	Gen 1:6–25, Gen 1:27–28, Gen 1:30, Gen 2:2–3	Isa 11:6–9, Isa 65:25, Psalm 103(104):30, Matt 19:29, Matt 26:27–28, Luke 14:12–13, *Papias*
83	5.34.2	Gen 3:6	Gen 9:27, Isa 30:25–26, Isa 58:14
84	5.36.3	Gen 1:26, Gen 1:31–2:1, Gen 2:2–3, Gen 2:7	Psalm 131(132):14/ Psalm117:20(118:19), Psalm 89(90):4, Matt 26:29, John 5:25, 28–29, Rom 8:19–21, 1 Cor 2:9, 1 Pet 1:12, 2 Pet 3:8 Rev 20:5

Bibliography

Primary Sources

The Apostolic Fathers. LCL 24–25. Translated by B. Ehrman. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2003.

Behr, J. *On the Apostolic Preaching*. Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1997.

Evans, E. *Tertullian Adversus Marcionem*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1972.

Grant, R.M. *Irenaeus of Lyons*. New York: Routledge, 1997.

———. *Theophilus of Antioch: To Autolycus*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1970.

MacKenzie, I. *Irenaeus's Demonstration of the Apostolic Preaching: A Theological Commentary and Translation*. Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2002.

Marcovich, M. *Apologies: Iustini Martyris Apologiae pro Christianis*. Berlin: De Gruyter, 1994.

———. *Dialogue with Trypho the Jew: Iustini martyris dialogues com Trophone*. Berlin: De Gruyter, 1997.

Roberts, A., and J. Donaldson. *Ante-Nicene Fathers*. Vol. 1. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1994.

Robinson, J.A. *St. Irenaeus: The Demonstration of the Apostolic Preaching*. London: SPCK, 1920.

Rousseau, A (et al.) *Contre les hérésies, Livre 1*. 2 vols. Sources Chrétiennes, nos. 263–64. Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1979.

———. *Contre les hérésies, Livre II*. 2 vols. SC 293, 294. Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1982.

———. *Contre les hérésies, Livre III*. 2 vols. SC 210, 211. Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1974.

———. *Contre les hérésies, Livre IV*. 2 vols. SC 100, 2 vols. Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1965.

———. *Contre les hérésies, Livre V*. 2 vols. SC 152, 153. Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1969.

———. *The Démonstration de la Prédication Apostolique*. SC 406. Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1995.

Smith, J.P. *St. Irenaeus: Proof of the Apostolic Preaching*. ACW 16. New York: Newman, 1952.

Unger, D.J., and J.J. Dillon. *St Irenaeus of Lyons, Against the Heresies: Book 1*. ACW 55. New York: Paulist Press, 1992.

Unger, Dominic J. John J. Dillon, Michael Slusser. *St. Irenaeus of Lyons: Against the Heresies* (*Book 2*). ACW 65. New York: Newman Press, 2012.

Unger, Dominic J. John J. Dillon, Matthew Steenberg. *St. Irenaeus of Lyons: Against the Heresies* (*Book 3*). ACW 64. New York: Newman Press, 2012.

Secondary Sources

Abadía, J.P.T. *Cristo y el universo: Estudio linguístico y themático de Ef 1:10h en Efesios y en la obra de Ireneo de Lyon*. Salamanca: Universidad Pontificia, 1995.

Abramowski, L. "Irenaeus, Adv Haer III 3,2: ecclesia Romana and omnis ecclesia; and ibid. 3,3: Anacletus of Rome." *JTS* 28 (1977): 101–104.

Alkier, S. "Intertextuality and the Semiotics of Biblical Texts." In *Reading the Bible Intertextuality*, 1–21. Edited by Richard B. Hays, Stefan Alkier, and Leroy A. Huizenga. Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2009.

———. "New Testament Studies on the Basis of Categorical Semiotics." In *Reading the Bible Intertextuality*. eds. Richard B. Hays, Stefan Alkier, and Leroy A. Huizenga, 223–248. Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2009.

Allenbach, J. (et. al.). *Biblia Patristica: Index Des Citations Et Allusions Bibliques Dans La Littérature Patristique*. Vol. 1. Paris: Editions du Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, 1975.

Altermath, F. "The Purpose of the Incarnation according to Irenaeus." *StuPat* 13 (1971): 63–8.

Anderson, G.A. *The Genesis of Perfection: Adam and Eve in Jewish and Christian Imagination*. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2001.

Anderson, R. *Ancient Rhetorical Theory and Paul*. Louvain: Kok Pharos, 1996.

Andresen, C. "Zur Entstehung und Geschichte des trinitarischen Personbegriffes." *ZNW* 52 (1961) 1–39.

Armstrong, G.T. *Die Genesis in der Alten Kirche: Die drei Kirchenväter*. Tübigen: Mohr Siebeck, 1962.

Aubineau, M. "Incorruptibilite at divinization selon saint Irénée." *RSR*, 44.1 (1956): 25–52.

Ayres, L. *Nicaea and Its Legacy: An Approach to Fourth Century Trinitarian Theology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006.

———. "The soul and the reading of scripture: a note on Henri de Lubac." *SJT* 61.2 (2008): 173–90.

Bacq, P. *De l'ancienne à la nouvelle alliance selon s. Irénée: unité du livre IV de l'Adversus Haereses*. Paris: Editions Lethielleux, 1978.

Balás, D. "The Use and Interpretation of Paul in Irenaeus's Five Books *Adversus Haereses*." *SecCen* 9 (1992): 27–39.

Balthasar, H.U. von. *Scandal Of The Incarnation: Irenaeus Against the Heresies*. San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1981.

Barnard, L.W. "The Old Testament and Judaism in the Writings of Justin Martyr." *VT* 14.4 (1964): 395–406.

Barr, J. "The Image of God in the Book of Genesis—A study of terminology." *BJRL* 51.1 (1968): 11–26.

———. "Jewish apocalyptic in recent scholarly study." *BJRL* 58, no.1 (1975): 9–35.

Barthes, R. "From Word to Text." In *Image—Music—Text*. Edited by S. Heath. Glasgow: Fontana, 1977.

Barthoulot, J. "Traduction integral de la Démonstration de la Predication Apostolique." *RSR* 6 (1916): 368–432.

Basevi, C. "La generazoine eternal di Cristo nei Ps 2 e 109 secondo S. Giustino e S. Ireneo." *Aug* 22.1–2 (1982): 135–47.

Bates, M.A. *The Hermeneutics of the Apostolic Proclamation: The Center of Paul's Method of Scriptural Interpretation*. Waco: Baylor University Press, 2012.

Bavaud, G. "*Saint Irénée, docteur de l'Immaculée Conception de Marie*." In *Virgo liber Verbi*, 121–131. Rome: Marianum, 1991.

Bauer, W. *Orthodoxy and Heresy in Earliest Christianity*. London: SCM, 1972.

Beal, T.K. "Intertextuality." In *Handbook of Postmodern Biblical Interpretation*, 128–130. Edited by A.K.A. Adam. St Louis: Chalice, 2000.

Beattie, T. "Mary in Patristic Thought." In *Mary: The Complete Resource*, 75–105. Edited by S.J. Boss. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.

Behr, J. *Asceticism and Anthropology in Irenaeus and Clement*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.

———. "Irenaeus *AH* 3.23.5, and the Ascetic ideal." *SVTQ* 36. 4 (1993): 309–10.

———. "Scripture, the Gospel, and Orthodoxy." *SVTQ* 43.3–4 (1999): 223–48.

———. "The Word of God in the Second Century." *ProEc* 9.1 (2000): 85–107.

———. *The Way to Nicaea*. New York: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 2001.

Bellinzoni, A. "The Gospel of Luke in the Second Century." In *Literary Studies in Luke-Acts*, 59–76. Edited by R.E. Thompson and T.E. Phillips. Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1998.

———. "The Gospel of Matthew in the Second Century." *SecCen* 9.4 (1992): 217–54.

Benoît, A. *Saint Irénée: introduction à l'étude de sa théologie*. Paris: Presses universitaires de France, 1960.

Bentivegna, J. "Pauline Elements in the Anthropology of St. Irenaeus." *StuEv* 5 (1968): 229–33.

Beuzart, P. *Essai sur la Théologie d' Irénée*. Paris: Leroux, 1908.

Bilde, P. "Gnosticism, Jewish Apocalypticism, and Early Christianity." In *In the last days: On Jewish and Christian Apocalyptic and its period*, 9–32. Edited by Jeppesen (et al.). Aarhus: Arhus University Press, 1994.

Bingham D.J. "Christianizing Divine Aseity: Irenaeus reads John." In *The Gospel of John in Christian Theology*, 53–67. Edited by Richard Bauckam and Carl Mosser. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008.

———. "Hope in Irenaeus of Lyons." *ETL* 76.4 (2000): 265–82.

———. "Irenaeus and Hebrews." In *Christology and Hermeneutics of Hebrews: Profiles from the History of Interpretation*. Edited by J. Laansma and D. Treier. New York: Continuum, forthcoming.

———. "Irenaeus reads Romans 8: Ressurection and Renovation." In *Early Patristic Readings of Romans*, 114–32. Edited by K. Gaca and L.L. Welborn. New York: T&T Clark, 2005.

———. *Irenaeus' use of Matthew's Gospel in Adversus Haereses*. Leuven: Peeters, 1998.

———. "Irenaeus on Gnostic Biblical Interpretation." *StuPat* 40 (2006): 367–79.

———. "Knowledge and love in Irenaeus of Lyons." *StuPat 36* (2001): 184–199.

Black, M. "An Aramaic Etymology for Jaldabaoth?," in *The New Testament and Gnosis: Essays in honour of Robert Mcl. Wilson*. eds A. Logan and A. Wedderburn. Edinburgh: T&T Clark (1983): 69–72.

Blackwell, B. "Paul and Irenaeus." In *Paul and the Second Century: The Legacy of Paul's life, Letters, and Teaching*, 190–206. Edited by M. Bird and J. Dodson. London: T&T Clark, 2011.

Blanchard, Y.M. *Aux sources de canon, le temoignage d'Irenee*. Paris: Cerf, 1993.

Blowers, P. "The Regula Fidei and the Narrative Character of Early Christian Faith." *ProE* 6, no.2 (1997): 199–228.

Boersma, H. "Irenaeus, Derrida and hospitality: on the eschatological overcoming of violence." *MT* 19.2 (2003): 163–80.

Böhlig, A. and C. Markschies. *Gnosis und Manichäismus: Forschungen und Studien zu Texten von Valentin und Mani sowie zu den Bibliotheken von Nag Hammadi und Medinet Madi*. Berlin: De Gruyter, 1994.

Bonwetsch, N. *Die theologie des Irenäus. Gütersloh: C. Bertelsmann, 1925*.

Bousset, W. *Jüdisch-christlicher Schulbetrieb in Alexandria und Rom: Literarische Untersuchungen zu Philo und Clemens von Alexandria, Justin und Irenäus*. Göttingen, 1915.

———. *Kyrios Christos: a history of the belief in Christ from the beginnings of Christianity to Irenaeus*. Translated by J.E. Steely. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1970.

Bouteneff, P.C. *Beginnings: Ancient Christian Readings of the Biblical Creation Narratives*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2008.

Boyarin, Daniel. *Intertextuality and the Reading of Midrash*. Bloomington, IN, Indiana University Press, 1990.

Brent, A. "How Irenaeus Has Misled the Archaeologists," in *Irenaeus: Life, Scripture, Legacy*. ed. P. Foster and S. Parvis. Minneapolis: Fortress (2012): 35–52.

Briggman, Anthony. *Irenaeus of Lyons and the Theology of the Holy Spirit*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012.

Brown, R.F. "On the Necessary Imperfection of Creation: Irenaeus' *Adversus haereses* IV, 38." *SJT* 28.1 (1975): 17–25.

Brox, N. "Irenaeus and the Bible." In *Handbook of Patristic Exegesis*, Vol. 1, 483–506. Edited by Charles Kannengiesser. Brill: Leiden, 2004.

———. "Rome and 'jede Kirche' im 2 Jahrhundert: Zu Irenäus, adv. haer. III, 3,2." *AHC* (1975): 42–78.

Brunner, E. *Man in Revolt: A Christian Anthropology*. Translated by Olive Wyon. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1947.

Bundrick, S. *Music and Image in Classical Athens*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.

Bushur, J.G. " 'Joining the End to the Beginning' Divine Providence and the Interpretation of Scripture in the Teaching of Irenaeus, Bishop of Lyons." Unpublished dissertation. University of Durham, UK, 2009.

Campenhausen, H. von. "Irenäus und das NT." *ThLBer* 90 (1965): 1–8.

Chilton, B.D. "Irenaeus on Isaac." in *StuPat* 17.2, 643–47. Edited by E.A. Livingstone. Oxford: Pergamon Press, 1982.

Clark, E. "Heresy, Asceticism, Adam and Eve: Interpretation of Genesis 1–3 in the Later Latin Fathers." In *Ascetic Piety and Women's Faith: Essays on Late Ancient Christianity*, 367–82. Edited by E. Clark. Lewiston, NY: Edwin Mellen Press, 1986.

———. R*eading Renunciation: Asceticism and Scripture in Early Christianity*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1999.

