

IRENÆUS AND HEBREWS

D. Jeffrey Bingham

Hebrews in Rome

In the sixth century, Stephanus Gobarus stated that Irenaeus (along with Hippolytus) denied the Pauline authorship of the Letter to the Hebrews.¹ A couple of centuries before, Eusebius had written that Irenaeus had quoted from the Letter in a no longer extant work. He had said that, “[Irenaeus composed] a collection of addresses on various subjects, in which he mentions the Epistle to the Hebrews and the “Wisdom of Solomon,” quoting several passages from them.”² That Irenaeus knew the Letter and that he used it in his ministry should not surprise us. Already at the end of the first century in Rome, Clement “subtly, but unmistakably,” to use the words of Luke Timothy Johnson, employed the thought and language of Hebrews (e.g., *I Clement* 36.1-5).³ The notion of subtle usage is helpful. B. W. Bacon counted “forty-seven [!] ‘echoes,’” and states that Hebrews is “the model for whole paragraphs” of *I Clement*, but found no “reference” to the Letter.⁴ Of Clement’s use of Hebrews, Eusebius wrote:

“In it he gives many thoughts from the Epistle to the Hebrews and even quotes verbally when using certain passages from it: thus most clearly establishing the fact that the treatise was no recent thing. For this reason it has seemed right and reasonable to reckon it among the other letters of the apostle. For, Paul having communicated in writing with the Hebrews in their native tongue, some say that the evangelist Luke, others that Clement himself, translated the writing. The latter statement is more probably true; because both the Epistle of Clement and that to the Hebrews maintain the same character from the point of view of style, and because the thoughts in each of the two treatises are not divergent.”⁵

Such an early attestation to the prominent place of Hebrews in Clement’s thought has been recognized by modern scholarship. D. A. Hagner wrote that “Clement’s acquaintance with and

dependence upon the Epistle to the Hebrews is acknowledged by nearly everyone.”⁶ He goes on to conclude, after a thorough analysis of Clement’s use of the Letter, that,

It seems certain then that Clement read, loved, was taught by, and made use of the Epistle to the Hebrews in writing his pastoral letter to the Church of Corinth. . . . Clement, faced with the need of writing to the Corinthian Church, found in the Epistle to the Hebrews a veritable mine of ideas and phraseology which were found to be not only convincing in themselves, but which seemed ready-made for, or perfectly adaptable to, his own purposes.⁷

The position of A. F. Gregory is bit different. He recognizes, following Ellingworth’s argument, that Clement is at places dependent on Hebrews, but wishes also to note the likelihood of independence and common relation of both Hebrews and *1 Clement* to another, common source. He says, after acknowledging the certain use of Hebrews by Clement in *1 Clement* 36.1-5,

Yet the pattern of striking parallels and possible allusions, but only limited verbal identity, means that it is difficult to exclude altogether the possibility that Clement and the author of the letter to the Hebrews might each have drawn on a common source or tradition. It may be best to conclude, as Paul Ellingworth demonstrates, that it is possible to affirm both the independence of Clement’s thought from that of Hebrews at a number of critical points, yet not to question the general consensus of the literary dependence of *1 Clement* on Hebrews.⁸

G. Theissen, on the other hand takes the argument to an extreme. He insists that *1 Clement* 36:1-6 is not dependent upon Hebrews 1:1-14, but derives only from a common tradition shared between them.⁹ However, G. L. Cockerill has, in my view, successfully challenged Theissen’s conclusions. He argues that while there is common traditional material, *1 Clement* also evidences in places derivation from and paraphrase of Hebrews.¹⁰ H. W. Attridge also believes that for *1*

Clement 36.2-6 “it is impossible to assume anything but literary dependence.”¹¹ Clare K. Rothschild agrees that Clement depended on Hebrews.¹²

With current scholarship recognizing the validity of Eusebius’s testimony regarding Clement and Hebrews, there is no reason to doubt the historian’s comments concerning Irenaeus and Hebrews. Irenaeus in a work or works no longer extant quoted from several passages in the Letter in his own pastoral-polemical task.

Westcott also thought that there were “several coincidences of expression” between Hebrews and the *Shepherd of Hermas* “sufficient to shew that Hermas also was acquainted with it.”¹³ The recent essay by Joseph Verheyden has not done anything to raise confidence in Westcott’s view of Hermas’s acquaintance with Hebrews.¹⁴ He seems to allow for Hermas’s use of Matthew and 1 Corinthians.¹⁵

But other contemporary scholarship seems to take for granted the use of Hebrews by *Hermas*, although perhaps in a more restrained manner than Westcott. Raymond Brown and John Meier, for instance, argue that both Clement and *Hermas* “although using the wording of Hebrews move in an almost opposite thought-direction.”¹⁶ Yet, Rome still, from 96 through the entire second century “remains the main witness for an awareness of Hebrews.”¹⁷ The Epistle was “received by the Roman church but never enthusiastically appropriated.”¹⁸ In other words Rome knew Paul had not written Hebrews, the author was merely a respected “second-generation Christian authority” so “Hebrews was not Scripture by the Roman criterion” of apostolic origin.¹⁹ Therefore, because of the qualified respect with which Rome (Clement, *Hermas*) held Hebrews, it felt free to modify its teachings in its own theological construction. Clement, then, softens the strong rejection of the Levitical priesthood and cult present in Hebrews while *Hermas* softens the position of Hebrews on no forgiveness of sins after baptism. Rome did this, Brown and Meier say, because “Rome did not like extreme positions.”²⁰

Whether or not the acceptance which the Letter had received in Rome influenced Irenaeus's comfort with quoting it we do not know. Nor can we say what use the Asians in the late first and second century made of it. But one note is worth making. Brown and Meier insist that Rome modified Hebrews in its employment of the writing. It could be that rather than blatant modification and alteration of the thought of the Epistle, Clement and Hermas were engaged in interpretation of it. In other words, they might not understand their own work to be a change from Hebrews, but rather a proper reading of it. As we encounter Irenaeus's own engagement with Hebrews we will witness uses and readings not necessarily expected by the modern critic. Such readings should not necessarily be assumed to be conflicts with the theology of Hebrews. They might be interpretations of the text believed by Irenaeus to be inherent within the text and the rule of faith.

Modern Reflections on Irenaeus and Hebrews

Nevertheless, despite the reasonable basis for believing Eusebius's testimony that Irenaeus quoted Hebrews in works which are now lost, and the early evidence for Rome's own use of the Epistle, scholars have been less willing to see the Letter making its mark in *Adversus haereses*. Some do acknowledge a partial citation of Hebrews 1:3 in book 2 and some allusions to the Epistle scattered elsewhere in Irenaeus's main work.²¹ In the nineteenth century, for example, we may note A. Camerlynck and W. W. Harvey. Camerlynck saw allusions to Hebrews 1:3; 1:13; 3:5; 10:1 (*Adv. haer.* 2.28.2; 2.28.7; 2.30.9; 3.6.5; 4.11.4), being especially confident about Hebrews 1:13, while Harvey saw allusions to ten passages: (Hebrews 1:3; 2:10; 3:5; 7:28; 8:1; 10:1; 10:26-31; 11:5; 11:13; 13:15).²² But, Camerlynck ultimately concluded that although Hebrews should have provided a "veritable arsenal" for Irenaeus's polemic, it did not. Irenaeus knew and read Hebrews, but because of his belief that it was not from Paul's hand, he did not employ it.²³ Even though Harvey recognized those several echoes, he remarked that *Adversus*

haereses “contains no clear quotations from this epistle.”²⁴ Views minimizing the connection between Hebrews and Irenaeus abound.

Camerlynck’s summary of other opinions in the nineteenth century seems to show even less willingness to recognize Irenaeus’s interest in Hebrews. Cornely (1885) believes any allusions to have little weight and Werner (1889) sees them as dubious.²⁵ It is difficult to find twentieth-century, and more contemporary confidence, in Irenaeus’s use of Hebrews in his extant writings. Most deny it a place in his “canon.” The place of the Epistle in Irenaeus’s constructive theology is minimized. For instance, Hoh allows for only four indirect citations, but he questions even these.²⁶ F. R. M. Hitchcock, thought that Irenaeus quite possibly knew Hebrews, but notes only four or five allusions (1:3; [2:5, translation of Enoch?]; 3:6; 13:10; 10:1/ *Adv. haer.* 2.30.9; [3.6.4]; 14.18.6; 4.5.1; 4.11.4) and postulates that he was “reluctant to use” the epistle because of Montanist appeal to Hebrews 6:4-5.²⁷ C. H. Turner recognizes no citations from the Letter and although he sets forth occasions in which the language of Irenaeus may echo Hebrews (Heb 1:3; 3:5; 4:4-10; 6:1; 10:1; 10:26ff; 11:5; 11:5-6; 11:13/*Adv. Haer.* 2.30.9; 3.6.5; 4.15.2; 2.2.5; 4.16.1; 3.12.13; 4.11.4; 4.28.2; 4.13.1; 4.16.2; 5.5.1; 5.32.2), he is quick many times to point out other textual parallels.²⁸ André Benoit finds all the allusions identified by Harvey to be “vague and remote.”²⁹ The bishop had read Hebrews, Benoit thinks, but he did not believe it had the same authority as apostolic texts. This is the reason, why Irenaeus did not mention the Letter. *Adversus haereses* is devoted to proving the Christian faith based upon the apostolic teaching.³⁰ Irenaeus is content, therefore, only to make indefinite allusions to it. Rothschild is also content to see incidental citations/allusions in Irenaeus.³¹ Schneemelcher recognizes the Scriptural status the four Gospels, Acts, and thirteen Pauline epistles held for Irenaeus. He notes also the high appraisal, similar to the place of honor he gave to Paul’s writings, that Irenaeus gives 1 Peter and 1 and 2 John. Hebrews, he says, however, “is not so highly esteemed.”³² Norbert Brox notes that

it is one of the few books that are “missing in him” but which are found in the canon of the fourth century Church.³³ Citing Eusebius he says, “Irenaeus knew Hebrews, but apparently outside the church's Canon.”³⁴ Robert Grant’s position shows a change from his early thought on Irenaeus to his later understanding. At first, Grant saw minimal reference to the Letter. Later, he would explicitly deny that it was a text in Irenaeus's New Testament canon and that it appears in his extant works. He writes in one place that,

