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## Notes.

## $\longrightarrow$

## Ignatiana.

BY PROF. J. RENDEL HARRIS, A.M.

## I.

ON p. 84 of Vol. I. of his 'Ignatius,' Lightfoot remarks as follows upon the lost Latin MS. of the Ignatian Epistles, known as Montacutianus from its owner, Bishop Montague : -
"I find in this MS. some words which seem to me to be significant. After the table of contents at the end of the Acts of Martyrdom, and before the commencement of the Correspondence with the Virgin and St. John (i.e., at the end of the translated portion of the Ignatian collection), the scribe writes 'Consummatori bonorum Deo gratias.' Does not this look like an ejaculation of thanksgiving on the part of the translator at the completion of his task? There is therefore good reason for believing that this MS. with its marginal glosses closely represented the version in the form in which it came from the hands of the translator."

It seems obvious that the ejaculation of thanksgiving to which Lightfoot refers has nothing to do with the translator but is itself a translation of a scribe's verse. Consummatori evidently stands for $\sigma v \nu \tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \sigma \tau \hat{n}$, and so the verse is at once made. For instance, let us compare Cod. Reg. 2283 (I give the numbers and descriptions from Montfaucon's Paleography) ; here we find the subscription

$$
\tau \hat{\omega} \sigma v \nu \tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \sigma \tau \hat{\eta} \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \kappa \alpha \lambda \omega ิ \nu \stackrel{\check{\omega}}{\varphi} \rho \gamma \omega \nu \cdot \dot{\alpha} \mu \grave{\eta} \nu \cdot
$$

This MS. was written in A.D. 1308 by Walter of Bergamo.
Somewhat similar is the following which Montfaucon gives from a copy of the Ascetica of S. Basil preserved in the Basilian Library at Rome:-

$$
\delta o ́ \xi \alpha \tau \hat{Q} \pi \lambda \eta \rho \omega \tau \hat{\eta} \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \kappa \alpha \lambda \hat{\omega} \nu .
$$

This MS. apparently bears the date iro5.
The exact subscription of the Montacute MS. is found in Cod. Reg. 2458 as follows: -
$\tau \hat{\varphi} \sigma v \nu \tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \sigma \tau \hat{\imath} \tau \bar{\omega} \nu \kappa \alpha \lambda \hat{\omega} \nu \theta \epsilon \hat{\varphi} \chi \chi \dot{\mu} \rho \iota s$.

This MS. is dated r 286 . It is upon cotton paper and contains the lives of certain saints.

It appears likely from what has been stated that the Greek MS. from which the Montacute translation was made may yet be identified by its subscription ; certainly some one ought to examine Cod. Reg. 2458 carefully. From the current forms of subscription we should not expect the missing Greek MS. to be earlier than the 12 th century.

## II.

Under Quotations from the Ignatian Epistles (Vol. I. p. 203) a reference is made to Anastasius the Sinaite as follows:-

Hodegus. 2 (Patrol. Graec. LXXXIX. p. 196, ed. Migne). тov̂
 $\pi \dot{d}$ Oovs $\tau o \hat{v} \theta \epsilon \hat{v} \mu$ ov. (Rom. 6.)

It should be noted that the very same reference is made again by Anastasius three pages further on, with two various readings as follows: insert $\mu \epsilon$ after єaratє and read $\eta \mu \omega \nu$ for $\mu o v$. It is easy to see how $\mu \epsilon$ dropped before $\mu \mu \eta \tau \eta \nu$.
III.

On pp. 204-21o Lightfoot gives the Ignatiana from the Parallela Sacra of S. John of Damascus. These are given under two heads. A. Parallela Vaticana from a MS. used by Lequien in his edition of John of Damascus. B. Parallela Rupefucaldina also used in part by Lequien; to which Lightfoot adds a single passage from Cotelier's Patres Apostolici which is taken from the same MS. Concerning these extracts Lightfoot remarks, "The above extracts are taken from Lequien, with the exception of the last, which is given by Cotelier, from Claromontanus, a MS. which seems closely to resemble the Rupefucaldinus. One or two extracts given by Lequien have been overlooked by previous editors of Ignatius."

Certainly Lightfoot is right in identifying the two MSS. in question with one another ; and in my recently published Fragments of Philo Judaeus I have pointed out that the MS. in question is to be found in the Phillipps Library at Cheltenham, and a glorious MS. it is, deserving of much careful study. But it should be noted that amongst the printed extracts there is one which Lightfoot himself has overlooked. It runs as follows in the Vatican Parallels, and should be added under the title $\kappa$ vii. p. 566.
 $\lambda \omega \mu a$.

The extract stands without a name to it and is followed without intermission by the following sentence : каі 'А 'А $\grave{\alpha} \mu$ тотѐ тòv $\pi \rho о \pi \alpha ́ т о р а$



The first of these extracts is found in Trall. 4 ; the second I shall show presently to be from Nilus.

But, further, there are indications in the printed text that the printed Rupefucald extracts do not contain all that Lequien obtained from the MS. He very seldom reprinted an extract which he had already given under the Vatican Parallels; for example, in giving the
 Mel., which I take to mean that he found this passage ascribed to Ignatius in the Rupefucald MS. and in Antony Melissa.

Under $\pi$. x. p. 642 Leq. notes as follows:-
" Haec Melissa perinde Ignatio tribuit: nec aliunde accipi potuerunt, quam ex alterutra epistola ad Polycarpum: cum tamen in neutrâ occurrant: sed nec in epistola ad Antiochenos ad quam pertinere feruntur in Cod. Rup."