Constantelos, J.D. "Irenaeus of Lyons and his Central Views of Human Nature," *SVTQ* 33.4 (1989): 351–63.

Czesz, B. "La parabola del figlio prodigo (Lc 15, 11–32) in Ireneo." *Aug* 17 (1977): 107–11.

Daley, B. *The Hope of the Early Church: A Handbook of Patristic Eschatology*. Cambridge: University Press, 1991.

Daniélou, J. "S. Irénée et les origins de la théologie de l'histore." *RSR* 34 (1947): 227–31.

Davidson, I. *The Birth of the Church: From Jesus to Constantine AD 30–312*. Vol. 1. Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 2004.

Dawson, D. *Allegorical Readers and Cultural Revision in Ancient Alexandria*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1992.

De Aldama, J.A. "Adam, typus futuri (San Ireneo *Advers. Haer*. 3.22.3)." *SacE* 13 (1962): 266–80.

———. "La naissance du Seigneur dans l'exégèse patristrique du Ps 21:10s (=22:10a)." *RSR* 51 (1963): 5–29.

———. *María en la patrística de los siglos I y II*. Madrid: Editorial Catholica, 1970.

De Alès, A. "La doctrine de la récapitulationen Saint Irénée." *RSR* 6 (1916): 185–211.

De Andia, Y. *Homo vivens: Incorruptibilité et divinization de l'homme selon Irénée de Lyon*. Paris: Etudes Augustiniennes, 1986.

———. "Irénèe théologien de l' unite." *NRT* 109 (1987): 31–48.

———. "L'interprétation irénéenne de la beatitude des doux: 'Bienheureux les doux, ils recevront la terre en héritage' (Mt 5:5)." *StuPat* 18.3 (1989): 85–102, originally

published "La beatitudine dei miti (Mt. v,5) nell'interpretazione di S. Ireneo." *RSLR* 20 (1984): 275–86.

———. "Modèles de l'unité des testaments selon Irénée de Lyon." *StuPat* 21 (1989): 49–59.

De Andia, Y. and D.L. Schindler, Jr "The 'Science So Falsely Called': Seduction and Separation." *Com* 24 (1997): 645–70.

Donovan, M.A. "Irenaeus in Recent Scholarship." *SecCen* 4:4 (1984): 219–241.

———. *One Right Reading? A Guide to Irenaeus*. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1997.

———. "Alive to the Glory of God: A key Insight in St. Irenaeus." *TS* 14.2 (1990): 99–112.

Downing, Victor K. "Doctrine of Regeneration in the Second Century." *ERT* 14.2 (1990): 99–112.

Driscoll, J. "Uncovering the dynamic lex orandi—lex credendi in the baptismal theology of Irenaeus." *ProEc*, 12.2 (2003): 213–25.

Dunderberg, Ismo. "The School of Valentinus." In *A Companion to Second-Century Christian 'Heretics,'* 64–99. Edited by A. Marjanen and P. Loumanen. Leiden: Brill, 2005.

Dunning, B.H. "Virgin Earth, Virgin Birth: Creation, Sexual Difference, and Recapitulation in Irenaeus of Lyons." *JR* 89.1 (2009): 57–88.

Edwards, M. "Gnostics and Valentinians in the Church Fathers." *JTS* 40(1) (1989): 26–47.

———. "On the Platonic Schooling of Justin Martyr." *TS* 42.1 (1991): 17–34.

Ehrman, B. *The New Testament: A Historical Introduction to the Early Christian Writings*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.

Fantino, J. *L'homme, image de Dieu chez saint Irénée de Lyon*. Paris: Editions du Cerf, 1986.

———. "La creation ex nihilo chez saint Irénée," *RSPT* 76.3 (1992): 421–42.

———. *La theologie d'Irenee. Lecture des Ecritures en reponse a l'exegese gnostique: Une approche trinitaire*. Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1994.

———. "Le passage de premier Adam au second Adam comme expression de salut chez Irénée Lyon." *VC* 52.4 (1998): 418–29.

Farkasfalvy, D. "Theology of Scripture in St. Irenaeus." *RevB* 68 (1968): 319–33.

———. *Inspiration and Interpretation: A Theological Introduction to Sacred Scripture*. Washington D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 2010.

Farmer, W.R. "Galatians and the second century development of the regula fidei." *SecCen* 4.3 (1985): 143–70.

Farrow, D.B. "St Irenaeus of Lyons: The Church and the World." *ProEc* 4 (1995): 333–55.

———. "The Doctrine of the Ascension in Irenaeus and Origin." *ARC* 26 (1998): 31–50.

Faur, J. *Golden Gloves with Silver Dots: Semiotics and Textuality in Rabbinic Tradition*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1986.

Fishbane, M. *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1985.

Ferguson, T.C.K. "The Rule of Truth and Irenaean Rhetoric in Book 1 of Against Heresies." *VC* 55.4 (2001): 356–75.

Ferlay, P. "Irénée de Lyon exegete du quatrième évangile." *NRT* 106.2 (1984): 222–34.

Flesseman-van Leer, E. *Tradition and Scripture in the Early Church*. Assen: Van Gorcum, 1954.

Fossum, J. "Gen. 1,26 and 2,7 in Judiasm, Samaritanism and Gnosticism." *JSJ* 16.2 (1985): 203–39.

Frei, Hans. *The Eclipse of Biblical Narrative: A Study in Eighteenth and Nineteenth Century Hermeneutics*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1974.

Frishman, J. *The Book of Genesis in Jewish and Oriental Christian Interpretation*. Louvin: Peeters, 1997.

Gambero, L. *Mary and the Fathers of the Church: The Blessed Virgin Mary in Patristic Thought*. Translated by Thomas Buffer. San Francisco: Ignatius, 1999.

Gamble, Harry. *Books and Readers in the Early Church: A History of Early Christian Texts*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1997.

Giere, S.D. *A New Glimpse of Day one: Intertextuality, History of Interpretation, and Genesis 1:1–5*. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2009.

Giverson, S. "The Apocryphon of John and Genesis." *StuTh* 17 (1963): 60–76.

Gonzalez-Faus, J.I. *Creación y progreso en la teología de San Ireneo*. Barcelona: San Cugat del Valles, 1968.

———. *Carne de dios: Significado Salvador de la Encarnación en la teología de San Ireneo*. Barcelona: San Cugat del Valles, 1968.

Graham, S.L. "Structure and Purpose of Irenaeus' *Epideixis*." *StuPat* 36 (2001): 210–21.

———. "Irenaeus and the Covenants: 'Immortal Diamond.'" *StuPat* 40 (2006): 393–98.

———. "Irenaeus as Reader of Romans 9–11." In *Early Patristic Readings of Romans*, 87–113. Edited by K.L. Gaca and L.L. Welborn. New York: T&T Clark, 2005.

Grant, R.M. "Scripture, Rhetoric and Theology in Theophilus." *VC* 13 (1959): 33–45.

———. "Irenaeus and Hellenistic Culture." *HTR* 42 (1949): 41–51.

———. *Gnosticism and the Early Church*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1966.

———. *Greek Apologists of the Second Century*. London: SCM, 1988.

———. *Irenaeus of Lyons*. London: Routledge, 1997.

Grant, R.M. and D. Tracy. *A Short History of the Interpretation of the Bible*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984.

Greer, R.A. "The dog and the mushrooms: Irenaeus's view of the Valentinians assessed." In *Rediscovery of Gnosticism*, 146–171. Vol. 1. Leiden: Brill, 1980.

Grillmeier, A. *Christ in Christian Tradition: From the Apostolic age to Chalcedon*. Vol. 1. Translated by J. Bowden. Atlanta, GA: John Knox Press, 1975.

Grivel, C. "Thèses préparatoires sur les intertexts." *Dialogizität, Theorie und Geschichte der Literatur und der schönen Künste*, 237–48. Edited by R. Lachmann. Munich: Fink, 1982.

Guevin, B. "The natural law in Irenaeus of Lyons' Adversus haereses: a metaphysical or a soteriological reality?" *StuPat* 36 (2001): 222–225.

Häkkinen, S. "Ebionites." In *A Companion to Second-Century Christian 'Heretics*,' 247–78. Leiden: Brill, 2005.

Harnack, A.von. "Der Presbyter-Prediger des Irenäus (IV,27,1–32,1): Bruch-stücke und Nachklänger der ältesten exegetisch-polemischen Homilien." In *Philotesia: Paul Kleinert zum LXX Geburtstag*, 1–37. Berlin: Trowitzsch, 1907.

———. *History of dogma*. 7 vols. New York: Dover Publications, 1961.

———. *Marcion: The Gospel of the Alien God*. Translated by J.E. Steely and L.D. Bierma. Durham: Labyrinth Press, 1990.

Hart, T. "Irenaeus, recapitulation and physical redemption." In *Christ in our Place*, 152–81. Allison Park, PA: Pickwick Publications, 1989.

Hays, R. *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989.

———. "Die Befreiung Israels im lukanischen Doppelwerk: Intertextuelle Narration als kulturkritische Praxis." In *Die Bibel im Dialog der Schriften: Konzepte intertextueller Bibellektüre*, 117–136. Tübingen: A. Francke, 2005.

Hatina, T.R. "Intertextuality and Historical Criticism in New Testament Studies: Is there a Relationship?" *BibInt* 7 (1999): 28–43.

Hauke, M. *Heilsverlust in Adam: Stationen griechischer Erbsündlehre: Irenäus-Origenes-Kappadozier*. Paderborn, Germany: Bonifatius, 1993.

Hefner, P. "Theological Methodology and St. Irenaeus." *JR* 44 (1964): 294–309.

Herra, S. *Irénée de Lyon Exégète*. Etude Historique: Paris, 1920.

Hill, C.E. "Polycarp contra Marcion Irenaeus' Presbertial Source in *AH* 4.27–32." *SP* 40 (2006): 399–412.

———. *From the Lost Teaching of Polycarp: Identifying Irenaeus' Apostolic Presbyter and the Author of* Ad Diognetum. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006

———. "Irenaeus of Lyons." In *The Johannine Corpus and the Early Church*, 95–118. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004.

Hitchcock, F.R.M. and H.B. Swete. *Irenaeus of Lugdunum: A Study of His Teaching*. Cambridge: University Press, 1914.

———. "Loof's Theory of Theophilus of Antioch as a Source of Irenaeus." *JTS* 38 (1937): 130–39; 255–66.

Hoh, J. "Die Lehre des hl. Irenäus uber das Neue Testament." *NTA* 7 (1919): 189–197.

Hollander, J. *The Figure of Echo: A Mode of Allusion in Milton and After*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1981.

Holsinger-Friesen, T. *Irenaeus and Genesis: A study of Competition in Early Christian Hermeneutics*. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2009.

Holzhausen, J. "Irenäus und die valentinianische Schule: zur Praefatio von *Adv. Haer*. 1." *VC* 55.4 (2001): 341–55.

Houssiau, A. "L'exégèse de Mt 11:27b selon S. Irénée." *ETL* 29 (1953): 328–54.

———. *La christologie de Saint Irénée*. Louvain: Publications universitaires de Louvain, 1955.

Irwin, W. "Against Intertextuality." *PL* 28 (2004): 227–42.

Jacobsen, A.-C. "The Importance of Genesis 1–3 in the Theology of Irenaeus" *ZAC* 8 (2004): 299–316.

———. "The Philosophical Argument in the Teaching of Irenaeus on the Resurrection of the Flesh." *StuPat* 36 (2001): 256–261.

Javierre, A.M. " 'In ecclesia': Ireneo, *Adv haer* 3, 3, 2", In *Comunione interecclesiale collegialité—primato ecumenismo*, 221–317. Rome: LAS, 1972.

Jourjon, M. "Saint Irénèe lit la Bible." In *Le monde grec ancien et la Bible*, 153–70. Paris: Beauchesne, 1984.

Kannengiesser, C. "The 'Speaking God' and Irenaeus' Interpretative Pattern: the Reception of Genesis." *ASE* 15.2 (1998): 337–52.

———. *Handbook of Patristic Exegesis*. Brill: Leiden, 1999.

Kelly, J.N.D. *Early Christian Doctrines*. 5th ed. San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1978.

King, K.L. *What Is Gnosticism?* Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2003.

———. *Images of the feminine in Gnosticism*. Philadelphia, Fortress Press, 1988.

Klebba, E. *Die Anthropologie des hl. Irenaeus*. Münster: Verlang von Heinrich Schöningh, 1894.

Kristeva, J. *Desire in Language: A Semiotic Approach to Literature and Art*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1980.

———. *Revolution in Poetic Language*. Paris: Éditions du seuil, 1974.

Kristeva, J. and T. Moi. *The Kristeva Reader*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1986.

Kugel, J. and R. Greer. *Early Biblical Interpretation*. Phiadelphia: Westminister Press, 1986.

Lampe, G.W.H. *A Patristic Greek Lexicon*. New York: Clarendon, 1961.

Lanne, D.E. "La 'xeniteia' d'Abraham dans l'oeuvre d'Irénée." *Irén* 47 (1974): 163–87.

———. "Nom de Jésus-Christ et son invocation chez saint Irénée de Lyon." *Irén* 48.4 (1975)" 447–67.

———. "Saint Irénée de Lyon, artisan de la paix entre les Églises." *Irén* 69 (1996): 451–76.