The views of Irenaeus (c. 180) are not altogether clear. He certainly alludes to Hebrews (1:3) when he says that the Father created everything “by the Word of his power” (*Adv. haer.* 2, 30, 9); but this is the only clear allusion in his writings, and he speaks of the Christian “altar in the heavens” (4, 18, 6) in such a way as to show that he is not relying on what Hebrews has to say on the subject.³⁵

However, in other places he says, that Irenaeus “knew most of the New Testament rather well,” but his collection of New Testament books “did not include Hebrews” and furthermore that “There are no real traces of Hebrews in his works.”³⁶ Luke Timothy Johnson, who was optimistic about Clement’s use of the Letter, joins this last opinion of Grant’s and writes that “there are no references to it in any of his extant writings.”³⁷

In this paper, an analysis of Irenaeus’s knowledge and use of Hebrews, I hope to begin a challenge to such opinions. I don’t intend here to insist that Irenaeus revered Hebrews as a sacred text, the same way in which he sees the Spirit speaking through the prophets, the evangelists, and Paul. But I do wish to demonstrate that his thought appears to be dependent in important degrees upon its language and teaching. Perhaps Gobarus, Camerlynck, and Benoit were correct and he knew that the bishop rejected it as being from Paul’s hand and that this caused him to use it more subtly in his argument against the Gnostics and Marcionites. His concern must have been overwhelming; otherwise it is difficult to explain why the voice of such a text is reduced almost

entirely to a whisper. For merely one example of the potential power of Hebrews in the debate against his opponents, we need only recall what E. C. Blackman pointed out sixty-two years ago: Hebrews 1:1 was a text which could be called forth to demonstrate that “Marcion’s isolation of the Redeemer from the World-creator was not difficult to refute.”³⁸ Perhaps Hitchcock is right and the bishop refused to use it because of the Montanist appeal to Hebrews 6:4-5.³⁹ Or we might speculate that he muted its presence because of an attraction the “prophetic” contents of Hebrews held for the Montanists or other prophets.⁴⁰ Or perhaps there is another cause. But, nevertheless, here we will see that whatever its place in his concept of sacred, inspired texts, Hebrews was important for his theological construction. It did serve, *contra* Camerlynck, as a mine of riches for his polemic.

*Irenaeus and Hebrews*⁴¹

Hebrews 1:2-3: The Omnipotent Creator

It is in his refutation of the Valentinian theses concerning the final consummation and the Demiurge (*Adv. haer.* 2.29-30) that we find Irenaeus’s first reading of the Letter to the Hebrews. In the particular portion (*Adv. haer.* 2.30.1-9) of his argument into which he inserts the wording of Hebrews, he is arguing against the Valentinian notion that the Demiurge has a psychic nature, a nature of a quality between matter and spiritual, and which is then inferior to the nature of the spiritual Valentinians themselves. His concluding point is that reason shows that even the Valentinians must ultimately confess that the Demiurge is the creator and former of all things, which makes him superior, not inferior, to themselves, for he is also their creation.

At this point, Irenaeus presents a beautiful statement on the Catholic perspective concerning the Creator. In it he inserts a partial citation of Hebrews 1:3 to teach that “by the word of his power” he created all things:

If...He made all things freely, and by his own power, and arranged and finished them, and His will is the substance of all things, then He is discovered to be the one only God who created all things, who alone is Omnipotent, and who is the only Father founding and forming all things, visible and invisible, such as may be perceived by our senses and such as cannot, heavenly and earthly, “*by the word of His power,*” [Heb. 1:3] and He has fitted and arranged all things by His wisdom, while He contains all things, but He Himself can be contained by no one: He is the Former, He the Builder, He the Discoverer, He the Creator, He the Lord of all; and there is no one besides Him or above Him....⁴²

I have stopped this remarkable theological statement short as it goes on for several more lines. In those lines the bishop of Lyons contrasts the God of the church to the Valentinian concept of the Demiurge, emphasizing that the Father creates through His Word and wisdom, and that this Father is the God of the patriarchs, the law, the prophets, Christ, the apostles, and the church. He is revealed through the Son who eternally co-exists with him.

What is important for our understanding of this early Christian father’s reading of Hebrews is that the only biblical text quoted within this magisterial reflection on God is a portion of Hebrews 1:3: “by the word of his power (*verbo virtutis suae*).”⁴³ Irenaeus takes from this text two key theological themes which appear in his grand confession and which are taken explicitly from the biblical text’s language. First, we see the idea of the exclusivity and supremacy of God’s power in creation. From this text he derives his language within his doctrinal summary which affirms that God “by his own power (*ex sua potestiale*)”, made, arranged, and finished all things.⁴⁴ Of this same biblical text he was thinking when earlier, as he was working his way up to the conclusion of his theological statement, he asked rhetorically, who can number all those things which have been constituted “by the power of God” (*per virtutem Dei*).⁴⁵

In addition to his argument for the immensity of God's power while he anticipates his citation of Hebrews 1:3, he also takes to heart the passage's language concerning the word (*verbum*) of God's power. This, of course, he reads Christologically, as he reads references to wisdom, pneumatologically. Both appear in his grand theological statement. God creates by his Word and arranges all things by his Wisdom (*Sapientia*).⁴⁶ Later in the conclusion, this becomes "He is the Creator who made all things by Himself, that is, through (*per*) His Word (*verbum*) and His Wisdom (*Sapientiam*)."⁴⁷ In the same conclusion his Word is further identified as his Son (*Filius*).⁴⁸ This suggests that Irenaeus is thinking not only of Hebrews 1:3, but also verse 2, which says that God has spoken through his Son.⁴⁹

Hebrews 1:2-3 performs for Irenaeus as a text which teaches the all-sufficiency of the creative power of the Father by means of or through the agency of his Word, his Son. In this way, Hebrews 1:2-3 joins ranks with biblical texts like Psalm 32 [33]:6 and John 1:3 which elsewhere Irenaeus joins together to teach that the rule of truth announces that "There is one God All-Powerful (omnipotence), who created all things through his Word (*verbum*)."⁵⁰ What the Psalmist and John provide in testimony to the Father's creation of *all things* through the Word; Son, the author of Hebrews provides in testimony to the *Almightyness* of the Word's, Son's creative agency, for it is the Word, or Son, of the Father's power who creates.

We must not think that Hebrews 1:2-3 functions alone in this context, however: It joins a host of other biblical testimonies which together provide Irenaeus with a network, a cento, if you like, of Bible words. Together with the words from Hebrews we find also words from Ephesians 1:21; Exodus 20:11; Psalm 145 (144):6; Acts 4:24; 14:15; Genesis 2:7-8; Matthew 22:32; 2 Corinthians 1:3; 11:31; Ephesians 1:3; 3:14; Colossians 1:3; and 1 Peter 1:3. Such centos are typical of Irenaeus. Through them, through his explicit linkage of biblical texts which in his mind are obviously associated and connected and which testify to the rule of truth, he

demonstrates the proper connection of the Scriptures. The Valentinians, he thinks, lack propriety in their own centos; their own arrangement of Scripture's pieces.⁵¹

Hebrews 1:8-9: The Exclusivity of the Father and Son

We may also be able to recognize a further role for the first chapter of the Letter in Irenaeus's polemic. In his third book he argues that the titles "God" and "Lord" have only been given by the Lord, the Spirit, or the Apostles appropriately to the Father and his Son. There, we may find a reference to Hebrews 1:8-9 and the immediate context. The argument in both *Adversus haereses* 3.6.1 and Hebrews 1 is similar. Hebrews, through a collection of Old Testament passages, is arguing that the application of the titles "Son," "God" and "Lord" is restricted to Jesus (Heb. 1:5 [Ps. 2:7]; Heb. 1:8, 13 [Ps. 45 [44]; [7]: 110 [109]:1; Heb. 1:10 [Ps. 102 [101] 25 [26]; Heb. 3:1). The Scriptures, or more pointedly, God, has never applied them to angels. In the same manner, Irenaeus, also through a network of texts, is arguing that the titles "God" and "Lord" have only been used "definitely and absolutely" by the Father for the Son, the Spirit, or for both (Ps. 110:1; Ps. 45:6; Ps. 82:1; 50:1, 3). The Scripture, where it doesn't record the Father speaking, Irenaeus insists, has used them only of the Son (Gen. 19:24). He emphasizes, particularly, that when the Spirit employs the titles "God" and "Lord" he restricts application to the Son. However, the title "gods" can be applied to the church, to those who have received the adoption by grace (Ps. 82:1; Ps. 50: 1, 3; Isa. 65:1; Ps. 82:6; Rom. 8:15). Only Psalm 45:6 and Psalm 110:1 occur in the sets of Old Testament texts employed by both Hebrews and Irenaeus.

