APPENDIX I:

JUSTIN'S QUOTATION MATERIAL IN IRENAEUS AND TERTULLIAN.

The problem raised in this Appendix would require a separate and quite substantial monograph if it were to be discussed in its full scope. The following lines are therefore meant only as a kind of pilot study, concerned mainly with the following question: Do we find indications in Irenaeus' and Tertullian's OT quotations which lead to the conclusion that these writers depend on Justin's sources employed in the Apology and/or the Dialogue, or do we rather find indications of direct dependence on the present text of these works?

The relevance of this question for the present study is brought out in the analysis of P. Prigent (Justin, passim). He often takes quotation sequences in Irenaeus and Tertullian as clues in his analysis of Justin's source (his own Syntagma), assuming that Irenaeus and Tertullian depend on Justin's source rather than on the text of the Apology and the Dialogue.

In order to test this, I have compared all non-LXX quotations in Justin with the corresponding quotations in Irenaeus and Tertullian. There are a few cases in which Justin has a perfect LXX text, while the same quotation recurs in a non-LXX text in the later writers. Here I make no claim to completeness, but I have made some pilot studies, and I doubt that there is much relevant material to be found.

My result is briefly summarized this: There are a few cases in which Irenaeus or Tertullian do seem to depend on Justin's source rather than on his present exposition in the Apology or the Dialogue. There are considerably more cases in which the opposite holds true. In the vast majority of cases, neither alternative can be proved: there is no need to go behind Justin's preserved works to find Irenaeus' or Tertullian's sources, nor can a direct recourse to Justin's sources be disproved. But in that case, the economy of hypothesis-principle opts for restraint in supposing hypothetical sources instead of known ones.

I present the material in the order here indicated. First (A) I comment on those cases which seem to indicate direct recourse to Justin's sources, next (B) I treat those cases in which the later writers can be proved to depend on Justin's present text, not on his sources. In category (C) I comment briefly on the rest of the examined cases.

In several instances I have commented upon the quotation sequences in which the quotations occur. But a full investigation of all relevant material would exceed the scope of this Appendix. I have included one test-case, however, which seemed to me particularly instructive (E).

Regarding Justin's non-LXX quotations, it emerges as a general conclusion that they either disappear totally in Irenaeus and Tertullian, or they re-appear as LXX texts, in excerpts often exceeding Justin's short non-LXX texts. This does not speak for an intensive use of Justin's sources.

On the whole, I am inclined to believe that the literary relations between on the one hand Irenaeus and Tertullian, and on the other hand Justin, Justin's sources and other known or lost writings, is so complex that the available evidence hardly allows a complete and convincing reconstruction. One can make reasonable, even cogent proposals on particular points, but one should be careful not to generalize, and I think one thing may be said with certainty: The theory true to all the facts is bound to be complex.

A final note:

When I speak about Tertullian texts as Septuagintal, I have no intention of deciding the debated question whether Tertullian used an existing Latin translation, or translated the Greek LXX in each case himself. If Tertullian quotes from a Latin Old Testament, it should clearly be regarded as a daughter translation of the LXX. Cf. T. P. O'Malley, Tertullian and the Bible (Latinitas Christianorum Primaeva 21, Nijmegen/Utrecht, 1967), with review of previous research pp. 2—8.
A: Irenaeus and Tertullian dependent on Justin's source

(1) Ezek 37:7f etc. (*Apol* 52:5f)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ezek 37 LXX</th>
<th><em>Apol</em> 52:5f</th>
<th>Tertullian: <em>De Res.</em> 32:1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>vs. 7:</td>
<td>θανατήσατοι</td>
<td>Et mandabo piscibus et maris et conpaginem ad conpaginem et ossa quae sunt comeata, quae sunt comestas, et faciam ossa quae sunt comestas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... καὶ προσήγαγε τὰ δόστα ἑκάτερον πρὸς τὴν ἀρμονίαν αὐτοῦ.</td>
<td>ἀρμονία πρὸς ἀρμονίαν καὶ ὁστῶν πρὸς ὁστῶν καὶ σάρκες ἁρύοντο...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vs. 8... ἐπ' αὐτὰ νεῦρα καὶ σάρκες ἁρύοντο...</td>
<td>καὶ σάρκες ἀναφυῆσονται</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is 45:23b LXX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... διὰ ἐμοὶ κάμψει πᾶν γόνυ καὶ ἄξιομολογήσεται πάσα γλώσσα τῷ θεῷ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Lucianic MSS = MT: ὁστῶν πρὸς ὁστῶν ἁκαστον.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In *Apol* 52:3—8, Justin has a passage on the resurrection of the dead. Two testimonies are quoted: Ezek 37:7f/Is 45:23 as 'Ezekiel the prophet' and Is 66:24 anonymously. It is known from Procopius that Justin had written a separate treatise *De Resurrectione*. Prigent has made a good case for the theory that this tract is partly preserved in the extracts in the *Sacra Parallela*. The main thrust of Prigent's argument is the demonstration that both Irenaeus and Tertullian seem to depend on the treatise excerpted in the *Sacra Parallela*. (It is not the other way round, as often claimed).

I think a closer study of Ezek 37:7f in *Apol* 52:5f and Tertullian's *De Resurrectione* 29-32 may confirm this. Chapters 29-31 in Tertullian's tract are concerned with a refutation of non-literal exegesis of Ezek 37:1-14 (quoted in 29:2-15, basically LXX text). In this refutation are included some more OT proof-texts: Mal 3:20f; Is 66:14; Is 66:22-24 (LXX quoted in the order; vs. 23b; 22; 24). So far, one could assume that *Apol* 52:5-8 was a main source behind Tertullian: He looks both of Justin's texts up in the LXX and adds some more testimonies. But this explanation breaks down in *De Res.* 32:1. Here we find another, non-LXX version of Ezek 37:7f which is curiously combined with a text reminiscent of 1 Enoch 61:5 (see synopsis). Here *Apol* 52 cannot be Tertullian's direct source, and a common source behind both passages cannot be ruled out.

Now, as it is probable that Tertullian adapted Justin's treatise on the resurrection in his own book on the same subject, I think one can reasonably surmise that Justin's treatise is Tertullian's source for the combined, non-LXX version of 1 Enoch 61:5/Ezek 37:7 found in *De Res.* 32:1. *Apol* 52 may excerpt from the same, combined text, which in that case comprised (at least) the excerpts 1 Enoch 61:5; Ezek 37:7f; Is 45:23.

Justin's text in *Apol* 52 and - by hypothesis - in his *De Res.* is quite likely to derive ultimately from a testimony source prior to Justin.

I have surmised above that this was the Christological part of the 'Kerygma source'. I cannot find sure indications that Tertullian had direct access to this source.

---

2. Prigent has not commented on this parallel.
3. Not listed in the BP I.