Lassiat, "L' Anthropologie d'Irénée." *NRT 100* (1978) 399–417.

———. *Promotion de l'homme en Jésus Christ d'après Irénée de Lyon*. Tours: Mame, 1974.

Lawson, J. *The Biblical Theology of Saint Irenaeus*. London: Epworth Press, 1948.

Layton, B. *The Gnostic Scriptures*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1995.

Lewis, N. *Cosmology and Fate in Gnosticism and Graeco-Roman Antiquity: Under Pitiless Skies*. Leiden: Brill, 2013.

Logan, A.H.B. *Gnostic Truth and Christian Heresy: A study in the History of Gnosticism*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1996.

Loewe, W.P. "Myth and Counter-Myth: Irenaeus' Story of Salvation." In *Interpreting Tradition: The Art of Theological Reflection*, 39–54. Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1984.

———. "Irenaeus' Soteriology: Christus Victor Revisited." *AThR* 67.1 (1985): 1–15.

Loofs, F. *Theophilus von Antiochien adversus Marcionem und die anderen theologischen Quellen bei Irenaeus*. Lepzig: J.C. Hinrichs, 1930.

Luckhart, R. "Matthew 11,27 in the 'Contra Haereses' of Saint Irenaeus." *RUO* 23 (1953): 65–79.

Luttikhuizen, G.P. *Gnostic Revisions of Genesis Stories and Early Jesus Traditions*. Leiden: Brill, 2006.

Luz, U. *Matthew 21–28: A Commentary*. Translated by James E. Crouch. Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 2005.

MacDonald, N. "Israel and the Old Testament Story in Irenaeus' Presentation of the Rule of Faith." *JTI* 3.2 (2009): 281–98.

Macrae, G.W. "Why The church Rejected Gnosticism." in *Jewish and Christian Self-Definition*, 126–33. Edited by E.P. Sanders. London: S.C.M. Press, 1980.

Margerie, B. de. *Introduction à L'historie de L'exégèse: 1. Les Pères grecs et orientaux*. Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1980.

Markschies, C, *Valentinus Gnosticus?: Untersuchungen zur valentinianischen Gnosis mit einem Kommentar zu den Fragmenten Valentins*. Tübingen: Paul Siebeck, 1992.

———. *Gnosis: An Introduction*. New York: T&T Clark, 2003.

Markus, R.A. "Pleroma and fulfillment: the significance of history in St. Irenaeus' opposition to Gnosticism." *VC* 8.4 (1954): 193–224.

Martens, P. "Revisiting the Allegory/Typology Distinction: The Case of Origen." *JECS* 16.3 (2008): 283–317.

May, G. *Creatio ex Nihilo: The Doctrine of 'Creation out of Nothing' in Early Christian Thought*. Translated by A.S. Worrall. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1994.

McHugh, J. "A Reconsideration of Ephesians 1,10b in Light of Irenaeus." In *Paul and Paulinism*: *Essays in Honour of C.K. Barrett*, 302–9. Edited by M.D. Hooker and S.G. Wilson. London: SPCK, 1982.

Meijering, E.P. "God Cosmos History: Christian and Neo-Platonic Views on Divine Revelation." In *God Being History: Studies in Patristic Philosophy*, 52–80. New York: American Elsevier, 1975.

———. "Irenaus zum zeitlichen Anfang der Welt." *VC* 54.1 (2000): 1–11.

Miller, P.C. "Words with an Alien Voice: Gnostics, Scripture and Canon." *JAAR* 57 (1989): 459–83.

Minns, D. *Irenaeus*. London, G. Chapman, 1994.

Moringiello, S.D. "Irenaeus Rhetor." Unpublished Dissertation. University of Notre Dame, 2008.

Moyise, S. "Intertextuality and the Study of the Old Testament in the New Testament." In *Old Testament in the New Testament: Essays in Honour of J.L. North*, 14–41. Edited by Stephen Moyise. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000.

Mutschler, B. *Irenäus als johanneischer Theologe*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004.

———. Das *Corpus Johnneum bei Irenäus von Lyon*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006.

Nautin, P. "Irénée, Adv haer, III 3,2: Eglise de Rome ou église universelle?" *RHR* 151 (1957): 37–78.

Nielson, J.T. *Adam and Christ in the Theology of Irenaeus of Lyons*. Assen: Van Gorcum, 1968.

Normann, R. *Irenäus als Paulusinterpret: zur Rezeption und Wirkung der paulinischen und deuteropaulinischen Briefe im Werk des Irenäus von Lyon*. Tubingen: JCB Mohr, 1994.

Norris, R.A. *God and World in Early Christian Theology*. New York: The Seabury Press, 1965.

———. "Irenaeus' use of Paul in his polemic against the Gnostics." In *Paul and the legacies of Paul*, 79–98. Edited by W.S. Babcok. Dallas: SMU Press, 1990.

———. "Theology and Language in Irenaeus of Lyon." *AThR* 76.3 (1994): 285–97

———. "The Insufficiency of Scripture: Adversus Haereses 2 and the Role of Scripture in Irenaeus's Anti-gnostic Polemic." In *Reading in Christian Communities*, 63–79. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 2002.

Olsen, M.J. *Irenaeus, the Valentinian Gnostics and the Kingdom of God (A.H. Book V): The Debate About 1 Corinthians 15:50*. New York: Mellen Biblical Press, 1992.

O'Neil, J.C. "How early is the doctrine of creatio ex nihilo?" *JTS* 53.2 (2002): 449–65.

Orbe, Antonio S.J., "El hombre ideal en la teología de san Ireneo." *Greg* 43 (1962): 464–68.

———. "El pecado de Eva, signo de divieion." *OCP* 29 (1963): 305–30.

———. "Homo nuper factus: En torno a s. Ireneo, Adv. haer. IV,38,1." *Greg* 46 (1965): 481–544.

———. *Anthropogía de San Ireneo*. Madrid: Biblioteca des Autores Cristianos, 1969.

———. "La Revelacion Del Hijo Por el Padre Segun San Ireneo (*Adv. Haer*. IV,6): Para la exegesis precivena de Matt 11,27." In *Theologia De San Ireneo IV: Traducción y Comentario del Libro IV del "Adversus haereses"*, 50–103. Madrid: Biblioteca de Autores Cristianos, 1996, originally published in *Greg* 51 (1970): 5–83.

———. "Ipse tuum calcabit caput (S. Ireneo y Gén 3:15)." *Greg* 52 (1971): 85–149; 215–69.

———. *Parabolas evangelicas in San Ireneo*. 2 vols. Madrid: Biblioteca de Autores Cristianos, 1972.

———. "San Ireneo y la Creación de la material." *Greg* 59 (1978): 71–127.

———. "Errores de los ebionitas (Analisis de Ireneo, Adversus haereses, V, 1, 3)." *Mar* 41 (1979): 147–70.

———. "San Ireneo y la doctrina de la reconciliación." *Greg* 61.1 (1980): 5–50.

———. "Cinco exegesis Ireneanas de Gen 2:17b *adv. haer*. V 23, 1–2." *Greg* (1981): 75–113.

———. "La Virgen María abogada de la virgen Eva; en torna a s. Ireneo *adv. haer*. V. 19, 1)." *Greg* 63 (1982): 453–506.

———. *Teología de San Ireneo: Comentario al Libro V del "Adversus haereses"*. Madrid: Biblioteca de Autroes Crisianos, 1985.

———. *Theología de San Ireneo: Comentario al libro V del Adversus Haereses*. 3 vols. Madrid: Biblioteca des Autores Cristianos, 1988.

———. "Gloria Dei vivens homo: Análisis de Ireneo, *adv. haer*. IV, 20, 1–7." *Greg* 73.2 (1992): 205–68.

———. "En torno a los Ebionitas." *Aug* 33 (1993): 315–37.

———. "El Espíritu en el bautismo de Jesús (en torno a san Ireneo)." *Greg* 76.4 (1995): 663–99.

———. "Sobre los 'Alogos' de san Ireneo (*adv haer* III, 11, 9)." *Greg* 76.1 (1995): 47–68.

———. "El signo de Jonás según Ireneo." *Greg* 77.4 (1996): 637–57.

———. *Theología de. San Ireneo: Comentario al libro IV del Adversus Haereses*. Madrid: Biblioteca des Autores Cristianos, 1996.

Osborn, E. "Reason and the Rule of Faith." In *The Making of Orthodoxy. Festschrift for Henry Chadwick*, 40–61. Edited by R. Williams. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989.

———. *Irenaeus of Lyons*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001.

Pagels, E. *The Johannine Gospel in Gnostic Exegesis*. New York: Abingdon Press, 1973.

———. *The Gnostic Paul: Gnostic Exegesis of the Pauline Letters*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1975.

———. "Exegesis and Exposition of the Genesis Creation Accounts in Selected Texts from Nag Hammadi." In *Nag Hammadi, Gnosticism, and Early Christianity*, 257–286. Edited by C. Hedrick and R. Hodgson. Wipf & Stock Publishers, 2005.

Painchaud, L. "The Use of Scripture in Gnostic Literature." *JECS* 4.2 (1996): 129–47.

Pelikan, J. *Mary Through the Centuries: Her place in the History of Culture*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1996.

Perkins, P. "Gnosticism and the Christian Bible." In *The Canon Debate*, 355–71. Edited by L.M. McDonald and J.A. Sanders. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2002.

———. Irenaeus and the Gnsotics: Rhetoric and Composition in Adversus Haereses Book One." *VC* 30 (1976): 103–200.

———. "Ordering the cosmos: Irenaeus and the Gnostics.' In *Nag Hammadi, Gnosticism, and Early Christianity*, ed. C.W. Hedrick, J. Hodgson, 221–38. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1986.

———. "Review of *Rolf Noormann, Irenäus als Paulusinterpret*." *CBQ* 58 (1996): 762–64.

Petersen, W.L. "Tatian the Assyrian." In *A Companion to Second-Century Christian 'Heretics,'* 125–58. Leiden: Brill, 2005.

Plagineux, J. "La doctrine mariale de saint Irénée." *RSR* 44 (1970): 179–89.

Pleše, Zlatko. *Poetics of the Gnostic Universe: Narrative and Cosmology in the Apocryphon of John*. Leiden: Brill, 2006.

Poffet, J.M. "Indices de reception de l'évangile de Jean au IIe siècle, avant Irénée." In *Communauté johannique et son histoire*, 305–26. Genova: Labor et Fides, 1990.

Poirier, P.H. "Pour une histoire da la lecture pneumatologique de Gn 2:7: Ouelques jalons jusqu'à Irénée de Lyon." *REA* 40 (1994): 1–22.

Porter, S.E. "The Use of the Old Testament in the New Testament: A Brief Comment on Method and Terminology." In *Early Christian interpretation of the scriptures of Israel: investigations and proposals*. Edited by Craig A. Evans, James A. Sanders. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997.

———. "Further Comments on the Use of the Old Testament in the New Testament," in *The Intertextuality of the Epistles: Explorations of Theory and Practice*, 98–110. Edited by T.L. Brodie, D.R. MacDonald, and S.E. Porter. Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2007.

———. "Allusions and Echoes." In *As it is Written: Studying Paul's use of Scripture*, 29–40. Leiden: Brill, 2008.

Pratscher, W. "The Second Epistle of Clement." In *The Apostolic Fathers: An Introduction*, 71–90. Waco, Texas: Baylor University Press, 2010.

Presley, S. "The Lost Sheep who is Found: Irenaeus' Intertextual Reading of Genesis 3 in *Adversus Haereses* 3.23.1–8." *StuPat* 51 (2011): 47–59.

———. "The Rule of Faith and Irenaeus's Demonstration of the order and connection of the scriptures." *ORA* (2010): 48–66.

———. "Irenaeus and the Exegetical Roots of Trinitarian Theology," in *Irenaeus: Life, Scripture, Legacy*. ed. P. Foster and S. Parvis. Minneapolis: Fortress Press (2012): 165–71.

Pretto, E. *La Lettera ai Romani, cc. 1–8, nell "*Adversus Haereses*" d'Ireneo*. Bari: Istituto di Litteratura Cristiana Antica, 1971.

Purves, J.G.M. "The Spirit and the Imago Dei: Reviewing the Anthropology of Irenaeus of Lyons." *EvQ* 68 (1996): 99–120.

Quasten, J. *Patrology*. Allen, TX: Christian Classics, 1983.

Rahner, H. *Symbole der Kirche*. Salzburg: Otto Muller, 1964.

Ramos-Lissón, D. "Le Role de la femme dans la théologie de saint Irénée." *StuPat* 21 (1989): 163–74.

Reventlow, H.G. *History of Biblical Interpretation*: *From the Old Testament to Origen*. Vol. 1. Atlanta, Society of Biblical Literature, 2009. Originally published: *Epochen*

der Bibelauslegung Band 1: Vom Alten Testament bis Origenes. Müchen: Verlag C.H. Beck, 1990.

Reynders, B. *Vocabulaire de la "Demonstration" et des fragments de saint Irénée*. Chevetogne: Editions de Chevetogne, 1958.

———. *Lexique comparé du texte grec et des versions latine, arménienne et syriaque de l'Adversus Haereses de saint Irénée*. Louvain: Peeters, 1963.

