# **Chapter 4: Scriptures and Tradition in Irenaeus and the Canonical New Testament**

## **Introduction**

 With the work of Irenaeus († ca. 200)[[1]](#footnote-1) and the canonical New Testament we move into the final third of the second century. Neither corpus can be viewed separately from the other as both appear at the same point in history and paint a picture of the beginnings of Christianity that will in many ways affect later readership.

Irenaeus is the first Christian known to advocate the four gospels.[[2]](#footnote-2) According to Tertullian, Marcion of Sinope was the only author prior to Irenaeus to even acknowledge the existence of the four gospels, although he rejected all of them as plagiarisms of his own.[[3]](#footnote-3) Irenaeus, on the other hand, defended them and dismissed ​​Marcion's Gospel as a defacement of Luke's. In pursuing his anti-heretical strategy, Irenaeus made particular use of the later canonical Acts of the Apostles, which he demonstrably cited as antecedent in the history of Christianity.[[4]](#footnote-4) He seems to have been familiar with some of the other twenty-seven texts that comprise today's canonical New Testament and combined them to form a corpus[[5]](#footnote-5) that he called "the rule of truth."[[6]](#footnote-6)

Irenaeus himself admits that those against whom he directed his *Conversion and Rejection of the Falsely So-Called Gnosis* or *Adversus haereses,* were speaking of oral traditions rather than written texts. His opponents were particularly critical of the Christian writings that he was championing because they felt they were "not correct, nor of authority, and that they are ambiguous, and that the truth cannot be extracted from them by those who are ignorant of tradition."[[7]](#footnote-7) We may recall, however, that, though less drastic in his criticism of scripture, Tertullian, like Irenaeus's opponents, placed tradition above scripture, and that even Eusebius referred primarily to writings other than the New Testament in his description of the beginnings of Christianity, albeit in a manner quite different from that of Irenaeus and Tertullian. Irenaeus, too, reproaches his opponents for referencing not only tradition, but also those Christian texts that he himself accepted. Therefore, contrary to Christians today, early proselytizers seem to have believed that tradition alone was reliable and that only that which had been transmitted orally and through revelation, prophecy, or authorities—and not scripture— could serve as the basis of early Christian history.

Marcion, for example, while not Irenaeus's chief opponent, as that distinction fell to Valentinus and his pupils, refers to Paul so often and so explicitly that Irenaeus seems to have been forced to take Paul into consideration even though the latter's ideas did not necessarily appeal to him theologically. In some cases, Irenaeus, like Tertullian, had no choice but to respond with what modern scholars term "defensive and embarrassing exegesis" in order to "rescue" what he regarded as orthodoxy.[[8]](#footnote-8)

When speaking of the four gospels, which he wishes to promote as the standard Christian texts, Irenaeus admits that "the very heretics themselves bear witness to them, and, starting from these [documents], each one of them endeavors to establish his own peculiar doctrine."[[9]](#footnote-9) Thereupon, he lists heretics and the gospels to which they make reference:

For the Ebionites, who use Matthew's Gospel only, are confuted out of this very same, making false suppositions with regard to the Lord. But Marcion, mutilating that according to Luke, is proved to be a blasphemer of the only existing God, from those [passages] which he still retains. Those, again, who separate Jesus from Christ, alleging that Christ remained impassible, but that it was Jesus who suffered, preferring the Gospel by Mark, if they read it with a love of truth, may have their errors rectified. Those, moreover, who follow Valentinus, making copious use of that according to John, to illustrate their conjunctions, shall be proved to be totally in error by means of this very Gospel, as I have shown in the first book. Since, then, our opponents do bear testimony to us, and make use of these [documents], our proof derived from them is firm and true.[[10]](#footnote-10)