Although Irenaeus might have put his cento of Old Testament texts together completely on his own, or might have had access to some early *testimonia*, the similarity of concentration on the proper application of the same titles, as well as five other considerations, suggest dependence upon Hebrews 1. First, we know that in *Adversus haereses* 2.28.7, when he cites Psalm 110:1,

the presentation in Hebrews is in his mind. When he cites it he reflects the idea of Hebrews 1:13 when he says that it was to the Word “alone” to whom he said the words of the Psalm. He reflects in his own thought the teaching of the Hebrews text of when it says, “But to what angel has he ever said?” This is the language of exclusivity. Camerlynck is especially impressed by the similarity and sees here clear “dependence” upon the Epistle.⁵² Second, we already know of his explicit reading of Hebrews 1:2-3. Third, Hebrews 1 is contrasting the titles “God,” “Son,” and “Lord” to *angels*. Angels, the Letter argues, do not receive these titles from God. Irenaeus, similarly, is contrasting the titles “God” and “Lord” to the adopted children of God, the members of the church, those he sees the Spirit naming as “gods.” Also, however, further down in his argument (3.6.1-5), he will also demonstrate that the term “gods” is also applied to those who are “no gods at all.” The Father and Son are to be contrasted to the church in terms of supremacy, as the angels are different from the Son. On the other hand the false gods, the idols, are to be contrasted in terms of reality. Fourth, the same types of rhetorical questions occur in both Hebrews and Irenaeus. In Hebrews we find: “For to what angel did God ever say?” as Psalm 2 is read and, “But to what angel has he ever said?”, as Psalm 110 is read (Heb. 1:5, 13). In Irenaeus we find, “who is meant by God?,” between the reading of Psalm 50:1 and 50:3 and “But of what gods [does he speak]?,” just prior to the reading of Psalm 82:6. Finally, both the Letter and Irenaeus make explicit reference to the Father and Son. Hebrews 1:5 has the titles from Psalm 2:7 and 2 Samuel 7:14 (1 Chron. 17:13) and in Hebrews 1:8 where “son” occurs in interpretation of the title “God” in Psalm 45:6. Irenaeus has the same titles in the immediate context without biblical references, but like Hebrews 1, uses both titles in interpretation of the titles “Lord” and “God.”⁵³ Again, we should point out, that the bishop employs individual texts in centos which he composes. He rarely reads a text independently. His biblical reading is always canonical. Here, it

seems, though the entire cento is his own, that he composes it under the influence of Hebrews 1. Probably, his attention to Psalms 2 is drawn by Hebrews 1:8-9.

Hebrews 3:5: Moses and the One God

Because Irenaeus apparently borrows the language of Hebrews 3:14, it now becomes possible for us to appreciate a broader appeal to the third chapter of the Letter. It might also be that when he characterizes Moses as the “faithful servant and a prophet of God” (2.2.5) that he is reading towards the beginning of the chapter in verse 5. There the Letter reads: “Now Moses was faithful in God’s house as a servant, to testify to the things that would be spoken later.” It might also be that he has Numbers 12:7 and Joshua 14:7 as his source, but there, although the attributes of “servant” and “faithful” are said to be true of Moses, the context of Numbers 12:6-8 contrasts Moses with a prophet, which is an office Irenaeus attributes to him. Numbers says that to prophets, the LORD manifests himself in visions and dreams, but to Moses he speaks “face to face.” However, in Hebrews 3:5, Moses is characterized as a prophet, as one who testified “to those things that were spoken later.” This suggests that the text of Hebrews, which does not carry forth the contrast between Moses and the Lord’s prophets, is the text upon which Irenaeus was gazing. The language of Numbers 12 and Hebrews 3 occurs again later in *Adversus haereses* 3.6.5 where Irenaeus writes that Moses is spoken of by the Spirit as “the faithful Moses, the attendant and servant of God.”⁵⁴ But once again, it seems that the text which influences Irenaeus’s words is that of Hebrews 3. In his polemic the bishop is concerned with arguing the difference between gods and the one God, idols and God the Father, the creator of all things by his Son. To this effect he cites Galatians 4:8-9; 2 Thessalonians 2:4, and 1 Corinthians 8:4-6. The last of these three passages states that there is “one God, the Father, of whom are all things ... and one Lord Jesus Christ, by whom are all things.” Here he argues that all things, $\tau\alpha\pi\alpha\upsilon\tau\alpha$, derive only from the Creator and his agent and no one else. Therefore, there is only one God the

Father and one Lord Jesus Christ. The argument against other gods is made by demonstrating the unique identity of the Creator and his Son. He then quotes Moses twice, from Deuteronomy 4:19 and 5:8, to make the point that one should not make idols of created things, “of whatsoever things (παντοσ) are in heaven, earth, and the waters.” In Hebrews 3:4, the verse that immediately precedes the one under consideration reads, “that the builder of all things, [τ]παντα, is God.” The context of Hebrews 3 serves the polemic of Irenaeus better than that of Numbers 12. It also seems that Hebrews 3:5 is silently part of the cento of texts which includes the ones of Paul and Deuteronomy. The case for Irenaeus’s use of Hebrews 3:5, on the basis of context, seems a bit stronger than the case Hagner was able to make for Clement of Rome. In his treatment of Clement he concluded that Clement was “very possibly dependent upon Heb. 3.”⁵⁵ Once again, as with Hebrews 1:3, it seems the Letter comes to the aid of the polemicist as he presents the catholic faith concerning the creation, the Creator, the Father, and his agent, his Son.

Hebrews 5:8-9: Christ, Mary, and the Amendment

It is to the category of Salvation that we now turn. In particular we will see how Hebrews 5:9 helps him build his concept of Mary’s recapitulation of Eve and of Eve’s descendants. In the argument in which the presence of Hebrews 5 can be seen, Irenaeus is arguing that the end is connected to the beginning within the fabric of Salvation history. “Our Lord,” he states, in his flesh, his humanity, his finitude and suffering, is traced back to Adam over seventy-two generations “connecting the end with the beginning.”⁵⁶ Adam, for Irenaeus, after Romans 5:14, is “the figure of him that was to come,” for the Word of God had predestined that the first human, of animal nature, would be saved by the second human of spiritual nature.

This view of redemptive history so clear in the figures of Adam and Christ sets the pattern for understanding other biblical figures, for recognizing other connections inherent within the history of salvation. So, in *Adversus haereses* 3.22.4, Irenaeus begins, “In accordance with

this design, Mary the Virgin is found obedient. . . . But Eve was disobedient. . . . [and] having become disobedient was made the cause of death, both to herself and to the entire human race.”⁵⁷

Here Irenaeus makes another connection based on the one between Adam and Christ. But, now, it is the two virgin women, Mary and Eve, and the connection is not one of redemption, but of disobedience and death. In the same way in which the sorrowful nature of Adam passed to all of his descendants, Eve passes death along also; her disobedience is the cause of death to all of these. But Irenaeus goes on to argue that the reverse is true as well. “So also,” he continues, “did Mary, having a man betrothed [to her] and being nevertheless a virgin, by yielding obedience, *become the course of salvation, both to herself and the whole human race.*”⁵⁸

Irenaeus will pick up this theme of “recapitulation of disobedience” through obedience again in *Adv haer.* 5.19.1. There he says that Adam’s disobedience at the tree “receives amendment by the correction” of the First-begotten and Eve’s virginal disobedience is balanced by Mary’s virginal obedience.⁵⁹ Mary, he says, became the “patroness” (*Advocata*) of Eve so that the human race is rescued by a virgin as well.⁶⁰

Having seen the theme of balance, advocacy, amendment, and correction through the connectedness of the Irenaeian economies, we need to return to the language of *Adv. haer.* 3.22.4. There Eve was said to have “become the cause of salvation, both to herself and the whole human race.” Here we can see how Irenaeus has read, employed, and extended the words of Hebrews 5:8-9. There we read: Although he was a Son, he learned *obedience* through what he suffered; and being made perfect he *became the source of eternal salvation to all who obey him.*

In Irenaeus’s thought we see that he seems to have taken the language of cause and effect and obedience/perfection applied strictly to Jesus in Hebrews, and through his theme of connections, applied it also to Mary, so that she becomes also the “cause of salvation” to all. For Irenaeus, Adam is not the only figure that needs to be corrected, and Christ is not the only one who

corrects, for the Lord accomplishes “recapitulation of so comprehensive a dispensation.”⁶¹ The Lord makes the recapitulation, but employs a variety of figures in the comprehensiveness of that recapitulation. So, for Irenaeus, the cause and effect of the amendment performed by Christ for Adam and his obedient descendants, which we see in Hebrews 5:8-9, must be extended to Mary and the amendment of Eve and her obedient children.