Rhee H. *Early Christian Literature: Christ and Culture in the Second and Third Centuries*. London: Routledge, 2005.

Robbins, G.A. *Genesis 1–3 in the History of Exegesis: Intrigue in the Garden*. Lewiston, NY: E. Mellen Press, 1988.

Robert, R. "Le témoignage d'Irénée sur la formation des évangiles." *RThom* 87.2 (1987): 243–59.

Roberts, C.H. and T.C. Skeat. *The Birth of the Codex*. London: Oxford University Press, 1983.

Robinson, J.M. *The Nag Hammadi Library in English*. San Francisco: Harper, 1991.

Roldanus, J. "L'héritage d'Abraham d'après Irénée." In *Text and Testimony: Essays on New Testament and Apocryphal Literature in Honour of A.F.J. Klijn*, 212–24. Edited by T. Baarda. Kampen: Kok, 1998.

Rondeau, M.-J. *Les commentateurs patristiques du Psautier* (*IIIe–Ve siècls*). *2 Vol*. Rome: Oriental Institute, 1982, 1985.

Rousseau, A. "L'Eternité des peines de l'enfer et l'immortalité naturelle de l' âme selon saint Irénée." *NRT* 99 (1977) 834–64.

Rudolph, K. *Gnosis: The Nature and History of Gnosticism*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1983.

———. "Bibel und Gnosis zum Verständnis Jüdisch-Biblischer Texte in Der Gnostischen Literatur, vornehmlich aus Nag Hammadi." In *Gnosis Und Spätantike Religionsgeschichte: Gesammelte Aufsätze*, 190–209. Leiden: Brill, 1996.

Ruiz, G. " 'Ma puissance se déploie dans la faiblesse' (2 Cor 12:9): An Interprétation d'Irénée de Lyon." In *Recherches et tradition: Mélanges patristiques offerts à Henri Crouzel, S.J. sous la direction d'A. Dupleix*, 259–69. Paris: Neauchesne, 1992.

———. "L'enfance d'Adam selon saint Irénée de Lyon." *BLE* 89 (1998): 97–115.

Sagnard, F.M.M. *La gnose valentinienne et le témoignage de saint Irénée*. Paris: J. Vrin, 1947.

Sanders, J.N. *The Fourth Gospel in the Early Church* (*Its Origin & Influence on Christian Theology up to Irenaeus*). Cambridge: University Press, 1943.

Schmidt, W.A. *Die Kirche bei Irenäus: akademische Abhandlung*. Helsingfors, 1934.

Schoedel, W.R. "Philosophy and Rhetoric in the *Adversus Haereses* of Irenaeus." *VC* 12 (1959): 22–32.

———. "Theological Method in Irenaeus (*Adversus haereses* 2.25–28)." *JTS* 35 (1984): 31–49.

Seeberg, R. *Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte*. Lepzig: 1908.

Sesboüe, B. *Tout Récapituler dans le Christ: Christologie et sotériologie d'Irénée de lyon*. Paris: Desclée, 2000.

Shotwell, W.A. *The Biblical Exegesis of Justin Martyr*. London: SPCK, 1965.

Simonetti, M. *Biblical Interpretation in the Early Church: An Historical Introduction to Patristic Exegesis*. Edited by A. Bergquist and M. Bockmuehl. Translated by John A. Hughes. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1994.

———. "Per Typical as vera: Note sull' esegesi di Ireneo." *VetChr* 18 (1981): 357–82.

Siniscalco, M. "La parabola del figlio prodigo (Lc 15:11–32) in Ireneo." *SMSR* 38.2 (1967): 5326–53.

Skeat, T.C. "Irenaeus and the Four-Gospel canon." *NovT* 34 (1992): 194–99.

Slusser, M. "The Exegetical Roots of Trinitarian Theology." *TS* 49 (1988) 461–476.

———. "How much did Irenaeus learn from Justin?" *StuPat* 40 (2006): 515–20.

Smith, C.R. "Chiliasm and recapitulation in the theology of Ireneus [sic]." *VC* 48 (1994): 313–331.

Smith, D.A. "Irenaeus and the Baptism of Jesus." *TS* 58 (1997): 618–42.

Smith, J.P. "Hebrew Christian Midrash in Ireaneus *Epid*, 43." *Bib* 38 (1957): 24–34.

Stanton, G. "Jesus Traditions and Gospels in Justin Martyr and Irenaeus." In *The Biblical Canons*. Edited by J.M. Auwers and J.H. de Jonge. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2003.

Stead, M.R. *The Intertextuality of Zechariah 1–8*. New York: T&T Clark, 2009.

Steenberg, M.C. "Cosmic Anthropology: Gen 1–11 in Irenaeus of Lyons with special reference to Justin, Theophilus and select Gnostic contemporaries." Unpublished dissertation. University of Oxford, 2003.

———. "Children in Paradise: Adam and Eve as 'Infants' in Irenaeus of Lyons." *JECS* 12.1 (2004): 1–35.

———. "The Role of Mary as Co-recapitulator in St. Irenaeus of Lyons." *VC* 58 (2004): 117–37.

———. "To Test or Preserve?: The Prohibition of Gen 2:16–17 in the Thought of Two Second-Century Exegetes." *Greg* 86 (2005): 723–41.

———. *Irenaeus on Creation*. Leiden: Brill, 2008.

———. *Of God and Man*. New York: T&T Clark, 2009.

Thomassen, E. *The Spiritual Seed: The Church of the 'Valentinians'.* Leiden: Brill, 2006.

Tiessen, T.L. *Irenaeus on the Salvation of the Unevangelized*. London: The Scarecrow Press, 1993.

———. "Gnosticism and Heresy: The Response of Irenaeus." In *Hellenization Revisited*, 339–59. Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1994.

Todorov, T. *Mikhail Bakhtin: the dialogical principle*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1984.

Torrance, T.F. "Kerygmatic Proclamation of the Gospel: The Demonstration of Apostolic Preaching." In *Divine Meaning: Studies in Patristic Hermeneutics*, 56–74. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1995.

Tortelli, K.M. "Some methods of interpretation in St Irenaeus." *VetCh* 30 (1993): 123–32.

Tosaus Abadía, J.P. *Cristo y el universo: estudio lingüístico y temático de Ef 1:10b, en Efesios y en la obra de Ireneo de Lión*. Univ Pontificia de Salamanca, 1995.

Tremblay, R. "La signification d' Abraham dans l'oeuvre d'Irénée de Lyon." *Aug* 18 (1978): 434–57.

———. "Le martyre selon saint Irénée de Lyon." *StuM* 16 (1978): 167–89.

———. *La manifestation et la vision de Dieu selon saint Irénée de Lyon*. Münster: Aschendorff, 1978.

———. *Irénée de Lyon: "L'empreinte des doigts de Dieu"*. Rome: Editiones Academiae Alfonsianae, 1979.

Tripp, D. "The Original Sequence of Irenaeus '*Adversus Haereses*' 1: A Suggestion." *SecCen* 8 (1991): 157–62.

Tull (Willey), P. *Remember the Former Things: The Recollection of Previous Texts in Second Isaiah*. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1997.

Turner, J.D. "Time and History in Sethian Gnosticism." In *For the Children, Perfect Instruction*, 203–14. Edited by H.-G Bethge. Leiden: Brill, 2002.

Valle, G. *A Study in Anti-Gnostic Polemics: Irenaeus, Hippolytus, and Epiphanius*. Waterloo, Ontario: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 1981.

Van Unnik, W.C. *Newly Discovered Gnostic Writings: A preliminary servey of the Nag Hammadi find*. London: SCM Press, 1960.

———. "An interesting document of Second Century Theological Discussion (Irenaeus, *Adv. Haer*. 1.10.3)." *VC* 31 (1977): 196–228.

———. "Theological Speculation and its Limits." In *Early Christian Literature and the Classical Tradition, In Honorem Robert M. Grant*, 33–43. Paris: Beauchesne, 1979.

Van Wolde, E. "Texts in Dialogue with Texts: Intertextuality in the Ruth and Tamar Narratives." *BibInt* 5.1 (1997): 1–28.

Voelz, J.W. "Multiple Signs and Double Texts: Elements of Intertextuality." In *Intertextuality In Biblical Writing: Essays in honour of Bas van Iersel*. Uitgeversmaatschappij J.H. Kok: Kampen, 1989.

Vogel, J. "The Haste of Sin, the Slowness of Salvation: An Interpretation of Irenaeus and the Fall and Redemption." *AThR* 89 (2007): 443–59.

Vogt, R.J. "Die Geltung dea Alten Testaments bei Irenäus von Lyon." *ThQ* 160 (1980): 17–28.

Wanke, D. *Das Kreuz Christi bei Irenäus von Lyon*. New York: De Gruyter, 2000.

Watson, F. "Is there a Story in these Texts?" In *Narrative dynamics in Paul: a critical assessment*, 231–39. Edited by B. Longenecker. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox, 2002.

Weinandy, Thomas. "St. Irenaeus and the Image Dei: The Importance of Being Human." *Logos* 6.4 (2003): 15–34.

Weiss, Friedrich. *Frühes Christentum und Gnosis: Eine rezeptionsgeschichtliche Studie*. Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 2008.

Wendt, H.H. *Die christlich Lehre von der menschlichen Volkommenhiet*. Göttingen, 1882.

Werner, J. *Der Paulinismus des Irenaeus*. Leipzig, 1889.

Wilchen, J. "Irenaeus' Doctrine of a 'living man.' " *ACR* 59 (1982): 74–82.

Williams, J. *Biblical Interpretation in the Gnostic Gospel of Truth From Hag Hammadi*. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1988.

Williams, M.A. *Rethinking "Gnosticism": An Argument for Dismantling a Dubious Category*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1996.

Wilson, R.M. "The Early History of the Exegesis of Gen. 1:26." *StuPat* 1 (1957): 420–37.

Wingren, G. *Man and the Incarnation. A study in the Biblical Theology of Irenaeus*. Translated by R. Mackenzie. Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1959.

Wood, A.S. "Eschatology of Irenaeus." *EvQ* 41 (1969): 30–41.

Xintaras, Z.C. "Man, the Image of God: According to the Greek Fathers." *GOTR* 1.1 (1954): 48–62.

Young, F. *The Art of Performance: Towards A Theology of Holy Scripture*. London: Darton, Longman and Todd, 1990.

———. *Biblical Exegesis and the Formation of Christian Culture*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1997.

Index of Scriptures

References are in accordance with modern English translations.

Genesis

1 51, 69, 75, 93, 150, 243, 260
1–2 36, 37n137, 38, 57, 66, 74n3, 76, 81, 83, 86, 92, 93, 96, 104, 129, 131, 136, 138, 159, 169, 171, 174, 175, 178, 191, 229, 236, 237, 238, 242, 247, 248, 252, 258, 260
1–3 *passim*
1–11 34, 35, 35n125, 36, 45
1:1 35n127, 55, 57, 58, 59, 64, 65, 74, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82n30, 86, 88n3, 89, 90, 91, 92, 129, 248, 254, 258, 259, 263, 264
1:1–2 242
1:1–5 41n146
1:1–27 56, 71, 245
1:1–2:4 82, 83
1:2 37, 55, 56, 63, 64, 69, 243, 263
1:2–3 63
1:3 63, 74, 74n5, 75, 76, 86, 86n49, 149, 149n66, 150, 150n69, 168, 170, 242, 253, 253n13, 260, 263, 265
1:3–12 56
1:3–25 37
1:3–27 55, 242
1:4 93
1:5 218, 221, 221n186, 223, 233, 258, 267
1:6 74n5, 75, 86n49, 150, 253n13
1:6–25 56n44, 227, 229, 267
1:7–8 63, 64, 263
1:9 74n5, 75, 86n49, 92, 93, 131, 150, 253n13, 254, 259, 264
1:10 93
1:11 75, 92, 93, 131, 254, 259, 264
1:11–12 229n215
1:12 93
1:14 75
1:14–19 55
1:14–27 56
1:20 75
1:24 75
1:24–25 229n215
1:24–31 218, 221, 222, 223, 267
1:26 15n41, 32, 35n127, 36, 36n133, 37, 38, 38n138, 47n8, 49, 51, 52, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 64, 65, 66, 66n83, 69, 70, 71, 75, 78, 82, 96, 97, 103, 106, 107, 108, 116, 117, 118, 119, 127, 128, 129, 130, 132, 135, 135n2, 136, 137, 138, 138n17, 144, 145, 146, 147, 148, 150n69, 151, 152, 157, 158, 159, 160, 161, 161n111, 161n112, 162, 163, 164, 165, 165n125, 166, 168, 169, 170, 173, 173n2, 174, 174n5, 175, 176, 178, 179, 180, 181, 185, 186, 187, 190, 191, 192, 194, 201n118, 202, 203, 204, 205, 206, 206n135, 208, 209n145, 215, 216, 225, 226, 226n204, 230, 232, 232n227, 233, 234, 235, 236, 237, 238, 239, 243, 244, 247, 248, 251, 252, 253, 254, 256, 257, 259, 260, 262, 263, 264, 265, 266, 267
1:26–27 78
1:26–3:24 40
1:27 61, 78, 135n2, 247
1:27–28 61, 227, 228, 229, 263, 267
1:27–30 229, 237, 249