Here it becomes clear not only that Irenaeus's opponents deemed Christian writings controversial, but also that Irenaeus did not use them as points of reference for demonstrating the authority of his own teachings. Like him, his opponents made use of both tradition and scripture, favoring oral tradition over the written texts. For Irenaeus, the scriptural argument did not offer immediate or convincing insights that solidly revealed the truth. Instead, he employs roundabout arguments showing that his opponents, too, refer to Paul and the four gospels as authoritative sources. His criticism focuses on his opponents' choice of gospel; they did not use all four, but only those they accepted as authentic. As he points out, some even came up with their own gospel, such as the Valentinians' "Gospel of Truth,"[[11]](#footnote-11) or reworked one of the gospels into their own version, as Marcion did with Luke's text. By censuring his adversaries, Irenaeus attempts to establish the authority of the four gospels that he wishes to promote and to highlight their consistency with the Church's teaching. This also explains why he, like Tertullian after him, refers not only to scripture but also to ecclesiastical tradition and feels compelled to explain why he, unlike some of his opponents, wishes to use not one, but all four gospels.

The existence of several competing accounts of Jesus's life caused a problem for Christian readers and inspired them to seek out alternative solutions. Several years prior to Irenaeus, Tatian (and perhaps also Theophilus of Antioch and Justin) harmonized various accounts to create what he simply called "The Gospel." That Tatian referred to it as the *Diatessaron* ("all four") seems to have been an invention of Eusebius of Caesarea, who, like Irenaeus, wished to stress the plurality of the four, as opposed to Tatian, who had reduced them into one.[[12]](#footnote-12) We shall return to the arguments with which Irenaeus justifies his acceptance of exactly four gospels—no more, no less— in a moment.

Although these authors did not yet regard the New Testament as an indisputable authority on the beginnings of Christianity, this is precisely what writers today tend to assume. For example, a recently published introductory textbook states that "the main source [on the first 100 years of Christianity] are naturally all writings of the New Testament, especially the letters of Paul, Acts, and the gospels."[[13]](#footnote-13) When it comes to sources, however, modern historians differ fundamentally from their forebears of the first millennium, even if they agree in part with the notion proposed by Irenaeus. Although Irenaeus, with his insistence on the four gospels (and Paul), is accessible to and informative for today's audience, epitomizing everything that is taken for granted in modern scholarship, our investigation reveals that both in his own day and for a long time afterward, the position he assumed and his choice of sources were rather precarious.

The works of Irenaeus were certainly read by Tertullian, Hippolytus, Marcellus of Ancyra, Gregory of Nyssa and his brother Basil, and others in the two centuries following his death, and his theological ideas continued to impact their works, and through them, other readers. He thus came to be seen as someone "close to the times of the apostles," "an apostolic man,"[[14]](#footnote-15) rather than someone occupied primarily with battling heresy. Yet, as his opponents gradually disappeared into historical obscurity, he, too, fell "into oblivion... until he was rediscovered by Erasmus."[[15]](#footnote-16) Even today, we have no complete Greek text of any of Irenaeus's major works. *Adversus haereses*was preserved in its entirety only in the Latin and Armenian translation, while his catechetical work, the *Demonstratio* or *Epideixis* survives only in Armenian. The "Letter to Victor," another letter to Valentinian Florinus "On the monarchy of God or that God is not the author of evil,*"* a treatise against Florinus entitled *On the Eighth…*, and a warning regarding Florinus are all preserved only in part. Other writings mentioned Eusebius, such as *Against the Greeks on Science*, a *Book of Various Orations*, a letter "On the schism" to the Montanist Blastus, and further correspondence have been lost entirely, with the exception of their titles.[[16]](#footnote-18)

Nevertheless, Irenaeus is clearly linked to the formation of the New Testament, as the evidence presented earlier shows. The history of the New Testament is, in fact, closely bound to the period in which Irenaeus lived and worked, i.e., the final third of the second century. Even if "the corridors of canon research are dimly lit, and the kind of evidence that one would hope to find is strangely missing, namely a credible ancient document that tells what led the church to acknowledge a NT canon of scriptures,"[[17]](#footnote-19) we can still trace the path to some extent, some of which lies through Irenaeus and his views on scripture.