Bertrand de Margerie hears the same allusion to Hebrews 5:9 in Irenaeus, an allusion he characterizes as “universally acknowledged.”⁶² In his understanding, Irenaeus’s reflection on Hebrews “signifies that Mary participates in the salvific obedience of Christ on the cross and has participated in it ever since the Annunciation, receiving from her Son the grace of obedience—obedience to him—in view of the salvation of the human race.”⁶³ Mary, then, becomes one of those who “obey him,” by means of grace, and one who thereby uniquely joins him in the recovery of the lost. De Margerie goes on to say, that Mary “received from him [Christ] the power to contribute in a unique way,—by consenting to become his mother—to the salvation of the whole human race.”⁶⁴

So now we have seen how Hebrews has helped inform Irenaeus’s presentation of redemptive history as he addresses his opponents. The entire reference to the reversal brought about by Christ and Mary began with the bishop concerned to explain the reality of Christ’s flesh, the actuality of his share in Mary’s flesh, his true taking from her of her flesh. He did not just pass through her as through a tube. In one dimension, then, the reversal of Eve through Mary, brought about in history, structures not only Irenaeus’s soteriology, but also his Christology. Mary’s participation in the amendment with Christ puts forth also Christ’s participation with Mary in her substance. They both bring about reversal of two erring humans, by virtue of the fact that both of them are obedient *humans*. They share. He shares her flesh; She shares in the work of reversal. There is co-participation. He participates in her humanity; she

participates, by grace, in the making of recapitulation. They share in obedience as they share in flesh. Hebrews has appeared linked to both the notion of recapitulation in history and also to the authenticity of the historical actual fleshiness of Christ.

Hebrews 5:15: The Immaturity of Humanity

We next see how the Epistle seems also to be linked to Irenaeus anthropology. In particular, it is linked to a very unique portion of his doctrine of humanity: his peculiar idea of the immaturity of humanity, a creature created to grow, mature, and develop within economies and a history designed to facilitate such maturation.

The discussion leading up to his apparent allusion to Hebrews begins with a question: “If, however, anyone says, ‘what then? Could not God have exhibited humanity as perfect from the beginning?’”⁶⁵ His response initially takes this line: All things are possible to God. He is always the same. But created things are inferior to him. They, unlike God, are not uncreated. As created, then, they are initially imperfect. A mother has it in her power to give food, meats, stews, firm vegetables to her infant, but does not, for her child is unable to receive it. Likewise, God could have made humans perfect from the beginning, but humanity being infantile in its creatureliness could not have received it. So, it is in this way that we should understand the first advent of the Lord. He came not with the glory with which he might have come, but in a fashion that we were capable of beholding. And then in Irenaeus’s own words we read: “He, who was the perfect bread of the Father, offered himself to us as milk [because we were] as infants.”⁶⁶ That is, as it were, we nursed “from the breast of his flesh,” so that by this “course of milk nourishment” we might “become accustomed to eat and drink the Word of God,” and might be able to receive and “contain” the Spirit, the “bread of immortality.”⁶⁷

In his continuing discussion of the topic, Irenaeus cites 1 Corinthians 3:2:

“And on this account does Paul declare to the Corinthians, ‘I have fed you with milk, not with meat, for you were not ready for it.’ That is, you have indeed learned about the advent of our Lord as human, nevertheless, because of your infirmity, the Spirit of the Father has not yet rested upon you.”

Because of the sin of the Corinthians, they did not have the Spirit, they were not spiritual. So, Irenaeus says, “the apostle had the power to give them strong meat,” that is the Holy Spirit, “but they were not capable of receiving it, because,” and now we hear the presence of Hebrews 5:14, “they had feeble and untrained faculties (ἀγμναστα χεῖν τῶ ἀσθητῖα).”⁶⁸ Hebrews 5:14 and its context parallels 1 Corinthians 3:2 in specific ways. Both are rebukes to the immature. Both address the unfortunate need to restrict the hearers to the consumption of milk and not meat or solid food. Hebrews 5:12c reads: “You need milk not solid food,” and 5:13 makes clear that the one fed milk is a child. And then 5:14 states: “But solid food is for the mature, for those who have their faculties trained (ξιν τῶ ἀσθητῖα γεγυμνασμῶ) by practice to distinguish good from evil.” It is important to note, since Irenaeus interprets the Corinthian poverty as the absence of the Spirit of the Father, that a few verses later in Hebrews 6:4, “partakers of the Holy Spirit” are mentioned.

Apparently, Irenaeus only borrows the specific language concerning “faculties” and “(un)trained” from Hebrews. However, his mind has joined the two passages together because of the commonality of language and topics shared by 1 Corinthians 3:2 and Hebrews 5:14. Whereas he cites 1 Corinthians, the presence of terminology from Hebrews indicates that he is thinking of both texts. They form a cento which informs his concept of humanity’s immaturity. This concept, of course, is contrasted to the perfection and absence of deficiency in the Creator. Rousseau, we might note, in his notes to the critical edition, also sees the allusion to Hebrews

5:14. Because of the presence of its language and the parallel contexts and topics, he believes that it is “certain” that the bishop is alluding to the Epistle.⁶⁹

Hebrews 8:5: Typologies and Economies

Now, as we move from chapter five of Hebrews to the eighth chapter, we find material which is attractive to Irenaeus as he expresses the hermeneutical framework for his understanding of the relationship between the two economies, between prophecy and fulfillment, between Law and grace, the earthly and the heavenly. Specifically, his eyes are fixed on Hebrews 8:5. In the context we find that the author is discussing the true high priest of the order of Melchizedek and the true sanctuary, the true tent erected not by humans, but by the Lord. Earthly priests (“now if he were on earth [γ□]”) and the earthly sanctuary of the old covenant, which was not faultless as the new covenant is, the epistle says are to be distinguished from the true ones. The earthly things, Hebrews 8:5 records,

Serve as a copy and shadow (σκι□) of the heavenly (πουρανῶν) sanctuary; for when Moses was about to erect the tent, he was instructed by God, saying ‘See that you make everything according to the pattern (τῶν leitourgias) which was shown you on the mountain (Ex. 25:40).’

We read of Irenaeus describing, perhaps the Jews, as those who deny that the prophets announced the one and the same Jesus Christ and who deny that the Son taught the same Father proclaimed by the prophets. In his mind they are “scoffers,” “those not subject to God” and those who “follow outward purifications for the praise of men.”⁷⁰ To these he goes on to say, God has “assigned everlasting perdition.” But he develops more fully what he considers to be their false worship. The “outward purifications” they follow he describes as “observances” which “had been given as a type of future things, “things to come,”; (τῶν μελλόντων), “The law,” he says,

and here he makes recourse to Hebrews 8:5, was “describing and outlining (σχημαγραφῶντος) eternal things by the temporal and the heavenly by the earthly (*terrenis caelestia*; τῶν ἐπιγείων τῶν ὀραίων).”⁷¹ One can also hear here, can hear the language of Hebrews 10:1 which speaks of the law as “a shadow of the good things to come (σκιῶν . . . τῶν μελλόντων).”

In the bishop’s understanding, there are those who do not recognize the connection between the prophets, Jesus Christ, and the Father. They remain tied to “the Old Testament dispensation” without believing in the “greater gift of grace” or “a fuller [measure of] grace and greater gifts” brought by Jesus in his advent. They have not moved in their worship beyond the outlines, the shadow, the temporal, the earthly.⁷² Origen, in Alexandria, of Course, spoke of the “Jewish cultus” as the “image and shadow of heavenly things” on the basis of Hebrews 8:5.⁷³ Here, we already find a similar construction present in Lyons in the second century.

We see the same connection at least two more time in *Adversus haereses*. In *Adv. haer.* 4.14.3, he cites Exodus 25:40, which also appears in Hebrews 8:5, and 1 Corinthians 10:4, 11. But it appears that he is thinking of Hebrews over Exodus or at least in addition to it. Again, the language of the earthly and heavenly, present in Hebrews 8:4-5, occurs in his argument. Irenaeus says that God in the old economy was “calling” the people of that economy “by secondary things to primary ones that is, by the figurative to the true, by the temporal to the eternal, by the carnal to the spiritual, by *the earthly to the celestial (terrrena ad caelestia*; τῶν ἐπιγείων τῶν ὀραίων)”.⁷⁴ As in *Adv. haer.* 4.11.3-4, the language of the “greater,” “fuller” new economy is here as well with the contrast between “secondary” and “primary” and this language echoes the terminology of Hebrews 8 which is that of a “more excellent” ministry, a “better” covenant “better promises”, and a “new covenant” versus one which was not “faultless” and which was “obsolete” (Heb 8:6-8, 13). In the same way in which we have already seen the bishop join Hebrews 5:14 with 1 Corinthians 3:2 in a centio, where the Corinthian text is cited and the

Hebrew text is present in allusion, we see here the linking of an allusion to Hebrews 8:5 with the citation of other passages from 1 Corinthians (10:4, 11).

Another allusion to the same context of Hebrews 8:5 appears in one of Irenaeus's rebukes concerning inappropriate hermeneutical practices. In *Adv. haer.* 4.19.1, he acknowledges that the Old Covenant modes of worship were received "in a figure as was shown to Moses." And he states that it was appropriate that "earthly things, (*πίγεια; terrena*)" should be types of "heavenly things (*τῶν προυρανίων; caelestia*)." ⁷⁵ But he scolds, the person, and he has in mind his opponents, who might incorrectly imagine that the "heavenly and spiritual things" are in themselves types of a "Pleroma" or another Father.⁷⁶ The typology has an end. This is his point again in *Adv. haer.* 5.35.2 where he again refers to Exodus 25:40/Hebrews 8:5. Here, in the midst of his argument for a literal new, eschatological resurrection, kingdom, Jerusalem and earth, he insists that such things are not to be "understood in reference to super-celestial matters," "for none of these literal elements of his eschatological hope "is capable of being allegorized."