1:28 78, 79, 80, 86, 101, 109, 110, 111, 123n115, 127, 128, 128n136, 129, 132, 137, 138, 139, 140, 140n27, 140n28, 141, 159, 160, 161, 161n111, 162, 163, 168, 170, 213, 248, 253, 259, 260, 263, 264, 265, 266
1:30 227, 228, 229, 267
1:31 53, 55, 71, 244, 263
1:31–2:1 230, 267
1:31–2:2 231
2 51
2–3 188, 243
2–4 153, 169
2:1 83, 84, 87, 225n196, 264
2:1–2 169, 225, 226, 233, 234, 237, 258
2:1–3 256
2:2 227
2:2–3 143, 144, 170, 171, 225, 226, 227, 228, 230, 237, 246, 247, 249, 259, 265, 267
2:5 49, 50, 50n21, 51, 96, 97, 97n30, 98, 103, 104, 130, 131, 153n83, 164, 165, 165n125, 200, 216, 251, 254, 257, 263, 264, 266, 267
2:5–7 69, 130, 243
2:6 50n21, 92, 98, 254, 259, 264
2:6–17 223
2:7 32, 36, 36n133, 37, 38, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 61n66, 65, 66, 66n83, 67, 69, 70, 71, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 89, 90, 91, 96n26, 98, 99, 100, 101, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, 118n96, 119, 127, 128, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, 135, 135n2, 136, 137, 138, 138n17, 142, 143, 144, 145, 146, 146n53, 147, 151, 152, 153, 154, 155, 155n90, 156, 157, 159, 160, 161, 161n112, 162, 163, 164, 165, 166, 168, 169, 170, 173n2, 174, 175, 176, 177, 178, 179, 181, 182, 183, 185, 186, 187, 188, 189, 192, 193, 194, 195, 196, 198, 199, 200, 200n112, 201, 202, 204, 206, 209, 209n145, 212, 215, 216n170, 225, 226, 226n204, 230, 231, 232, 233, 234, 235, 236, 237, 238, 243, 244, 247, 248, 251, 252, 253, 254, 255, 256, 257, 258, 259, 260, 261, 262, 263, 264, 265, 266, 267
2:7a 51, 128, 146n53
2:7ab 146n53
2:7b 51, 128, 146n53
2:7c 146n53
2:8 81, 81n27, 82, 86, 153n83, 182, 183, 184, 212, 213, 236, 258, 261, 263, 266, 267
2:9 121, 122, 131, 255, 265
2:10 55, 56, 92, 263
2:15 80, 81, 86, 182, 183, 184, 255, 258, 263, 266
2:16 65, 66, 209, 212, 213, 217, 217n172, 263, 267
2:16–17 32, 36n130, 40, 68, 89n3, 93, 95, 119, 213, 214, 218, 219, 220, 221, 221n186, 222, 223, 236, 261, 263, 264, 267
2:17 33, 60n58, 67, 70, 208, 209, 210, 212, 213, 214, 217, 218, 229, 233, 244, 258, 263, 267
2:17b 32, 32n114
2:17–18 157, 266
2:22 65, 66, 70, 216n170, 244, 263
2:24 106, 112, 112n82, 113, 114, 264
2:25 109, 110, 111, 112n82, 253, 264
3 37n137, 69, 89, 102, 115n89, 116, 118, 124, 125, 126, 130, 139, 184, 215, 233, 258
3–4 248
3:1 47, 67

3:1–2 74n3
3:1–5 102, 120, 125, 135, 136, 170, 175, 212, 217, 218, 261, 265, 267
3:1–6 64, 65, 67, 68, 70, 97, 124, 125, 135n2, 151, 152, 166, 167, 173n2, 174, 175, 211, 212, 222, 224, 233, 236, 244, 251, 263, 265, 266, 267
3:1–8 101, 130, 264
3:2 213, 214n163
3:2–3 214, 218
3:3 212, 213, 214, 267
3:4 219
3:4–5 219
3:5 102, 116, 117, 118, 119, 124, 125, 130, 159, 163, 164, 214, 248, 251, 252, 257, 264, 266
3:5–8 132, 250
3:6 89n3, 106, 109, 110, 114, 132, 139, 167, 176, 177, 201, 202, 202n119, 204, 207, 208, 209, 210, 211, 212, 215, 216, 216n170, 229, 236, 237, 252, 253, 264, 265, 266, 267
3:6–9 203
3:7 67, 70, 116, 117, 120, 244, 250, 263, 265
3:7–8 120, 126, 130, 248, 257
3:7–9 203
3:7–13 117
3:8 81n28, 116, 117, 120, 135n2, 203, 208, 209, 211, 212, 234, 235, 238, 250, 256, 265, 267
3:8–9 202, 267
3:9 33n117, 139, 170, 203, 203n127, 236, 252, 260, 265
3:9–11 120, 121, 265
3:10 116, 117, 120, 130, 248, 250, 257
3:13 116, 117, 120, 130, 248, 250, 257
3:14 116, 117, 119, 130, 215, 224n191, 248, 256, 257, 259, 264
3:14–15 167
3:14–16 122
3:14–19 126
3:15 32, 32n114, 33, 89n3, 116, 117, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 130, 131, 166, 167, 215, 216, 217, 237, 248, 249, 253, 255, 257, 265, 266, 267
3:15a 122
3:15b 122, 123
3:16 116, 117, 119, 123, 130, 248, 257, 264
3:16–17 117
3:17–18 152, 154, 154n86, 169, 265
3:17–19 116, 117, 119, 130, 248, 257, 259, 264
3:18 47n9
3:19 59, 60, 60n58, 61, 69, 89n3, 119, 121, 122, 173n2, 188, 189, 190, 194, 204, 235, 236, 243, 244, 252, 255, 263, 265, 267
3:20 63, 65, 66, 67, 70, 244, 263
3:21 37, 49, 51, 52, 57, 69, 70, 116, 117, 120, 121, 130, 242, 243, 244, 248, 250, 257, 263, 265
3:22 89n3, 214
3:23 67, 176, 177, 182, 183, 184, 185, 214, 236, 263, 266
3:23–24 116, 117, 121, 126, 130, 248, 257, 265, 266
3:24 174, 266
3:27 263
4 68, 116, 154
4:7–8 116, 117, 120, 126, 130, 248, 250, 257, 265
4:7–11 117
4:9 116, 117, 120, 126, 130, 248, 250, 257, 265
4:10 154n87, 196, 234, 255, 267
4:11 116, 117, 120, 130, 248, 250, 257, 265
5:2–32 236
5:3–32 182, 184
5:5 219n180, 220, 222, 223, 267
5:24 182, 184, 234, 236, 256, 266
6 95, 139, 169, 265

6–50 56, 263
6:2 66, 263
6:2–5 156, 266
6:13–16 142n37
6:17 90, 264
7–8 82, 83
9:5–6 196, 234, 255, 267
9:9 266
9:8–16 95, 264
9:27 229n214, 230, 230n217, 267
9:29 182, 184, 236
12 155
12:1 90, 264
14:3 20n62
14:18–20 79, 263
17:9–11 143n42
18 139, 265
27:27–29 237, 249
28:12 127n130

Exodus
3 139, 265
3:4 90, 264
3:6 58, 59, 71, 260, 263
3:10 90, 264
19–20 95, 264
20:1 90, 264
20:11 82n30
20:12 170, 171, 249, 259, 265
24–26 56
24–36 56, 263
25:11 164, 165, 266
26:1 55, 263
28:17 55, 263
31:13 143, 144, 169, 170, 171, 249, 259, 265
36:8 55, 263

Numbers
12:7 76, 242, 263
21:4–9 135n2
21:8 229n216

Deuteronomy
10:16 143n42
18 90n7
22:23–24 106, 110, 111, 112n82, 253, 264
32:4 131

Joshua
3–4 57, 263

1 Samuel
9:22 57, 263
20:1–42 57, 263

2 Samuel
4:18 263
6:5 20n62
6:14 20n62
23:13 57, 263

1 Kings
11:21 57, 263
18:31 57, 263

2 Kings
2:11 182, 184, 234, 236, 256, 266, 267
6:1–7 211, 267
12:8 20n62

Job
3:16 79, 80, 86, 248, 263
10:8 78, 263

Psalms
20:5(21:4) 84, 84n44, 86, 87, 247, 255, 264
21:10a(22:10a) 31n106
21:30(22:29) 188, 266
23(24):1 156, 266
31(32):1–2 210, 238, 267
32(33):6 35n125, 35n127, 58, 71, 76, 128, 132, 148n63, 260, 261, 263, 265
32(33):9 35n127, 84, 86, 87, 242, 247, 253, 255, 263
44:12(45:11) 164, 165, 166, 266
44:17(45:16) 106, 110, 114, 253, 264
68:27(69:26) 108, 132, 255, 264
79(80:1):2 21n69, 94
78(79):10 16, 16n50
81(82):6 164
81(82):6–7 159, 163, 266
81(82):7 163, 164
89(90):4 222, 223, 225, 231, 233, 234, 256, 258, 267

90(91):13 116, 123, 124, 126, 130, 131, 249, 255, 257, 265
103(104):30 228, 267
110(111):10 116n94
117:20(118:19) 231, 231n221, 267
118(119):73 78, 86, 263
131(132):14 231, 231n221, 267
145(146):6 82n30
148:5 76n9, 86n50
148:5–6 84n42, 247
151:2 20n62

Proverbs
1:7 116, 120, 121, 130, 250, 257, 265
3:19–20 15n41, 147, 148, 170, 260, 265
8:22 148
8:22–25 15n41, 147, 148, 170, 260, 265
8:27–31 15n41, 147, 148, 170, 260, 265
8:30 20n62, 128, 132, 260, 265
9:10 116n94
17:7 20n62
19:14 20n62

Ecclesiastes
7:14 20n62

Isaiah
2:3–4 151, 152, 153, 154, 169, 265
6:8 90, 264
6:11–12 229n214
7:2 20n62
7:11 99, 100, 131, 254, 256, 264
7:12 99, 100, 264
7:14 99, 100, 151, 152, 169, 178, 178n20, 251, 264, 265
11:6–9 228, 229, 237, 249, 267
25:8 192, 266
26:19 229n214
30:25–26 229, 229n214, 267
31:9–32:1 229n214
40:11 114, 114n88, 264
40:12 35n125
42:5 192, 193, 234, 238, 255, 262, 266
43:5–7 142, 143, 248, 265
45:5 50, 52, 65, 65n82, 66, 67, 70, 244, 263
46:9 65n81, 70n99, 244n4
54:11–14 229n214
57:1 154, 169, 265
57:16 192, 193, 234, 238, 255, 262, 266
58:14 229n214, 230, 267
65:18–22 229n214
65:25 228, 229, 237, 249, 267

Jeremiah
1:5 201, 201n117, 234, 236, 252, 255, 267
1:7 90, 264
16:14–15 229n214
23:7–8 229n214
23:29 211, 267
31:10 229n214

Ezekiel
1:6 92n13
1:10 92n13
2:3 90, 264
20:12 143, 144, 169
23:42 20n62
28:25–26 229n214
37:7 20n62
37:12–14 229n214

Daniel
3:5 20n62
3:19–25 182, 184, 236, 266
7:27 229n214
12:13 229n214

Jonah
1:9 101, 102, 132, 250, 264
1:17 101, 102, 264
2 182, 184, 236, 266
2:1–2 101, 132, 250, 264
2:2 102
3:1 101, 132, 250, 264
3:8–9 101, 102, 132, 250, 264

Nahum
3:8 20n62

Zechariah
1–8 41n146

Malachi
2:10 147, 169, 171, 253, 259, 265

Matthew
1:16 123n117
1:23 99
1:23–25 111, 264
2:43 152, 169
3:9 229n214
3:10 155n90, 211, 267
3:12 79, 80, 86, 227, 248, 263, 267
4:2 108, 132, 217, 255, 264
4:2–10 216, 237, 252, 267
4:3 217, 252
4:6 217
4:8 217
4:10 217
5:5 30n101, 106, 107, 108, 131, 254, 264
5:39 154, 169, 265
5:45 156, 157, 266
6:12 209, 210, 223, 267
6:19 143, 144, 170, 171, 249, 259, 265
7:9 191, 192, 266
7:19 155n90
8:11 227, 228n210, 237, 249, 267
9:2 209, 210, 235, 238, 267
10:16 211, 212, 267
11:23–24 155, 155n90, 266
11:27 29n101, 82, 137, 137n12, 147, 148, 169, 171, 253, 259, 263, 265
12:5 229n214
12:29 116, 118, 119, 126, 127, 130, 133, 151n73, 152, 169, 217, 251, 252, 256, 257, 261, 264, 265, 267
12:39–40 101, 102, 132, 250, 251, 264
12:41–42 151, 151n73, 152, 169, 251, 265
13 166
13:17 141, 168, 265
13:24–30 166, 266
13:25 167, 191, 192, 266
13:36–43 166, 266
13:38 237, 249
13:41 167
13:42 167
15:13 213, 267
15:14 212, 213, 267
16:6 177n16
16:11 177n16
16:27 227, 267
17:1 54, 71, 244, 263
18:12–14 116n92, 265
18:19 20n62
19:6 106, 112, 112n82, 113, 113n82, 114, 264
19:7–8 135n2
19:29 228, 237, 249, 267
19:30 106, 110, 112n82, 114, 253, 264
20:2 20n62
20:6 112n82
20:13 20n62
20:16 106, 110, 114, 253, 264
21–28 143n40
21:19 155n90
21:33–43 155, 157, 169, 266
22:2–10 264
22:3 92n14
22:7 156, 157, 266
22:29 151, 265
22:29–32 58n53
22:32 82, 82n30, 83, 263
22:43 151, 151n73, 251, 265
23:35 116, 196
23:35–36 234, 255, 267
23:37 157
24:28 142, 143, 248, 265
24:42 155, 266
25:21 141, 265
25:41 90, 91, 91n10, 116, 119, 130, 166, 167, 224, 224n193, 256, 257, 259, 261, 264, 266, 267
26:27–28 228, 267
26:29 231, 267
26:38 108, 132, 255, 264
27:45 54, 71, 244, 263
27:62 221, 223