As we shall see below, Irenaeus's predecessor, Justin Martyr (ca. 100–ca. 165), does not speak of the New Testament at all. He never cites Paul's letters, although he seems to have read Revelation with sympathy as he mentions it once with some respect,[[18]](#footnote-20) counting it among "our writings."[[19]](#footnote-21) Despite referring to the gospels four times, he reveals his reservations about their authenticity by terming them the "so-called gospel[s]" and attributing the sayings of Christ to the *Memories of the* *Apostles*,[[20]](#footnote-23) a title about which he also expresses reservations. Nevertheless, as Stanton notes, Justin's *Dialogue* *with Trypho* offers the earliest evidence of the use of the plural εὐαγγέλια ("gospel books") in Christian literature, about which Matthias Klinghardt writes:

The terminus ante quem of the canonical Four Gospels results from the patristic testimony of the Gospels in their canonical form. This form not only includes its text stock, which is... quite difficult to determine, but above all the title with the author's information. This is undoubtedly the case with Irenaeus in the last third of the 2nd century at the latest, who knows the Gospels under their canonical titles. With the exception of Justin's... all other patristic testimonies of the 2nd century for the reception of the canonical versions of New Testament texts either cannot be precisely dated (e.g. EvThom; Did; 2Clem etc.), or their dating is so highly controversial that they are omitted for the determination of the terminus ante quem. This applies above all to the Papias fragments and the Epistles to Ignatius.[[21]](#footnote-24)

Thus, even though Klinghardt makes a good argument that the compilation of texts known as the New Testament was already known to Justin, and perhaps even to Marcion, it is only from Irenaeus onward that the four gospels can safely be said to have been known, as supported by external evidence. On the basis of textual comparison, Klinghardt demonstrates that Justin knew not only Marcion's, but also Luke's Gospel, which he viewed as a reaction to Marcion's. His methodology leads him to conclude that Justin's knowledge of the Gospel of Luke in its canonical version indicates that Justin knew not only this Gospel, but also Acts and all the other writings of the later canonical New Testament, since he regards all these writings as equal. Klinghardt admits, however, that there is no absolute proof of Justin's knowledge of the Acts of the Apostles (and implicitly of the gospels or the other New Testament texts).

Both Klinghardt and David Trobisch, who has built on Kinghardt's thesis on the canonical editing of the New Testament, have come under heavy criticism from many of their peers.[[22]](#footnote-25) Yet, even if one is wary of subscribing to it fully, the idea of a canonical edition has certain advantages over alternative theories that posit a fluid text and an organic growth of writings that gradually merge into the New Testament as it corresponds more closely with the existing manuscripts of the New Testament, which present it not as individual works, but as a fixed corpus. Admittedly, even if we take papyri into account, original exemplars of the New Testament are sparse, as the costliness of book and codex production in ancient times limited the proliferation of copies.[[23]](#footnote-27)

If we wish to follow Klinghardt, we must also be able to explain why, if Marcion and Justin both knew the gospels, the first was seemingly unaware of Acts and the second never cited from Paul's epistles. Speaking of Marcion, Tertullian states that he should have taken Acts into account since Paul's letters confirm their content, just as Marcion's Gospel – according to Tertullian – confirms that of Luke.[[24]](#footnote-28) This allegation is, of course, unsupported by Marcion, who never claimed to have made use of Paul in his gospel and does not seem to have mentioned or even known Acts at all. If anything, Tertullian's argument reflects the fact that the Gospel of Luke, the Epistles of Paul, and the Acts of the Apostles were perceived as belonging to the same collection of texts, the one used by Valentinus.[[25]](#footnote-29) But to whatever extent Marcion knew of these writings, he bound his gospel with ten Pauline letters only, to which he added his preface, the *Antitheses*.