In the immediate context a host of texts occur in support of his literal hermeneutic. Revelation 20 (11-15), Matt. 25:4, Revelation 21:1-4; Isaiah 65: 17, 18; 1 Corinthians 7:31; Matthew 26:35 all solidify his position in his mind. They place a limit on the manner in which the typology taught in Exodus 25:40/Hebrews 8:5 may be understood. For Irenaeus, Hebrews 8:5 provides a way to comprehend the differences in economies, dispensations, and covenants. It informs a paradigm for understanding the differences between old, new, and eschatological. But it must be read in linkage to other biblical passages which complement it and which place limitations of Catholicity on the typology it presents.

Hebrews 11: Faith, Promise, and Resurrection

We find also in *Adversus haereses*, the bishop probably alluding to other material from Hebrews which now we shall mention only briefly. He may have Hebrews 11:4 (and Matt 23:35)

in mind as he discusses the sin of Cain and speaks of Able as just (*iustus*; δίκαιος).⁷⁷ Hebrews 11:5-7; Wisdom 4:10 and Sirach 44:16 might inform his discussion of Enoch and Noah and those faithful ones “before Abraham,” as our Bishop says. They pleased (*placens*: εἰρησθησας) God by faith and demonstrated salvation without circumcision or the Law of Moses.⁷⁸ Furthermore, he may, as A. Orbe suggests, have his eye on these same texts as he reads Gen 5:24 and discusses the surety of bodily resurrection demonstrated when God bodily translated (*translatus*; μετετέθη) Enoch.⁷⁹ Both Hebrews and Wisdom of Solomon could have inspired his reading of Enoch. We might speculate, then, that this gives us a clue as to how we are to understand Eusebius’s statement about Irenaeus’s extensive citation of these two books in that work no longer extant.⁸⁰ Could it be that in that work, Irenaeus treated, at length, portions of Hebrews (at least elements of the eleventh chapter) and linked them interpretively to Wisdom (at least chapter 4)?⁸¹ Maybe this book was a theological treatise largely supported by centos composed of material from Hebrews and Wisdom.⁸²

Irenaeus’s treatment of Hebrews 11 is not exhausted in what he does with verses 4-7, and *Adv. haer.* 5.32.1-2 figures prominently.⁸³ Hebrews 11:8-9, 10, 13 (along with Heb 4:1; 6:12; 10:36) seem to be behind his discussions of Abraham. Irenaeus presents him as a stranger and pilgrim (*peregrinor*; *peregrination*; *peregrinus et advena*; ξένος ; πάροικος και παρεπίδημος) in this world, who lived by faith. However, the patriarch did not receive the inheritance (*hereditas*; κληρονομῶν) of the land (*terra*; γῆ), promised (*promitto*; επαγγελλομαι) by God. Instead, Irenaeus makes clear, what God promised would only be received (*recipio*; ἀπολαμβάνω [Heb 11:39 has: κομιζῶ]) at the resurrection. He used Abraham in this way to argue for the one God, the prefigurement of both covenants in that one patriarch and the blessed hope of resurrection. Furthermore, the language of Hebrews 11:19 makes a probable appearance as well. It speaks of the patriarch’s faith in God as the one who can raise humanity from the dead (ἐκ νεκρῶν

ἡμεῖς). When Irenaeus writes of him (God) who raises (*suscito*; ἡγείροντος) mortal flesh from the dead (*a mortuis*; κενεκρῶν) he uses the terminology of Hebrews.⁸⁴

Other Occurrences of Hebrews in Adversus haereses

Finally, we glance at two appearances of Hebrews in book three. First, at the beginning of his third book we hear what appears to be a whisper of Hebrews 3:14. As he concludes the first chapter of book three, where he insists that the evangelists transmitted the teaching of “one only God, Creator of heaven and earth” and of one only Christ, the Son of God,” he employs a unique term to describe the church’s evangelists who endure in the catholic faith. In Hebrews 3:14 the author of the letter refers to those who hold their “first confidence firm to the end” as those who “Share (μετόχοι) in Christ.” Now in *Adversus haereses* 3.1.2 he says that those who disagree with the truths of one God and one Son of God, that is, in his mind, the Valentinians, despise “those who share (*participes*; μετόχους) in the Lord.”⁸⁵ For the bishop of Lyons, it seems that it is those who have written the Gospel in four versions who remained firm and who are those who share in Christ. To despise their teaching is to despise Christ and the Father and to render one condemned. The evangelists “share” in Christ because they have been given the power of the Gospel.⁸⁶ It is they who transmit the truth and of whom the Lord spoke in Luke 10:16: “He who hears you hears me, and he who rejects you rejects me, and he who rejects me rejects him who sent me.”⁸⁷ The evangelists share in the Lord in the sense that, however the heretics respond to their teaching, that is the same way they respond to the Son and the Father. Here then, it appears, is Irenaeus’s reading of Hebrews 3:14 in connection to Luke 10:16.

Second, we have what seems to be a reference to Hebrews 13:12 in one place where Irenaeus speaks of Christ’s death.⁸⁸ Hebrews 13:12 in speaking of the suffering of Jesus, declares that it took place outside the gate. The purpose of this suffering was “to sanctify (ἁγιάσω) the people (λαῶν) through his own blood (διὰ τοῦ ἰδίου αἵματος).” Irenaeus describes Jesus

Christ as redeeming the church from apostasy by his own blood (*sanguine suo*; τῷ αἵματι αὐτοῦ) so that it might be a sanctified (*sanctifico*; ἁγιάζω) people (*populus*; λαός).

Conclusion

At this point, I think, we have provided sufficient warrant for our claim. Hebrews, though Irenaeus scarcely cites it in *Adversus haereses*, is present in allusion in significant ways. It informs important, paradigmatic theological theses in Irenaeus's response to his opponents.

It is important to note that in this argument for the use of Hebrews in Irenaeus most evidence has not come from the presence of explicit citations. However, although he doesn't cite remarkable portions of Hebrews, he unobtrusively inserts its language, argument, and conceptions. He has appropriated the text's language and ideas and made them his own through memory, association, and argument. It flows from his pen as if it were his own creation. Allusions, rather than signifying an absence of citation, and therefore a minimal role for a text actually signify the opposite. Scripture has become such a part of thought and life through memory and rumination that it shows itself without pomp. But this is what we would expect from a culture in which both orality and the written word function centrally. Jan Vansina said it best:

As opposed to all other sources, oral tradition consists of information existing in memory. It is in memory most of the time, and only now and then are those parts recalled which the needs of the moment require. This information forms a vast pool, one that encompasses the whole inherited culture—*for culture is what is in the mind.*⁸⁹

Allusions, rather than indicating the incidental function of Scripture, indicate its normative place. But they witness to something else as well. Allusions are selected from a pool, and selection is

interpretation which “occurs mainly for social reasons.”⁹⁰ These social, or cultural profiles “correspond to the *present* view of reality and of the world.”⁹¹ Therefore, allusions reflect what a culture currently believes to be paramount. Allusions are windows into prominent communal values. They are also windows into the whole pool of tradition for “even the smallest word or phrase...refers in some degree to the whole and to the authority that the whole commands...”⁹²

Irenaeus’s use of Hebrews demonstrates, then, the presence of a text, the language and ideology of which, has seeped selectively and quietly into his polemic. Its presence is not, apparently, as easily recognized as it was to Eusebius in the collection of Irenaeus’s writings with which he was familiar, but which are no longer available to us. But present, in *Adversus haereses*, it seems to be, nevertheless. Its presence, perhaps, is not more obvious because Irenaeus rejected its Pauline authorship and therefore, in polemic against the Gnostics and Marcionites, he feels the need to be subtle. This seems also to hold true for Tertullian, who believed that Barnabas wrote Hebrews and in *On Modesty* (20.2) cites Hebrews 6:4-8, but who, in *Adv. Marc.*, does not provide a defense for the apostolicity of Hebrews, although he defends all of Paul’s epistles.⁹³ He never cites nor appears to allude to Hebrews in *Adversus Valentinianos* and never cites the Letter in his *Adversus Marcionem*, although there appear to be recognizable allusions to at least Hebrews 1:14 and 4:12.⁹⁴ Tertullian appears to use it in a subtle way, typical of Irenaeus, perhaps because Marcion did not recognize Hebrews as apostolic.⁹⁵ In anti-Valentinian and ant-Marcionite polemic catholic authors do not seem to make obvious use of Hebrews. But it does inform Tertullian and Irenaeus in their polemics.

Suffice it now to conclude, that although perhaps in a different manner than Eusebius knew it, *Adversus haereses* also provides evidence of the important place of Hebrews in the theological work of the bishop of Lyons. Perhaps hesitant to explicitly cite it in this polemical work, because of his argument’s tie to the apostolic tradition he, regardless, has its language and

ideology in his mind. It informs his concept of Catholicity and his response to those who think it appropriate to depart from it.

¹ *Phot. Cod.232* (Migne, PG 103.1103)

² Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* 5.26; trans. G. A. Williams, rev. ed. A. Louth, *Eusebius, The History of the Church from Christ to Constantine* (London/New York: Penguin, 1989), 174.

³ Luke Timothy Johnson, *Hebrews: A Commentary* (Louisville: WJKP, 2006), 3. Cf. B. F. Westcott, *The Epistle to the Hebrews* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1984), lxii-lxiii.

⁴ *An Introduction to the New Testament* (New York: MacMillan, 1900), 33, n.2.