Mark
8:15 177n16
10:9 113n82
15:42 221, 223

Luke
1:3 178n20
1:27–34 111, 264
1:30–35 212, 267
1:34 110n73
1:35 176, 177, 178, 179, 236, 251, 260, 261, 266
1:38 110, 132, 253, 264
1:78 210, 267
2:5 123n117
2:7 212, 267
2:40 160n104
3:8 229n214
3:23 108
3:23–38 109, 110, 253, 264
3:38 108
4:6 218, 267
5:20 209n147
5:24 210, 267
5:36 20n62
7:35–36 155, 266
10:19 116, 122, 123, 124, 126, 130, 131, 255, 257
10:19–20 123, 249, 265
11:21–22 116n93
11:50–51 234, 255n117
12:1 177n116
12:37–38 229n214
14:12–13 228, 237, 249, 267
15:4 100, 118n96, 131, 254
15:4–5 100
15:4–6 131, 194, 201, 201n115, 236, 252, 264, 267
15:4–7 116, 118, 124, 126, 252, 265
15:5–6 100, 256
15:24 100, 264
15:32 100, 264
15:33 54n37
15:47 117, 264
16:10 84, 86, 87, 247, 255, 264
17:2–6 155, 169, 266
19:10 116, 118, 197, 200, 201, 201n115, 234, 236, 252, 255, 264, 267
21:34–35 155, 266
22:44 108, 132, 255, 264
23:54 221, 223

John
1:1–3 35n125, 35n127
1:2–3 96, 264
1:3 35n127, 58, 71, 75, 76, 86, 87, 103, 104, 107, 131, 132, 145, 147, 149, 150, 168, 170, 242, 251, 253, 254, 260, 261, 263, 264, 265
1:10 96, 264
1:11 180, 180n29, 236, 251, 266
1:13 176, 179, 266
1:14 52, 53, 71, 96, 97, 131, 147, 148, 152, 152n76, 169, 171, 205, 206, 206n135, 234, 236, 237, 251, 252, 254, 255, 263, 264, 265, 267
1:18 93, 174, 264, 266
2 92n14, 131, 260
2:1 92, 93, 254, 264
2:1–6 93
2:6 92, 254
2:10 93, 264
4:6 108, 132, 255, 264
4:14 155n90
4:31–38 153n80
4:37 153, 153n80, 154, 169, 265
5:1–15 199, 267
5:14 236, 252
5:25 231, 231n221, 267
5:28–29 231, 231n221, 267
5:31 137, 265
5:39–40 139, 170, 265
5:46 139, 265
6:11 92, 93, 254
8:44 32, 102, 173n2, 175, 216n169, 218, 219, 223, 233, 258, 266, 267
8:58 142n36
9 197, 199, 203, 203n127, 204, 205, 207, 234, 235, 238
9:1 234, 255
9:1–2 199
9:1–7 33n117, 198, 201, 215, 233, 235, 236, 252, 258, 267
9:2 199

John (*cont.*)
9:3 199, 200, 201, 202, 203, 237, 252
9:6 200, 202, 203, 204, 237, 252, 267
9:7 202, 203n127, 237, 252
9:12 203n127
9:35–41 203n127
9:37–38 202, 267
11:35 108, 132, 255, 264
12:24 189n72
14:2 101, 132, 254, 264
15:9–10 247
15:16 142, 265
17:5 247
17:24 142, 248, 265
19:14 54, 71, 244, 263
19:34 108, 132, 255, 264
20:20 188, 235, 255, 266
20:24 57, 263

Acts
1:7 116, 118, 264
2:17 192, 193, 194, 234, 255, 266
4:14 82n30
4:15 82n30
4:24 82n30
5:9 20n62
8:17–19 160, 266
8:18–24 59
10:42 147, 148, 171, 265
14:15–17 21
15:15 20n62

Romans
1–8 3, 3n7, 28
1:3–4 106, 107, 264
1:20 28n94
3:4 219n179
5 98
5–6 96
5:10 208, 267
5:12 33n120, 97, 98, 98n34, 103, 104, 105, 116, 123, 130, 131, 177, 178n23, 249, 251, 254, 257, 264, 265
5:14 98n32, 108, 109, 264
5:17 116, 123, 130, 249, 257, 265
5:19 97, 98n34, 103, 104, 105, 131, 208n143, 251, 254, 264
5:20 116, 124, 265
6:2 116, 130, 257
6:6 178n22, 197n102
6:7 122, 265
6:10 116, 122, 126, 130, 131, 255, 265
6:11 192, 266
6:12–13 197n102
6:19 197n102
7:5 197n102
7:7 98n32
7:11–13 98n32
8 29n97
8:9 190, 238, 262, 266
8:11 188, 189, 235, 255, 266
8:15 190, 238, 262, 266
8:21 231, 267
8:29 135n2, 185, 185n54, 186, 188, 189, 232n226, 234, 238, 248, 266
8:36 143, 144, 170, 171, 249, 259, 265
9–11 29n97
11:17 191, 192, 266
11:34 174, 266
12:3 214, 236, 261, 267
12:4 101, 132, 254, 264
13:1–6 156, 266

1 Corinthians
1:29 102, 132, 250, 251, 264
2:2 247
2:6 186, 187, 187n61, 234, 248, 266
2:9 99, 231, 267
2:11 187
2:14 186n61
2:14–15 186n61
2:15 151, 186, 186n61, 187, 234, 248, 265, 266
3:1 187n62
3:2 160
3:2–3 159, 160, 266
5:6–7 177, 236, 261
5:7 176, 177, 177n16, 178, 236, 266

6:12 158, 266
6:14 188, 189, 266
6:20 196n96
7:5 20n62
8:1 16, 78, 86, 247, 263
12:7 187n62
12:11 127, 265
12:12 101, 132, 254, 264
12:20 101, 132, 254
12:28 127, 265
13:12 190, 238, 262, 266
15:13–21 196n96
15:20 100, 101, 132, 264
15:22 116, 176, 177, 178, 192, 194, 266
15:23 101, 132, 254, 264
15:26 116, 123, 124, 130, 249, 257, 265
15:32 196n96
15:36 188, 189, 266
15:42 189
15:42–44 188, 189, 235, 255, 266
15:43–44 189, 190
15:43a 190
15:43b 189
15:44 189, 235, 255
15:45 105, 192, 193, 194, 234, 236, 238, 255, 262
15:45–46 192, 193, 236, 266
15:45–47 33n120, 105, 264
15:46 108, 109, 186n61, 264
15:46–47 263
15:47 50, 52, 57, 63, 69, 70, 105, 116, 118, 126, 243, 244, 252, 263, 264
15:48 50
15:50 24, 28n97, 191, 192, 195n92, 196, 197, 197n102, 234, 255, 267
15:53 159, 163, 164, 181, 182, 235, 261, 266
15:54 193, 196
15:54–55 116, 123, 124, 130, 249, 257, 265

2 Corinthians
1:3 82
3:3 196n96
4:10–11 196n96
4:18 58, 263
5:4 190, 190n76, 193, 196n96, 266
6:15 20n62
11:3 135, 137, 170, 216n169, 224n190, 265
11:31 82n30
12:2–3 81
12:2–4 81, 263
12:3–4 258
12:4 80, 81, 86, 182, 184, 234, 255, 256, 266
12:7–9 181, 266
12:9 29n97, 181, 182, 183

Galatians
1:15 201, 234, 237, 252, 255, 267
1:15–16 192, 195, 266
3:16 116, 122, 123, 123n117, 126, 130, 131, 249, 255, 257, 265
3:19 116, 122, 123, 123n117, 126, 131, 216, 216n169, 237, 249, 255, 265, 267
4:4 106, 107, 166, 167, 216, 216n169, 237, 249, 253, 264, 266, 267

Ephesians
1:3 58, 59, 71, 82n30, 260, 263
1:5 116, 118, 264
1:7 175, 175n11, 180, 180n32, 197n102, 236, 252, 266
1:9 116, 118, 264
1:10 33n120, 95, 96, 97, 103, 104, 131, 138, 168, 176, 214, 215, 221, 223, 233, 236, 251, 258, 261, 264, 265, 266, 267
1:10b 28n97
1:11–12 174, 235, 248, 266
1:14 127n130, 190, 238, 262, 266
1:21 65, 70, 82, 263
1:22 101, 132, 254, 264
2:8 127, 256, 265
2:13 197n102
2:14–15 197n102
3:6 232n226

Ephesians (*cont.*)
3:14 82n30
3:18 35n125, 211, 267
3:21 35n125
4:3 113n82
4:5–6 149, 150, 168, 170, 260, 265
4:6 63, 70, 147, 169, 171, 211, 244, 253, 259, 263, 265, 267
4:9 100, 118n96, 131, 254
4:9–10 131, 256, 264
4:15–16 149, 150, 168, 170, 260, 265
4:16 25, 101, 113n82, 132, 150, 162n115, 253, 254, 264
4:22 178n22
4:25 158, 266
4:29 158, 266
5:8 158, 266
6:12 65, 70, 263

Philippians
1:22 194, 266
2:8 208, 237, 252, 267
2:13 179n25
3:9 101, 132, 254, 264
3:10–11 196n96
3:20 186n57, 196n96
3:21 186n57, 196n96, 232n226

Colossians
1:3 82n30
1:14 175n11, 180n32
1:15 232n226
1:16 58, 71, 261, 263
1:18 101, 106, 110, 114, 132, 147, 148, 171, 232n226, 253, 254, 264, 265
1:19 179n25
1:21 180n30
1:21–22 197, 267
1:22 197n102, 234, 255
2:7 127n130
2:11 143n42
2:14 210, 238, 267
2:16 61, 261
2:19 25, 101, 113, 132, 149, 150, 162n115, 168, 170, 197n102, 253, 254, 260, 265
3:5 194
3:9 178n22, 194, 195
3:9–10 194, 195, 266
3:10 194
3:14 113

1 Thessalonians
5:23 187, 234, 248, 266

2 Thessalonians
1:5 155n90
2:3–4 225

1 Timothy
2:5 209, 267
2:6 175, 236, 252, 266

2 Timothy
1:10 116, 118, 252, 364
2:23 135, 265
3:7 212, 267

Titus
3:5 201, 237, 252, 267

Hebrews
1:3 82, 87, 260, 263
3:5 76, 85, 242, 263
5:9 110, 132, 253, 264
5:12–14 159, 160, 266
7:7 79, 80, 86, 248, 263
7:19 159n99
11:19 181, 182, 235, 261, 266

James
1:18 174, 175, 175n7
1:22 174, 266

1 Peter
1:2 174, 175, 235, 248, 266
1:3 82n30
1:12 232, 232n225, 267
2:16 158, 266
2:22 197n102
2:23 147, 148, 171, 265
3:20 57, 263
5:10 162n114

2 Peter
3:8 222, 223, 225, 231, 256, 258, 267

1 John
1:6 174, 266

Revelation
1:15 20
3:7 147, 148, 171, 265
4:7 21, 92, 94, 264
5:2 148, 265
5:9 148, 265
12:9 116, 123, 124, 126, 131, 216n169, 224n190, 249, 255, 265
12:15 224n190
13:2–18 225
13:3 229n216
13:12 229n216
13:14–18 225, 267
13:18 225
19:9 92n14
19:20 227, 267
20:2 116, 123, 124, 126, 130, 131, 249, 255, 257, 265
20:5–6 231, 267
20:6 229n214

Shepard of Hermes (*Mand*)
1 82, 87, 145, 147, 169, 253, 260, 263, 265
1:1 58, 71, 262

2 Maccabees
14:22 20n62

3 Maccabees
1:19 20n62

4 Maccabees
7:7 20n62
14:3 20n62
14:6–7 20n62

Wisdom of Solomon
2:24 216n169
6:19 159, 161, 163, 266
16:20 20n62

Apocryphon of John
13:19–21 24n86
19:11–21:27 226
22:22–24 24n86
23:3–4 24n86
29:6–7 24n86

Index of Modern Authors

Aleith, E. 28
Alkier, S. 8

Bacq, P. 29, 36n129, 42, 45, 134n1, 142n37
Balás, D. 28
Behr, J. 15, 31, 34n124, 38, 97, 111n75, 120, 122, 128, 140, 141n32, 158, 160, 183n44, 187
Bellinzoni, A. 29
Bentivegna, J. 28
Blackwell, B. 28
Boyarin, D. 8, 45
Briggman, A. 15, 19
Brown, R. 31
Brunner, E. 205