In any case, as demonstrated above, Irenaeus tried to link the Gospel of Luke to the Acts of the Apostles and to link them together by attributing them to the same author. In conclusion, unless clearer evidence emerges, we may remain skeptical of the early existence of a collection of all twenty-seven writings now assigned to the New Testament,

Tertullian's claim that Marcion expressly rejected the Acts of the Apostles seems more of a polemical argument than evidence of the work's existence by the mid-second century. At the same time, the idea that Marcion claimed to have come up with his own gospel based on those attributed pseudonymously to two apostles (Matthew and John) and their two disciples (Mark and Luke) is unlikely to have been invented by Tertullian. There is no reason why he should have fabricated and attributed to Marcion the notion that the four gospels were plagiarized versions of his own (Marcion's) gospel, which had extended and Judaized the text and linked it back to the Jewish scriptures.[[26]](#footnote-31)

If this idea was grounded in Marcion's own argument, it then follows that Marcion's New Testament, which consists of an anonymously authored gospel, ten Pauline letters (Gal, 1-2Cor, Rom, 1-2Thess, Laod./Eph, Kol, Phil, Phlm[[27]](#footnote-32)), and a foreword, the *Antitheses*, was compiled into a collection in order to distinguish his gospel from the four aforementioned ones. It may be that, by creating this opposition between his own collection and the four "plagiarized" gospels, Marcion inadvertently offered Irenaeus a template for combining these four gospels into one collection. Thus, when defending the gospels against Marcion, Irenaeus does so not individually, but collectively. Hence, the canon of the four gospels was not "a codification and legalization of something traditional,"[[28]](#footnote-33) that is, church practice, or a "compromise... between customs and clashing traditions,"[[29]](#footnote-35) or the result of the use of one gospel "in locally or (and) theologically different Christian communities,"[[30]](#footnote-36) but rather an apologetic and anti-heretical measure taken by Irenaeus,[[31]](#footnote-37) who can thus be regarded as the "architect of the fourfold gospel" even if its foundations were established by one of the authors whom he criticized.[[32]](#footnote-38)

Wolfram Kinzig contends that the term "New Testament" may go back to Marcion, who was the first to assign it to a collection of Christian writings. According to Kinzig, Tertullian uses this innovation roughly seventy times when referring to and discussing the core message of Marcion's gospel and *Apostolikon*. Kinzig also points out that Tertullian only speaks of a "New Testament" in the context of his encounter with Marcion.[[33]](#footnote-39) If Marcion's collection was a response to the four gospels, that would explain why he added a preface entitled "*Antitheses*" to his collection. In response, Irenaeus seems to have initiated or compiled the four gospels denounced by Marcion and added to these the Acts of the Apostles with additional Catholic letters before appending a broader collection of Pauline letters and the Book of Revelation. However, this collection did not seem to be titled the "New Testament" because none of the second-century anti-Marcionites had accepted Marcion's terminology, and when they did mention it, it was with the purpose of criticizing or problematizing. The title of the larger collection seems to have come into use only in the third century.[[34]](#footnote-40) In principle, one could take the reverse position and claim that Marcion's work was a counter-compilation to a pre-existing larger one that he had abridged, as suggested by Irenaeus and reiterated more explicitly by Tertullian. However, we lack external evidence for the earlier existence of any such broad collection. Klinghardt also emphasizes the logic of the editorial unity of Irenaeus's broadened collection and its anti-Marcionite nature. Whatever position we may take, the term "New Testament" clearly allowed Marcion to differentiate his collection from the "Old Testament," a title he could have seen in Paul, 2 Cor. 3:14.