⁵ Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* 3.38.1-3; trans. H. J. Lawlor and J. E. L. Oulton, *Eusebius, Ecclesiastical History*, vol. 1, *Translation* (London: SPCK, 1927), 98.

⁶ D. A. Hagner, *The Use of the Old and New Testaments in Clement of Rome* (Leiden: Brill, 1973), 179.

⁷ Hagner, *The Use of the Old and New Testaments in Clement of Rome*, 194-95.

⁸ "1 Clement and the Writings That Later Formed the New Testament," in *The Reception of the New Testament in the Apostolic Fathers*, ed. A. Gregory and C. Tuckett (Oxford: Oxford University, 2007), 152. He references P. Ellingworth, "Hebrews and 1 Clement: Literary Dependence or Common Tradition?" *Biblische Zeitschrift*, ns. 23 (1979) 262-69.

⁹ Gerd Theissen, *Untersuchungen zum Hebräerbrief*, SNT, no.2 (Gütersloh:Gerd Mohn, 1969), 33-38. I am grateful to James Thompson for this reference.

¹⁰ "Heb 1:1-14, 1 Clem. 36:1-6 and the High Priest," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 97 (1978): 437-40.

¹¹ *The Epistle to the Hebrews* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1989), 6-7.

¹² *Hebrews as Pseudepigraphon: The History and Significance of the Pauline Attribution of Hebrews*, WUNT, no. 235 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009), 29-30.

¹³ Westcott, *The Epistle to the Hebrews*, lxii.

¹⁴ J. Verheyden, "The Shepherd of Hermas and the Writings That Later Formed the New Testament." In Gregory and Tuckett, eds. *The Reception of the New Testament in the Apostolic Fathers*, 293-329.

¹⁵ Verheyden, "The Shepherd of Hermas and the Writings That Later Formed the New Testament." 329.

¹⁶ R. E. Brown and J. P. Meier, *Antioch and Rome* (Mahwah, NJ: Paulist, 2004), 147. Particularly, the issues of difference concern the Levitical cult (Clement) and forgiveness after baptism (*Hermas*).

¹⁷ Brown and Meier, *Antioch and Rome*, 147.

¹⁸ Brown and Meier, *Antioch and Rome*, 148.

¹⁹ Brown and Meier, *Antioch and Rome*, 148.

²⁰ Brown and Meier, *Antioch and Rome*, 204.

²¹ Westcott, *The Epistle to the Hebrews*, lxv.

²² A. Camerlynck, *Saint Irénée et le canon du Nouveau Testament* (Louvain: J. -B. Istas, 1896), 36; *Sancti Irenaei Episcopi Lugdunensis Libros quinque adversus haereses*, 2 vols., ed. W. W. Harvey (Cambridge: Academic Press, 1857), 2: 522.

²³ A. Camerlynck, *Saint Irénée et le canon du Nouveau Testament*, 36-37.

²⁴ Harvey, *Sancti Irenaei*, 1: clxvii-clxviii.

²⁵ A. Camerlynck, *Saint Irénée et le canon du Nouveau Testament*, 36.

²⁶ J. Hoh, *Die Lehre des hl. Irenäus über das Neue Testament* (Münster: Aschendorrschen, 1919), 198.

²⁷ F. R. M Hitchcock, *Irenaeus Of Lugdunum: A Study of His Teaching* (Cambride: University Press, 1914), 230.

²⁸ C. H. Turner, "Appedix II: De Epistula ad Hebraeos," in *Novum Testamentum Sancti Irenaei Episcopi Lugdunensis*, ed. W. Sanday, C. H. Turner, and A. Souter (Oxford: Clarendon, 1923), 226-27.

²⁹ A. Benoît, *Saint Irémée: introduction a l'étude de sa théologie* (Paris: Universitaires de France, 1960), 143.

³⁰ Benoît, *Saint Irémée: introduction a l'étude de sa théologie*, 144.

³¹ *Hebrews as Pseudepigraphon*, 30-31.

³² *New Testament Apocrypha*, vol. 1, *Gospels and Related Writings*, rev. ed., W. Schneemelcher, trans. R. McL. Wilson (Louisville: WJKP, 1991), 26.

³³ N. Brox, "Irenaeus and the Bible," in C. Kannengiesser, *Handbook of Patristic Exegesis* (Leiden, Brill, 2006), 484.

³⁴ Brox, "Irenaeus and the Bible," 484.

³⁵ R. M. Grant, *A Historical Introduction to the New Testament* (New York/Evanston: Harper & Row, 1963), 31.

³⁶ R. M. Grant, *Irenaeus of Lyons* (London/New York: Routledge, 1997), 1; R. M. Grant, *Heresy and Criticism* (Louisville: WJK, 1993), 92.

³⁷ Luke Timothy Johnson, *Hebrews*, 4.

³⁸ *Marcion and His Influence* (London: S.P.C.K., 1948).

³⁹ *Irenaeus of Lugdunum*, 230. See Jerome *Adv. Jov.* 2.3; *Ep. 41 ad Marcellam* 3; Tertullian *De pudic.* 20.1-2; Pacian *Ep. Symp.* 1.2 and Germanus *Syn. Haer.* 5 on Hebrews 6:4-6 and rigorist views concerning repentance and penance in Montanism and Novationism. Cf. W. Tabbernee, *Fake Prophecy and Polluted Sacraments: Ecclesiastical and Imperial Reactions to Montanism* (Leiden/Boston: E. J. Brill, 2007), 364-66; C. Trevett, *Montanism: Gender, Authority and the New Prophecy* (Cambridge: University Press, 1996), 117, 131. F. E. Vokes, "Penitential Discipline in Montanism," *Studia Patristica* 14 (1976): 62-76; W. Tabbernee, "To Pardon or Not to Pardon? North African Montanism and the Forgiveness of Sins," *Studia Patristica* 35 (2001): 375-86; Z. Garcia, "El Perdón de los pecados en la primitiva iglesia: Tertuliano y polémica católico-montanista," *Razón y Fe* 23 (1909): 360-67; P. C. De Labriolle, *La Crise Montaniste* (Paris, E. Leroux, 1913), 404-57.

⁴⁰ On Hebrews as a work of Christian prophecy attractive to Montanists and therefore as a text minimized or rejected by Montanism's opponents, see Trevett, *Monasticism*, 131 and H. Lietzmann, *Kleine Schriften*, vol. 2, TU, no. 68 (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1958), 81-84.

⁴¹ The following indices were consulted: *Biblia Patristica: Index des citations et bibliques dans la littérature patristique*, vol. 1, *Des origines à Clement d'Alexandrie et Tertullien*, Centre d'Analyse et de Documentation Patriarcale, ed. J. Allenbach et al. (Paris: Éditions du Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, 1975), 520-25; the website, *BibIndex: Index of Biblical Quotations and Allusions in Early Christian Literature* http://www.bibindex.mom.fr/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=6&Itemid=8&en&lang=en; and the index in the SC critical edition (I have used the cumulative index in the single volume French translation of the SC volumes of *Adv. haer.* (*Irénée de Lyon Contre les heresies*, trans. A. Rousseau [Paris: Cerf, 1984], 705). Combined, they list the following references for Hebrews in Irenaeus: Heb 1:3; 1:8-9; 1:13; 2:8; 2:10; 3:5; 3:14; 5:9; 5:14; 8:5; 9:11-14; 9:23; 10:1; 10.26; 10:38; 11:1; 11:4; 11:5; 11:8-10; 11:13; 11:19; 13:12 (Heb 1:3--*Adv. haer.* 2.30.9 [SC294: 318.224]; Heb 1:8--9- 3.6.1 [SC211: 66.19]; Heb 1:13-- 2.28.7 [SC294: 286.189]; Heb 2:8--1.29.2/ 4.33.13 [SC264: 360.27/100.2: 840.306]; Heb 2:10-- 3.12.13 [SC211: 234.445]; Heb 3:5-- 2.2.5/ 3.6.5/4.15.2 [SC294: 40.81/211: 80.122/100.2: 554.47]; Heb 3:5-6--4.30.4 [SC100.2: 784.119-20]; Heb 3:14-- 3.1.2 [SC211:24.31]; Heb 5:9-- 3.22.4 [SC211: 440.68]; Heb 5:14-- 4.38.2 [SC100.2: 950.43]; Heb 6:5--3.7.1 [SC211: 82.18-19]; Heb 8:5-- *Dem. 9/ Adv. haer.* 4.11.4/ 4.14.3/ 4.19.1/ 5.35.2 [SC62: 46.5/ SC100.2: 508.86/ 548.79/ 614.3/ SC153: 450.106]; Heb 9:11-14-- 4.8.2 [SC100.2: 470.42]; Heb 9:23-- 4.11.4 [SC100.2: 508.86]; Heb 10:1-- 4.11.4 [SC100.2: 508.86]; Heb 10:26-- 4.27.2 [SC100.2: 742.112]; Heb 10:38--*Dem* 35 [SC62: 88.2]; Heb 11:1-- *Dem.* 3 [SC62: 32.1]; Heb 11:4-- *Adv. haer.* 3.23.4 [SC211: 454.88]; Heb 11:5-- 4.16.2/ 5.5.1 [SC100.2: 562.36; 564.31/ SC153: 62.8]; Heb 11:8-10-- 4.5.3 [SC100.2: 432.61]; Heb 11:13-- 4.25.1 [SC100.2: 704.7]; Heb 11:19-- 5.3.2 [SC153: 44.32]; Heb 13:12-- 3.5.3 [SC211: 62.77]).