Clark, E. 11
Constantelos, D. 31
Coollidge, J.S. 28
Czesz, B. 29

D'Alés, A. 197
Daniélou, J. 222
de Aldama, J.A. 112
de Andia, Y. 29
Donovan, Mary A. 27n90, 31, 45, 96, 97, 111n75, 115n90
Dunning, B. 50

Fantino, J. 31, 205n133
Farkasfalvy, D. 21
Ferlay, P. 30
Fishbane, M. 9, 45
Frei, H. 2

Giere, S.D. 41, 42
Graham, S. 28, 95
Grant, R. 10, 77, 97
Greer, R. 120

Häkkinen, S. 173n3
Harnack, A. 16n50, 36n131
Hays, R. 8, 9, 45
Hill, C. 30
Holsinger-Friesen, T. 5, 32, 34, 36, 37, 38, 45, 50n20, 161n111
Houssian, A. 29

Jacobsen, A.C. 5, 32, 33, 34, 38, 45

Kannengiesser, C. 5, 32, 33, 34, 36, 38, 39, 45
Kristeva, J. 7
Kugel, J. 120

Lawson, J. 2, 32
Levesque, G. 18
Luckhart, R. 29
Luttikhuizen, G. 39, 47
Luz, U. 143n39
Lyman, R. 111n75

Martins, P. 44
McHugh, J. 28
Moringiello, S. 10
Moyise, S. 8n16
Mutschler, B. 30

Nielsen, J.T. 31, 32
Noorman, R. 29, 30, 58
Norris, R.A. 28

Olsen, M.J. 28
Orbe, A. 3, 5, 28, 29, 31, 32, 33, 41, 43, 45, 98n34, 111n75, 112n82, 134n1, 137n12, 140, 144n43, 146, 148n63, 149n67, 153, 156, 159n99, 160n104, 162, 165n125, 174n5, 176n13, 177n16, 180n29&30, 181n34, 186n59, 187n65, 205, 206n137, 208n143, 209n148, 213, 217, 219n181, 220, 221n186, 224n191&93, 226, 227n206, 229n216, 230, 232n225
Osborn, E. 107

Painchaud, L. 36n129
Peterson, W. 124
Poffet, J.M. 30
Porter, S. 43
Pretto, E. 3, 28

Quasten, J. 27

Reventlow, H. 12
Rousseau, A. 16n16, 19, 84n44, 91n10, 111, 112n82, 142n33, 180n32, 184n44, 187n65, 188n67, 206n137, 224n193, 230, 230n217
Ruiz, G. 28

Schoedel, W. 14, 77, 79
Sesboüe, B. 31
Siniscaleo, M. 29
Slusser, M. 137
Smith, C.R. 34, 223
Stanton, G. 29
Steenberg, M.C. 5, 16n48, 27n90, 31, 32, 34, 35, 38, 40, 45, 74n5, 75n6, 82, 99n40, 109n65, 109n68, 110, 112, 112n82, 115, 121, 140, 141n32, 149, 159, 161n112, 185, 198n106, 209n148, 219n181, 221n186, 223, 225, 226, 227, 229n215

Tosaus Abadiá, J.P. 28
Tull, P. 43

Unnik, W.C., 77

Van Wolde, E. 41, 42
Voelz, J. 40n146

Weinandy, T. 31
Wendt, H. 159
Werner J. 28, 29
Williams J. 24
Wingren, G. 2, 97n29, 159, 197

Young, F. 10

Index of Subjects

Abel 68, 120, 153, 154, 169, 196
Abel-Christ typology 154, 169
Abraham 31, 59, 68, 71, 79, 82–3, 86, 129, 139, 143, 155, 227, 228n210, 258, 260
Abyss (*abyssum*) 63, 69, 243
Accursed *κατηραμένοι* 119, 256
Achamoth 49, 51, 52
Adam *passim*
Adam-Cain typology 126, 250
Adam-Christ typology 31–32, 44, 88, 96, 97, 103–04, 106, 108–12, 131, 151, 153–55, 166, 169, 174–79, 191–93, 197–98, 201–02, 204–08, 212, 233, 236–37, 250–54, 257
Adam-Jonah typology 102, 132, 151, 169
Adam-Noah typology 169, 250
"all things" (*omnia*) 14, 15, 20n65, 22, 58, 67, 71, 75, 120, 129, 145, 147, 148, 169, 250, 253, 262
Angels 58, 60, 65, 66, 71, 75, 136, 47, 149, 159, 167, 199, 232
Animal skins 242
Anthropology 6, 31 34, 50, 57, 69, 80, 98, 107, 108, 182, 183, 188, 205
  body 52, 60, 63, 68, 81, 83, 84n44, 85, 101, 107–08, 132, 136, 175–76, 181–83, 186–90, 194, 195, 199, 202, 204, 220, 228, 234–35, 247–48, 254
  dualistic 61
  flesh (*caro*) 51, 52, 57, 60n58, 61, 62, 69, 71, 101, 104, 106–08, 121, 122, 127, 131–32, 136, 166, 176, 182–84, 186, 189–92, 194–95, 202, 205–06, 228, 235, 244, 254–55, 260–61
  flesh and blood (*carnis et sanguinis*) 191, 196–97, 214, 234, 236, 252, 255
  natural/animal body (*corpus animate*) 189, 190, 255
  perfect/spiritual person 187, 234, 248
  spiritual body 188–90, 235, 255
  soul/spirit 51, 83, 84, 85, 107, 135, 136, 153, 186–90, 234, 247–8, 255
Antichrist 123, 124, 224, 225, 227, 233, 236
Antiphones 73
Aptare 14, 18, 19, 20, 21, 52
Archons 64, 68, 70, 243, 244
Aristotle 19, 20
Ark of the covenant 165
Asceticism 11, 61, 158
Asymmetrical/symmetrical correspondence 197, 207, 211, 215, 236

Barnabas 222
Basilides 66n85, 74, 83, 136
breath of life (*adspiratio vitae*) 51, 70, 78, 128, 129, 136, 145, 146n53, 177, 185n55, 187, 189, 192–94, 198, 207, 144, *see also* God, breath of
Bythus 63

Cain 68, 115–26, 130, 154, 248, 250
Carpocrates 74, 83, 136
Cerdo 61
Cerinthus 92
Chaos 63, 64n76
Chiasm 6, 89, 99, 110n71, 115–20, 122, 124–26, 130–32, 248, 250, 257
Chiliasm 3n9, 40, 221n186, 222, 223, 225, 226, 230
Christ *passim*
  authority of 92, 122, 148, 209
  crucifixion of 153, 154, 197, 207, 210–12, 215, 233, 258
  incarnation of 5, 44, 53, 71, 88, 93, 96, 97, 98, 100, 103–04, 107–09, 115, 125, 131, 138, 144, 151, 152, 167–69, 173–79, 181, 196–97, 203, 205, 206n135, 207, 209–10, 215, 232, 236–37, 250–51, 254, 258, 260
  see also Jesus
  temptation of 197, 215–18, 233, 237, 258
  Parousia of 227
  preexistence of 93, 96, 142, 142n36, 151
Christophanies 139
Christology 34, 94n19, 100, 105, 152, 172, 178, 238
  docetic 176, 196
Church 38, 63, 78, 83, 89, 91, 94, 117, 126, 127, 133, 136, 137, 151, 195, 212–14, 246, 256, 261
  faith of 11, 18, 22, 127, 256
  reading of scripture 18, 19, 21, 22
  teaching of 47, 88

circumcision 143
clay 146, 165, 200
Clement of Alexandria 232n225
Clement of Rome 89
Counselor of the Father 174, *see also* Logos
covenants 21–2, 26, 91–2, 94–5, 130, 152, 169, 258, *see also* harmony
creation *passim*
  and anthropomorphic language 78n20, 161
  as work of God, *see* God, work of
  days of 6, 40, 53, 54, 56n44, 57, 69, 71, 143, 199, 221–23, 225–28, 231, 237, 242–44, 249, 256, 258
  doctrine of 147, 150, 240, 241
  ex nihilo 3n9, 93, 145, 147, 161, 182
  Gnostics 14–15, 37, 46, 49, 50, 51, 53, 57, 60, 62, 64, 65, 69, 70, 76
  Irenaeus 5, 13, 33, 35n123, 40, 45, 58, 59, 76, 80, 87
  Mosaic accounts 50, 68, 72, 73, 74, 76, 77, 85, 150, 242–43
  of Adam from dust 50, 52, 69, 99, 101, 105, 108, 115, 128, 132, 146, 153, 156, 157, 165, 175, 183, 185, 188, 196–99, 202, 234, 235, 237, 252, 254–55
  of Adam and Eve as Infants/children 111, 159, 160
  of the world 49, 50, 58, 83, 89, 138
  waters 63, 64
creator-creature relationship/distinction 77, 78, 86, 99, 143, 158, 247

David 76, 107, 108, 151, 152, 169, 188, 251, 254
Day (*dies*) 40, 219, 220–23, 225, 234, 256, *see also* creation, days of
Days of Noah 155–56, 169
Day of the Lord 143
decad 55, 56
deep *see* Abyss
Demiurge 49, 50–2, 55, 65, 70, 74, 91, 146, 180–81, 186, 202, 218, 243, 244
duodecad 55, 56
Dionysius of Alexandria 225n194
divine discourse 33, 202
divine economy 4, 6, 20, 26, 38, 40, 53, 58, 91, 94, 101, 104, 109–10, 118, 126, 129–30, 133, 139, 141, 143, 155, 157–58, 161, 163, 165, 168–69, 171, 173, 178, 184, 186, 190, 192, 197, 201, 203–04, 206, 211, 216, 221, 225–26, 231, 235, 238, 246–48, 252–53, 258, 262
Docetism 176, 181n34, *see also* Valentinians

Ebionites 88, 94n19, 98, 99, 105n53, 106, 115, 151, 169, 173, 176, 177–79, 180, 181
Eden *see* Garden
Elijah 54, 184, 234, 236, 256
Elisha 211
Empirical medicine 77, 79
Encratites 59, 61, 62, 68
Enemy (*inimici*) 97, 122–23, 126, 167, 215–17, 237, 249, 252–53, *see also* Satan & serpent
Enoch 184, 234, 236, 256
eschatology 6, 34, 38, 40, 97, 166, 182, 183, 223, 247
  fulfillment 91
  judgment 91, 166, 171, 225
  kingdom 38, 144, 172, 225, 229, 238, 249, 258
  perfection 187, 191–92
  reading of creation 164, 171, 222–23, 225, 259
  reality 164, 185
  Sabbath 143–44, 170, 222, 223, 226–28, 233, 237, 256
  vision 172, 189, 207, 230, 249
eternal fire 119, 166, 167, 224, 256, 261
Eusebius 46n3, 137n11&12, 138n15
Eve 66, 67, 68, 69, 95, 102, 110, 111, 112, 113–14, 116–19, 121–25, 132, 137, 139, 158–60, 166, 167, 175, 203, 211–16, 218–19, 221, 223, 237, 242, 248, 253, 259, 261
Eve-Mary typology 106, 109, 110, 111n75, 112n78, 114, 211–12, 236, 237, 250, 252
exegesis *passim*
  Gnostic 23, 44, 47, 59, 73, 81, 196, 241
  Irenaeus 1, 3, 5, 9, 10, 12, 23, 28, 30, 37, 45, 47, 52, 88, 89, 129, 134, 149, 171, 216, 223, 231, 240–41, 262
  patristic 5, 10, 11, 44
  pre-critical 1, 2
Exodus 89, 129
extratextuality 8

fear of God 120
flatum vitae 145, 188, *see also* breath of life
Flood 82, 89, 95, 129, 156
Forgiveness of sins 209–10, 234–35, 238, 256
fourfold gospel 29, 92, 94
free will 157, 158, 164, 177, 179, 185