Despite the methodological considerations outlined above and the aforementioned evidence that Justin, like Marcion, already knew some (and according to Klinghardt, "all") of the writings of the New Testament recognized as canonical today, even though he never mentioned them explicitly, it seems impossible that he would have considered them "his own."[[35]](#footnote-41) Instead, he seems to have been reluctant to deal with what he cautiously referred to as the "so-called" gospels, which is why his student Tatian came up with a highly successful "harmony"—a synthesis of the four gospels. Since Justin also ignores the Pauline letters, for the most part, as well as the other canonical writings of the corpus (with the exception of Revelations[[36]](#footnote-42)), he may have been skeptical of any New Testament compilation and so stuck with the Jewish writings, to which, at best, he added the *Memories of the Apostles*.

Hence, prior to Justin, only Marcion of Sinope applied the singular form of "gospel" to any written work based on Paul (Rom. 2:16; 16:25)[[37]](#footnote-43) and, as stated, introduced the term "New Testament" to Christianity.[[38]](#footnote-44)

Robert M. Grant believes that Irenaeus's contemporary, Theophilus of Antioch, knew the three gospels of Matthew, John, and Luke, of which he preferred the first two, as well as the Acts of the Apostles, at least eight of Paul's epistles, possibly the two letters of Peter, and Revelation (further indication that the entire corpus may already have been available to him), but regarded these texts as merely an inspired set of writings rather than on par with the holy scriptures of the Jews.[[39]](#footnote-45)

If we add to Justin and Theophilus, the briefly mentioned Valentinus and Papias of Hierapolis, whose contributions have been handed down by Eusebius, then it becomes evident that the discussion on the four gospels falls into the period following the Second Jewish War (after 135), i.e., the latter half of the second century BC.

Like Tatian, with his synthesized gospel, Justin, too, seems to have attempted to bring together the various gospels in his *Memories of the Apostles*, while ignoring the other texts in the compilation—an approach that clearly distinguishes these authors from Marcion. Similarly, Theophilus of Antioch seems to have dealt with the multiplicity of the gospels either by creating or using a harmonized compilation. Other authors of the second century wrote their own gospels, some of which, like the "Gospel of Peter," were harmonies that included a considerable amount of their authors' thoughts and additions. People wrote gospels that differed markedly in style, genre, and structure from the one authored by Marcion or the four criticized by him. The period also saw a plethora of Acts of the Apostles, Revelations, and pseudonymous epistles that were ascribed to the protagonists of Christ's story, members of his family, the apostles, and their alleged early successors.[[40]](#footnote-46) Most of these texts seem to have borrowed formal elements or content from existing and competing texts, which indicates that they did have some impact, albeit no binding authority.

David Trobisch has, in fact, claimed that the New Testament as we know it today (i.e., the four gospels, the Acts of the Apostles, the thirteen Epistles of Paul—including the Epistle to the Hebrews and the Pastoral Epistles, the so-called Catholic Epistles, and Revelation), reveals "an anti-Marcionite stance" in term of its underlying "editorial concept."[[41]](#footnote-47) He, therefore, sees this collection as forming in "confrontation with the Marcionite movement and the Easter festival dispute," that is, after the Bar Kokhba War or even later than the middle of the second century.[[42]](#footnote-48) Both the Marcionite movement and the Easter dispute, in which Irenaeus was heavily involved, will be discussed in more detail further on. What follows is Irenaeus's idea of ​​the beginnings of Christianity, the way in which he constructed these beginnings, as derived from or imposed on his own compilation of Christian texts, which later came to be known as the canonical New Testament.
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Knox, J. (1942). Marcion and the New Testament: An Essay in the Early History of the Canon. Chicago, Ill., University of Chicago Press.

Lyon, I. v. and N. Brox (1993). Epideixis. Adversus Haereses I. Darlegung der apostolischen Verkündigung. Gegen die Häresien I. Freiburg i.Br., Herder.
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41. Trobisch (1996). "Die Endredaktion des Neuen Testaments: Eine Untersuchung zur Entstehung der christlichen Bibel." 158. [↑](#footnote-ref-47)
42. Ibid. [↑](#footnote-ref-48)