⁴² *Adv. haer.* 2.30.9; Trans. *Against Heresies, Books 1-5 and Fragments*, trans. A. Roberts and W. H. Rambaut, in *The Ante-Nicene Fathers* (ANF), vol. 1, *The Apostolic Fathers with Justin Martyr*, rev. ed. (Edinburgh: T&T Clark; reprint, Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1987; reprint, Peabody: Hendrickson, 1994), 406; hereafter ANF 1. Critical edition used was *Irénée de Lyon: Contre les heresies, Livres 1-5*, ed. trans. and annot. A. Rousseau, L. Doutreleau, B. Hemmerdinger, and C. Mercier, Sources chretiennes (SC) 263, 264 [Livre 1], 293, 294 [Livre 2], 210, 211 [Livre3], 100.1, 100.2 [Livre 4], 152, 153 [Livre 5] (Paris: Cerf, 1979 [Livre 1], 1982 [Livre 2], 1974, 2002 [Livre 3], 1965 [Livre 4], 1969 [Livre 5]).

⁴³ *Adv. haer.* 2.30.9 (SC 294: 318.224). I believe this is a partial quotation or citation of Hebrews 1:3. However, I think that all the other references to Hebrews mentioned in this paper are best classified as "allusions," not "quotations" or even "echoes." Such terms have been the topic of much discussion in New Testament studies (e.g. R. B. Hays, *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul* [New Haven: Yale, 1989], 19-32; R. B. Hays, *The Conversion of the Imagination: Paul as Interpreter Of Israel's Scripture* [Grand Rapids; Eerdmans, 2005], 163-89; S. 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*, ed. T. L. Brodie and D. R. MacDonald, and S. E. Porter, NTM, no. 16 [Sheffields: Sheffield Phoenix, 2007], 98-110; S. E. Porter, "Allusions and Echoes," in *As It is Written: Studying Paul's Use of Scripture*, ed. S. E. Porter and C. D. Stanley [Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2008], 29-40; C. D. Stanley, *Paul and the Language of Scripture: Citation Technique in the Pauline Epistles and Contemporary Literature*, SNTSMS, no. 74 [Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1992]). I have adopted the definitions of Porter: Allusion indirectly invokes a specific "external person, place, or literary work" to bring it into the contemporary text

or material; Echo indirectly invokes language which is thematically associated with a “more general notion or concept” into the contemporary text (Porter, “Allusions and Echoes,” 33, 39-40).

⁴⁴ *Adv. haer.* 2.30.9 (SC 294: 318.219).

⁴⁵ *Adv. haer.* 2.30 (SC 294: 305. 54-306.55). And Heb 1:3 in *Adv. haer.* 4.25.1 (SC100.2: 706. 10) might inspire him again, when alluding to Ephesians 2:20 he speaks of Christ, the chief-cornerstone, “sustaining all things” (*omnia sustinens*; πάντα βαστάων). Heb 1:3 has φῶρον τε τῷ πῶντα. Cf. A. Orbe, *Teología de San Ireneo: Commentario al Libro V del “Adversus haereses”*, 3 vols. [Madrid: Biblioteca de Autores Cristianos, 1985, 1987, 1988], 3: 334-35.

⁴⁶ *Adv. haer.* 2.309 (SC 294: 318. 224-320.225).

⁴⁷ *Adv. haer.* 2.30.9 (SC 294:320. 238-39).

⁴⁸ *Adv. haer.* 2.30.9 (SC 294: 320.248).

⁴⁹ I am grateful to Fr. Roch Kerestzy for bringing this to my attention.

⁵⁰ *Adv. haer.* 1.22.1 (SC 264: 308.2-3).

⁵¹ *Adv. haer.* 1.8.1-9.5.

⁵² Camerlynck, *Saint Irénée et le canon du Nouveau Testament*, 36. Cf. T. Zahn, *Geschichte des Neutestamentlichen Kanons* (Erlangen/Leipzig:), 1:298, n.2.

⁵³ He does, further down in 3.6.2 employ Isa. 43:10 with “Lord God” and “Son.”

⁵⁴ Cf. Turner, “Appendi II: De Epistula ad Hebraeos,” 226, who draws these prophetic texts to our eyes seeming to prefer an Old Testament origin for Irenaeus’s words due to his statement regarding the Spirit’s (not the Lord’s or the apostles’) testimony concerning Moses. However, Irenaeus could simply be recognizing the prophetic origin of the words and their setting in Hebrews.

⁵⁵ D. A. Hagner, *The Use of the Old and New Testaments in Clement of Rome* (Leiden: Brill, 1973), 191.

⁵⁶ *Adv. haer.* 3.22.2-3

⁵⁷ *Adv. haer.* 3.22.4; trans. Roberts and Rambout, ANF 1:258.

⁵⁸ *Adv. haer.* 3.22.4; trans. Roberts and Rambout, ANF 1:758.

⁵⁹ *Adv. haer.* 5.19.1; trans. Roberts and Rambout, ANF 1:919.

⁶⁰ *Adv. haer.* 5.19.1; trans. Roberts and Rambout, ANF 1:919.

⁶¹ *Adv. haer.* 3.23.1; trans. Roberts and Rambout, ANF 1:759.

⁶² B. de Margerie, “Mary Coredemptrix in the Light of Patristics,” in *Mary Coredemptrix, Mediatrix, Advocate, Theological Foundations: Towards a Papal Definition?*, ed. M. I. Miravalle (Santa Barbara, CA: Queenship, 1995), 8. See further on the theme in Irenaeus, M. C. Steenberg, “The Role of Mary as Co-Recapitulator in St Irenaeus of Lyons” *Vigiliae Christianae* 58 (2004): 117-37.

⁶³ De Margerie, “Mary Coredemptrix in the Light of Patristics,” 8.

⁶⁴ De Margerie, “Mary Coredemptrix in the Light of Patristics,” 9.

⁶⁵ *Adv. haer.* 4.38.1; trans. Roberts and Rambout, ANF 1:874, slightly altered.

⁶⁶ *Adv. haer.* 4.38.1; trans. Roberts and Rambout, ANF 1:874.

⁶⁷ *Adv. haer.* 4.38.1; trans. Roberts and Rambout, ANF 1:874.

⁶⁸ *Adv. haer.* 4.38.2 (SC 100.2: 950-51); trans. Roberts and Rambout, ANF 1:875 slightly altered.

⁶⁹ SC 100.1: 281-82.

⁷⁰ *Adv. haer.* 4.11.4; trans. Roberts and Rambout, ANF 1:793.

⁷¹ *Adv. haer.* 4.11.4 (SC 100.2: 508-09).

⁷² The language in quotation marks comes from *Adv. haer.* 4.11.3, the paragraph preceding the one in which he alludes to Hebrews 8:5, and *Adv. haer.* 4.11.4. Trans. Roberts and Rambout, ANF 1:792.

⁷³ Cf. e.g. J. Daniélou, *Gospel Message and Hellenistic Culture*, trans. J. A. Baker (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1973), 285-86.

⁷⁴ *Adv. haer.* 4.14.3 (SC 100.2: 546-47).

⁷⁵ *Adv. haer.* 4.19.1 (SC 100.2: 616-17).

⁷⁶ *Adv. haer.* 4.19.1 (SC 100.2: 616-17).

⁷⁷ *Adv. haer.* 3.23.4 (SC211: 454.88).

⁷⁸ *Adv. haer.* 4.16.2 (SC100.2: 562.35-38); 5.5.1 (SC153: 62.8-9).

⁷⁹ *Teología de San Ireneo*, 1: 233

⁸⁰ See the citation from Eusebius *Hist. Eccl.* 5.26 given at the beginning of this paper. This, then, might answer, at least in part, Hoh’s question concerning why Eusebius mentions both Hebrews and Wisdom in the same remark. He

had wondered if it concerned Eusebius's curiosity over why Irenaeus would cite from two disputed books or Eusebius's surprise that Irenaeus had so greatly employed these two books together (*Die Lehre des hl. Irenäus über das Neue Testament*, 46). Cf. Orbe, (*Teología de San Ireneo*, 1: 233), who sees in *Adv. haer.* 5.5.1 a connection between the Eusebius statement and Irenaeus's exegesis. M. C. Steenberg believes the "little book," spoken of by Eusebius, was "on the Epistle to the Hebrews and the Wisdom of Solomon [emphasis mine]" (*Irenaeus on Creation: The Cosmic-Christ and the Saga of Creation* [Leiden: Brill, 2008], 19, n. 60). Irenaeus apparently cites Wisdom (6:19) literally only at the very end of *Adv. haer.* 4.38.3 (SC100.2: 956.83-84). However, the editors of SC note the following accommodated citations or allusions in Wis 1:7 (*Adv. haer.* 3.11.8; 4.20.6; 5.2.3; 5.18.3); Wis 1:14 (1.22.1; 2.10.2); Wis 2.24 (4.pref.4; 4.40.3; 5.25.4); Wis 4:10 (4.16.2; 5.5.1); Wis 7:5 (2.34.2); Wis 10:4 (1.30.10); Wis 11:20 (4.4.2); Wis 14:21 (3.5.3).

⁸¹ C. Spicq, notes that Irenaeus already seemed to have recognized the similarities and he references the Eusebius remark as evidence (*L'Épître aux Hébreux*, 2 vols. [Paris: Gabalda, 1952], 1:42). Maybe he even joined the just, dead man of Wisdom 4:16 to the just, dead Cain of Hebrews 11:4. It is not difficult to see Irenaeus composing a small book demonstrating the unity of the testimony of these two books to prove the unity of redemption and revelation, of anticipation and fulfillment, of the old and the new.