Garden 56, 81n28, 95, 102, 124, 132, 137, 153n83, 167, 170, 184, 203, 208, 212–13, 224, 236, 237, 250, 253, 261
gematria/numerology 4, 5, 14, 47, 48, 53, 54, 55, 56, 68, 72, 73, 94, 242–45
genealogy 104n52, 108, 110n71, 114
Gnosis 13, 48, 49n17, 69, 124, 135, 213, 224, 243, 257
Gnostics *passim*
  and creation accounts 48, 244
  and intertextual connections *See* intertextuality
  and literary interpretation 69
  defined 46n1
  hermeneutic 48, 121
  mosaic imagery 48, 50
  salvation 57, 62, 80
  See creation
  See exegesis
  See prosopological interpretation
God
  as Artist (*Artifex*) 107, 144, 200
  aseity 73, 141, 142, 143
  as Builder 82
  as Creator *passim*
  as Fashioner (*Plasmatorem*) 90, 129, 130, 208
  as Father *passim*
  as Framer (*Fabricatorem*) 137, 138, 168, 170, 238
  as Maker (*Factorem*) 82, 90, 129, 130, 137, 138, 168, 170, 208, 238, 259
  as Nourisher (*Nutritorem*) 137, 138, 168, 170
  breath of 127, 133, 192–94, 256, 261, *see also* breath of life
  commands of 119, 158, 217
  foreknowledge of 174–75, 235, 248
  goodness of 161, 163
  hands of 107, 132, 146, 164, 168, 170, 179, 182, 184, 199, 200, 226, 235, 260
  kingdom of 143, 144, 191, 220, 227–28, 231, 237–38, 249, 258
  power of 99, 118, 124, 161, 177, 181, 182–83, 189, 235, 261
  Spirit of 17, 20, 58, 63, 71, 88, 91, 107, 126, 127, 133, 134, 146, 160, 164, 165, 170, 177, 178, 179, 182, 183, 185, 186, 187, 190, 191–94, 205–07, 214, 234–35, 238, 248, 253–56, 262
  voice of (*Vox Dei*) 84, 87203, 209, 238
  will of 17, 78, 81 124, 125, 127, 128, 129 118, 184, 190–91, 201, 209, 247
  wisdom of God (*sapientia Dei*) 14, 15, 19, 82, 87, 99, 128, 129n137, 132, 145, 148, 183, 214, 240, 242, 260
  Word of 14, 17, 52, 75, 82, 86, 87 96n26, 103–05, 107, 108, 115, 118, 128, 129n137, 131, 132, 140, 141, 145, 148, 149, 150, 168, 170, 174, 191, 198, 200–04, 206, 208–12, 237, 240, 242, 247, 252, 254, 260
  work of 203, 237, 240, 246, 260, 262, *see also* creation
Gospels 22, 33n17, 38, 92–4, 111, 112n78, 135, 150, 155, 171, 172, 173, 177n16, 180, 195, 197, 202, 207, 208, 234, 238, 256, 258

harmonia 13, 19, 20
  defined 19, 20n62
Harmony 12, 14–15, 18, 23, 96, 167, 172, 223, 237, 259
  acetic 112n78, 183
  and order 20n65
  consonare and *aptare* 18ff.
  consonatia and *apta* 18, 18n56
  of covenants 21, 94
  Pythagorean 20
  scriptural 3n9, 4, 18, 21–3, 40, 74, 85, 151, 167, 239, 262
  textual 9, 37, 97, 246
  theological and exegetical 211
historical contexts 8, 246
Hericlitus 19
higher criticism 1
Hippolytus 19, 143n40, 230
historical-critical method 2
Homer 19, 23
hylics 80, 186

image and likeness (*imaginem et similitudinem*) 35n128, 38n138, 51, 57, 60, 69, 96–7, 107, 117–19, 123, 128, 137, 146, 152, 159, 161, 162, 164, 171, 174, 179,

181, 185–87, 190–92, 194, 204–06, 216, 226–27, 230, 232, 238, 244, 251
imago Dei (image of God) 117, 132, 147, 161, 168, 173, 177, 185–6, 188, 204–07, 232, 234, 247–48, 257
Intertextuality *Passim*
and ancient literary culture 11, 45
and method 1, 4, 5, 7, 8, 35, 48, 57, 59
and modern studies 7ff., 44
as "foundational lens" 42
textual citation *passim*
conceptual connections 102, 106, 107, 108, 111, 169
Gnostics 47, 48, 53, 59, 68
Irenaeus *passim*
narratival arrangements 6, 25, 58, 59, 83, 86, 89, 90, 128, 135, 167, 168, 241, 259
narratival connections 4, 123, 258
narratival readings 74, 139, 226, 258
organizational strategies 253, 257
textual allusion *passim*
textual echo *passim*
verbal connections 4, 26, 47, 59, 68, 74, 89, 92, 106, 107, 108, 115, 129, 131, 135, 142, 143, 149, 150, 155, 159, 165, 171, 173, 175, 233, 241, 243, 253, 256, 261
Irenaeus *passim*
and general-to-particular reasoning 16, 25, 27, 58, 71, 135, 145, 147, 148, 167, 170, 173, 191–92, 198, 203, 207, 218, 221, 236, 238, 241, 261
and intertextuality reading of scripture *See* intertextuality
and literal readings 248
and literary readings 4, 243, 247
and mosaic of the king 23, 52, 240
and organizational strategies
and textual relationships *See* intertextuality
and typology and allegory 43, 44, 109, 110, 113, 115, 121, 126, 131, 135, 167, 173, 249, 250
as theologian of creation 3, 14, 34, 35
doctrine of revelation 13, 16, 17, 240
hermeneutic 1, 9, 12, 21, 38, 39, 45, 48, 59, 73, 74, 85, 123, 168, 232, 240
Mosaic account 4, 48, 241–43
polemical theology 4, 26, 27, 116, 129, 133, 134, 233, 246, 257
recapitulation 33n120, 36n132, 88, 97, 103, 104, 105, 106, 108, 110, 112, 114–16, 118, 125–26, 130, 137n11, 152, 168, 176, 195, 214–15, 221–23, 248, 250–52, 256–57
regula fidei (rule of faith) 48, 57, 58, 59, 82, 90n5, 91
regula veritatis (rule of truth) 57, 58, 78
See creation
See exegesis
See prosopological interpretation
theology of creation 3, 13, 14, 16, 17, 34, 35, 36, 37, 58, 72, 74, 133, 242
theology of scripture 16–8, 25, 74, 242
typological readings 104
Ignatius 227
Issac 82, 83, 86, 258

Jacob 59, 82, 83, 86, 258
Jaldabaoth 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 70, 71, 244–45
Jeremiah 201, 234, 25
Jesus 52, 54, 59, 68, 71, 88, 93, 96n25, 98, 142, 168, 173, 176, 180, 198–99, 200, 203n127, 215–16, 260, *see also* Christ
John 30, 52, 76, 92, 105, 160, 181
John the Baptist 80
Jonah 101, 102, 151, 152, 169, 184, 236, 250–51
sign of 98n36, 101, 132, 250
Joseph 105, 111, 113
Justin Martyr 6, 12, 34, 61, 81n26, 99, 117, 138, 139, 149, 153n82, 167, 168, 170, 173n3, 222, 224, 246

knowledge of God 17, 78, 81 124, 125, 127, 128, 129, 194, 224, 247–48, 261

Law 9, 21, 76, 82, 83, 86, 89, 94, 129–30, 141, 156, 216–17, 220, 258
Logos 33, 132, 174

Marcion 61, 83, 94n19, 137, 138, 151, 152, 173, 180, 181, 224
Marcionites 142, 180, 181n34
Marcosians 53ff., 57, 68, 69, 71, 136, 229, 243–44
Marcus 53, 244
Marriage 61, 111, 112, 113, 114n86
Mary 105, 108, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 123, 132, 176, 177, 178, 211–12, 253–54
Melchizedek 79

Menander 60, 60n59, 83
Midrash 3, 9, 10
Millennialism *see* Chialism
Moses 50, 54, 55, 68, 72, 76, 85, 129, 139, 144, 165, 170, 238, 242, 259

Neopythagorean numerology 14
Noah 68, 82, 83, 86, 139, 155n90, 156, 157, 169, 196, 258

Ogdoad 52, 53, 56, 54n36, 57
Ophites 59, 62, 63ff., 70, 71, 218, 243–45
Origen 30, 64n77, 91n10, 221, 225n194, 226

Papias 222, 229n215
Paradise 67, 81, 86, 95, 111, 114, 116, 117, 118, 120–23, 125, 183, 184, 212–15, 217–18, 234, 236, 255–56, 258, 261
Paul 9, 16, 21, 22, 26, 28, 29, 38, 50, 78, 80, 81, 86, 96n25, 97, 98, 104, 105, 106, 107, 131, 150, 158, 176, 181, 184, 187–88, 190, 192, 195, 201, 234, 251, 255–56, 259
Peter 54, 160
Philo 19, 49n14, 75n8, 149, 221, 226
Plato 19, 50, 83
pleroma 49, 71, 73, 80, 81, 187n61, 242
Plotinus 205n131
Pneumatics 80, 189
Polycarp 12, 92, 222
postlapsarian 122, 162, 177, 249
preexistence 142n36, 142, 151
prelapsarian 141n32, 162, 184, 192, 207, 229
Presbyter 6, 149, 150n69, 151, 167, 168, 246
Prophets 9, 11, 12, 17n52, 22, 63, 68, 76, 82, 83, 86, 89, 90n7, 91, 126–27, 129, 135, 141, 154, 155, 156, 171, 201, 222, 224–25, 231, 246, 258–59
Prosopological interpretation 4, 6, 25, 139, 259
  defined 26
  Gnostics 47, 59, 62, 70, 136, 243–44
  Irenaeus 6, 47, 54n36, 61, 62, 68, 71, 74, 85, 87, 89, 132, 135, 136, 145, 146, 149, 159, 167, 168, 170, 173, 207, 238, 243, 246
protoevangelium 116–17, 122, 123, 166, 215
protological/protology 34, 38, 45, 49, 77, 223
protoplast (first formed man) 85, 211, 212
psychic 51, 52, 80, 186, 189
Ptolemaeus 46

resurrection 96n25, 101, 102, 103, 132, 134, 139, 154, 159, 164, 166, 171, 172, 173, 182, 183, 185, 188–91, 194, 197–98, 207, 220, 222, 224, 227–33, 238, 247, 251–54
revelation 14, 16–17, 22, 39, 48, 50, 72, 76, 77, 79, 85, 93, 129, 130–31, 133–34, 147, 150, 163, 168, 174, 179, 198, 205, 206n135, 213, 238–42, 258–59, 262
rhetoric 3, 10, 111, 13, 16, 18, 20, 41–2, 73, 145, 148, 181, 183, 226n202, 253

sabbath 143, 144, 169, 170, 221–23, 237, 233, 258
salus carnis 181–83, 195
salvation 80, 97, 98, 102, 103, 106, 115–19, 122–27, 132, 136, 140, 151, 152, 154, 162, 163, 169, 194, 196, 203, 222, 230, 232, 250–51, 253
salvation history 86, 89n5, 91, 109, 114n86, 123, 129, 130, 134, 142, 149, 155, 157, 164, 168, 172, 182, 183, 205, 215, 217, 225, 238
Satan 89, 91, 102, 117–20, 122, 123, 132, 137, 151, 152, 167, 175, 215–18, 224, 227, 233, 235–37, 249, 251–53, 256, 259, 261
Saturninus 59, 60, 61, 68, 74, 83, 136 243
Scripture *passim*
  and authority of Apostles 77, 135
  and authority of the mosaic account 24, 48, 72–4, 76–7, 85, 241
  as body of truth (*veritate corpus*) 17, 24, 25
  consonance 12–3, 18, 23, 25, 27, 237, 240–41, 262
  continuity of scripture 5, 19, 25, 45, 52, 76, 81, 85, 89, 91, 130, 139, 179, 198, 238–39, 242, 246–47, 262
  inspiration of 262
  organizational function of 4, 10n25, 25, 130, 173, 241, 256–58
  prophecy and fulfillment 4, 25, 173, 248
  theology of 16, 17, 25, 74, 242
  unity of 20, 23, 74, 142, 149, 171
  see also harmony
  witness of 3–6, 13, 22, 25, 30, 36, 40, 89, 168, 171, 196, 239

Septuagint 122, 221
serpent 65, 67, 68, 70, 102, 116–18, 120–26, 131, 133, 136, 137, 166, 170, 175, 211, 214, 21–19, 223–24, 233, 236, 248, 252, 256, 258–59, 261
serpent-Satan typology 236–37
Sethian 59, 62, 64n77
Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego 184, 236
Simon Magus 59, 60n59, 61, 83, 160
Skepticism 77, 79
Solomon 151, 152, 169, 251
Sophia 49, 63, 65, 67, 68, 70, 186, 218
Soteriology, Irenean 159
spark of life 60, 61
Spirit of life 51, 66, 69, 244

Tatian 59, 61, 62, 68, 88, 116, 117, 119, 124, 125
Tertullian 180n29
Tetrad 53, 55, 56
Theophanies 20, 139, 170
Theophilus 34, 56n44
tree of knowledge (of good and evil) 66, 67, 95, 110, 122, 208, 213, 218–20, 236, 261
  fruit of 32, 218–19, 221
tree of life 122
Triacontad 55, 56, 57
Trinitarian activity 14n36, 26, 80, 140, 142, 146, 149, 161, 170, 178, 184
Trinity 15n41, 26, 136, 146, 150, 170, 186, 198, 258, 260
type/antitype 250

Valentinians 23, 24, 46, 53, 54n36, 57, 62, 68, 69, 70, 73, 80, 81, 83, 88, 94n19, 106, 115, 121, 136, 137, 142, 145, 151, 158, 163, 165n128, 173, 174, 176, 180, 181, 186, 194–97, 202–04, 208–09, 218, 224, 243–44
  Docetic Valentinians 176
  Ptolemean Valentinianism 47
Valentinus 46, 47n4, 136, 151, 152
virgin 99, 100, 111, 152, 211, 215, 251, 253
  birth 98–9, 104–06, 115, 131, 151, 176, 237, 251
  earth 98, 103–04, 131, 216, 251, 254

womb 52, 79, 80, 200–01, 234, 255
wrestler 24, 196

Xenophanes 73

Zerubbabel 152n77