⁸² The recognition of some level of similarity, particularly in language and thought, between the two texts has caused remarkable theses. For example, E. H. Plumptre argued that they had a common author, Apollos, who penned Wisdom while a Jew and Hebrews after conversion to Christianity ("The Writings of Apollos," *The Expositor* n.s. 1 (1885): 329-48; 409-35); cf. E. H. Plumptre, *Ecclesiastes* (Cambridge: University Press, 1890), 68-70. Plumptre concluded his essay with the argument that his thesis concerning Apollos explains Irenaeus's grouping of Hebrews with Wisdom; they were from the same author ("The Writings of Apollos," 435). L. Noack (*Der Ursprung des Christentums* [Leipzig: Fleischer, 1857], 222) had earlier argued for Apollos, but thought he wrote Wisdom as a Christian convert (e.g., Wis 2:20 is a key sign). See also for an argument that Hebrews is certainly familiar with Wisdom because of lexical and conceptual parallels: H. von Soden, *Hand-Commentar zum Neuen Testament*, vol. 3.2, *Hebräerbrief, Briefe des Petrus, Jakobus, Judas* (Tübingen/Leipzig: J.C.B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1899), 5. Parallels recognized between the two books include: Heb 1:1/ Wis 7:22; Heb 1:2/Wis 9:4, 9; Heb 1:3/Wis 1:21, 7:26, 9:4,9; Heb 1:6/ Wis 1:7; Heb 2:5/ Wis 1:7; Heb 2:10/ Wis 4:13; Heb 2:14/ Wis 1:13, 2:24; Heb 2:15/ Wis 12:2; Heb 2:18/Wis 3:5; Heb 3:3-4/ Wis 13:4; Heb 3:4/ Wis 9:2; Heb 3:5/ Wis 17:21; Heb 3:6/ Wis 16:6, 19:1; Heb 3:12/ Wis 3:10, 14:25; Heb 3:14/ Wis 16:21; Heb 4:6/ Wis 14:6; Heb 4:9/ Wis 4:7; 18:22; Heb 4:12-13/ Wis 1:6, 7:22-24, 18:15-16; Heb 4:15/Wis 3:5; Heb 5:9/ Wis 4:13; Heb 5:12/ Wis 13:61; Heb 5:13/ Wis 13:18; Heb 6:1; Wis 6:15; Heb 6:6/ Wis 6:9, 18, 7:27; Heb 6:17/Wis 9:17; Heb 6:20/ Wis 12:8; Heb 7:16/ Wis 1:3, 5:23, 7:25, 12:15, 17; Heb 7:26/ Wis 3:13, 4:2; Heb 8:1/Wis 9:4,9; Heb 8:2, 9, 11/ Wis 9:8; Heb 8:8/ Wis 11:14; Heb 8:17/ Wis 18:24; Heb 9:2-6/ Wis 13:4; Heb 10:1/ Wis 9:25; Heb 10:19/ Wis 5:1; Heb 10:36/ Wis 13:6; Heb 11/ Wis 10:1-11:1; Heb 11:1/ Wis 16:21; Heb 11:2/Wis 9:1, 4, 9; Heb 11:5/ Wis 4:10; Heb 12:6-11/ Wis 3:5; Heb 12:10/ Wis 18:7; Heb 12:17/ Wis 12:10; Heb 12:28/ Wis 4:10; Heb 13:7/ Wis 2:17; Heb 13:20/ Wis 13:21, 16: 13; Heb 13:21/ Wis 4:10, 9:10. Cf. Plumptre, "The Writings of Apollos," 332-34; A. Nairne, *The Epistle to the Hebrews* (Cambridge: University Press, 1922), cx-cxii; Spicq, *L'Épître aux Hébreux*, 1:42; *The Book of Wisdom with Introduction and Notes*, ed. A. T. S. Goodrick (London: Rivingtons, 1913), 8; von Soden, *Hand-Commentar zum Neuen Testament*, 5. Note also the similarities between Sir 24:1-29, Wis 10:1-21, and Heb 11 (cf. P. Enns, "Wisdom of Solomon and Biblical Interpretation in the Second Temple Period," in J.I. Packer and Sven K. Soderlund, eds., *The Way of Wisdom: Essays in Honor of Bruce K. Waltke* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2000), 223, 225, n. 17. P. Ellingworth notes Wis 7:27 as a text the author of Hebrews certainly employed in writing Heb 3:4 (in addition to Heb 1:3/ Wis 7:26) and points to the commonality between Heb 4:12 and Wis 7:22-8:11 (esp. 7:23, 24) (*The Epistle to the Hebrews: A Commentary on the Greek Text* [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993], 205, 261. F. F. Bruce thinks that Heb 2:14 indicates that the author belonged to the circle out of which Wisdom (he has in mind here: Wis 1:13, 14 and 2:23, 24) earlier arose (*The Epistle to the Hebrews* [Grand Rapids; Eerdmans, 1990], 85-86). The interest in these parallels, evident in earlier works, does not seem to have continued in the more recent studies on Hebrews.

⁸³ *Adv. haer.* 4.5.3; 4.25.1 (SC100.2: 432.62; 704.7); 5.32.1 (SC153: 396. 8-9 [Heb 6:12; 11:39]); 5.32.2 (SC153: 400.33 [Heb 11:13], 42 [Heb 11:8-9]). Cf. Orbe, *Teología de San Ireneo*, 3: 356 [Heb 6:12; 11:39], 367 [Heb 11:13], 372 [Heb 11:8-9]; Roberts and Rambaut, ANF 1: 561, n. 6. The SC retroversion has κομιζω rather than απλοβανω as in Heb 11:39. Despite the difference Orbe still says that "It is very probable that Irenaeus was inspired by Heb 11:39" (Orbe, *Teología de San Ireneo*, 3: 356). Orbe also draws our attention to Heb 4:1; 6:12; and 10:36 as also parallel texts to the concepts developed in *Adv. haer.* 5.32.1-2 (Orbe, *Teología de San Ireneo*, 3: 356).

⁸⁴ *Adv. haer.* 5.3.2 (SC153: 44. 32). Orbe believes Eph 1:19-20 or Rom 8:11 probably influence Irenaeus here rather than Heb 11:19, apparently because, as he notes, Irenaeus doesn't consider Hebrews to be from Paul's hand and the current chapter, in his mind, is controlled by that Apostle's witness (*Teología de San Ireneo*, 1: 180). However, the

tone of Irenaeus's discussion pleads for the Hebrew text. He is responding to those who do not have faith in the resurrection and who reject it (cf. 5.2.2 and 5.3.2). This makes Abraham's faith in the face of circumstances a perfect testimony to these false teachers.

⁸⁵ Adv. haer. 3.1.2 (SC211: 24.31).

⁸⁶ Adv. haer. 3. Pref. (SC211: 20.26-37).

⁸⁷ Adv. haer. 3. Pref. (SC211: 20.28-30).

⁸⁸ Adv. haer. 3.5.3 (SC211: 62.76-77).

⁸⁹ J. Vansina, *Oral Tradition as History* (Madison: University of Wisconsin, 1985), 147. Emphasis added.

⁹⁰ Vansina, 190.

⁹¹ Vansina, 190.

⁹² W. A. Graham, *Beyond the Written Word: Oral Aspects of Scripture in the History of Religions* (Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1987), 112.

⁹³ I am grateful to Fr. Denis Farkasfalvy for bringing this insight on Tertullian to my attention.

⁹⁴ The critical edition of *Adversus marcionem* consulted was *Contre Marcion*, ed., trans., and annot. R. Braun, Sources chretiennes 368 (book 2) and 399 (book 3) (Paris: Cerf, 1991, 1994). See Adv. marc. 2.9.7 (SC 368: 68.51); 3.14.3, 7 (SC 399: 132.16-18; 134.42-43). E. Evans seems to concur on the allusion to Heb 1:14 (*Tertullian Adversus Marcionem Books 1-3* [Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1972], 112, n.9.a). Braun also see possible allusions to Heb 1:7 and 10:39 (Adv. marc. 2.8.2; 2.18.1), but these seem to be citations of the Old Testament passages of Ps 103:4 and Deut 32:35 (SC 368: 62.14-15; 112.8-9) which Hebrews also cites. *Biblia Patristica*, 1:520-25 and the website index, *BiblIndex: Index of Biblical Quotations and Allusions in Early Christian Literature*, http://www.biblindex.mom.fr/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=6&Itemid=8&lang=en, lists the following references to Hebrews within Adv. Marc.: Heb 1:2; 1:13-14; 2:9; 4:12; 4:15; 5:5-9; 7:17; 8:8-12; 10:30 (5.4.2; 2.9.7; 4.21.12; 3.14.3,7; 5.14.1; 5.9.9; 5.9.9; 5.11.4; 4.14.12). The critical edition of Adv. Val. consulted was *Contre les Valentiniens*, ed. trans., and annot. J.-C. Fredouille, Sources chretiennes 280 (Paris: Cerf, 1980). For Tertullian's defense of Paul's epistles without Hebrews see Adv. Marc. 5.1-21.

⁹⁵ On Tertullian and Hebrews see J. F. Jansen, "Tertullian and the New Testament," *Second Century* 2 (1982): 192-93.