Lightfoot does not note this, although he remarks that the passage is found in Antony Melissa. This is sufficient to show that the Rupefucald extracts are imperfectly given by Lightfoot, even from the printed text.

When we turn to the MS. itself we see this more clearly. Perhaps the best plan will be to set down the corrections in order to Lightfoot's texts.

1. Vatican Parallels.

Add the titles as printed by Lequien as follows: -
a. ix. 'I $\gamma$ vatiov.

a. xxi. 'I qvatíov. $^{2}$

є. xvii. 'I $\gamma v a \tau i o v$. тov̂ av̉rov̂ $\pi \rho o ̀ s ~ П о \lambda v ́ к а \rho \pi o v ~ \Sigma ~ \Sigma \mu u ́ \rho \nu \eta s$ тov̂ av่тồ
є. xxviii. tô̂ åyíov 'I
$\kappa$. vii. No title.
$\pi$. x. 'Iyvatiov.
$\pi$. xiii. 'I ${ }^{2}$ vatióo.
$\sigma$. xi. 'I ${ }^{2}$ vatíou.
v. ix. 'I
$\chi$. iv. 'I $\gamma v a \tau i ́ o v . ~$
And the passage previously alluded to ( $\kappa$. vii.) must be added.
2. Rupefucald Parallels.

On p. 206: omit the heading $\dot{\epsilon} \kappa \tau \hat{\eta} s a \dot{u} \tau \hat{\eta} s$ from the second extract from Trallians.

Under $\delta$. xxxiv. correct the transcription of Lequien by adding $\tau o \hat{v}$ before коьгov, omitting $\tau о \hat{v}$ before $\theta \epsilon \sigma \hat{v}$ and $\tau o ̀ ~ b e f o r e ~ \pi \lambda \epsilon i o v . ~$

Under $\delta$. x. should be added the following sentence which is found on f. 139 b of the MS.

On p. 206 ( 7 th line from end) add o $\boldsymbol{v}$ before $\gamma \epsilon \omega \rho \gamma \epsilon \hat{\iota}$, which is an accidental omission of Lequien.

On p. 208 correct the second heading by omitting $\pi \rho o ̀ s$ May $\eta$ $\boldsymbol{\sigma}$ óos.

On p. 209 under $\pi$. xxxvii. add from Rup. f. 243 as follows : -







 $\rho \bar{\omega} \sigma \iota \nu$ єis є́ $\boldsymbol{\epsilon} \alpha i ̂ \rho a s$.

Insert also on the same page under $\pi$. xl. from Rup. f. 245 the sentence which the Vatican Parallels give under $\pi$. xiii.
 סıaßódos.

Insert on the same page under $\sigma$. iv. from Rup. f. 254 b the sentence found under $\sigma$. xi. in the Vatican Parallels, with the heading
 ойтє oì $\pi \nu \epsilon v \mu a \tau \iota \kappa о \grave{~ \tau a ̀ ~} \sigma \alpha \rho \kappa \iota \kappa \alpha ̀$.

On the same page under $\chi$. xxi. change the $\dot{\epsilon} \phi \epsilon \sigma$ 'ous in title to $\mu \alpha \gamma \nu \eta \sigma i o v s$. It is an error of Lequien's.

On the same page under $\chi$. xxi. insert from Rup. f. 278 the sentence given in the Vatican Parallels under $\chi$. iv. : $\tau o \hat{v}$ aủ $\mathfrak{v o v} \dot{\epsilon} \kappa \tau \hat{\eta} \mathrm{s}$ $\pi \rho o ̀ s ~ П о \lambda v ́ к а \rho \pi о \nu . ~$

On the same page under the last extract add the title as given in Rup. 275 b.


[^0]It is probable that a careful examination of Cod. Rup. would bring to light other corrections, but these are all that I have noted thus far. They require certain corresponding alterations to be made in the critical apparatus of the Epistles, but these it is not necessary to repeat.

The next thing to be noted is the additions that should be made to the quotations from Damascene Parallels from the text of Cod. Reg. $9^{2} 3$ to which I have also drawn attention in the Philo-fragments. The importance of this text will appear at once when we recall that for Ignatius, as for many other fathers, it is the only known uncial authority. It covers in its extracts very nearly the same ground as the Vaticair Parallels, as the following series of extracts will show : -
3. Extracts from Parallels in Cod. Reg. 923.
f. 72. $\tau$ ov̂ áyíov 'Iyvatiov.

f. 73 b. 'Iүvatióv.











тро̀s Поди́картоv.










f. 15 I. rồ áyío 'Iyvatióv.

 $\gamma_{\text {áp }} \mu \epsilon \mu a \sigma \tau \iota \gamma o v ̃ \tau v$.
f. 216 . The ascription of this next passage is doubtful for the following reasons; we have as follows: -

 रó $\boldsymbol{\rho} \boldsymbol{\sigma}$




Now here the title 'Ignatius to Trallians' is attached to the continuation of a passage from the epistle of James which has preceded. We must infer either that a passage of Ignatius has dropped, whose title survives here ; or that this is the misplaced title of the following passage to which an additional title has therefore become necessary.




f. 286 b . тoû áyiov 'I I



 $\pi i \sigma \tau \epsilon \omega \varsigma$.
f. 346 b. rov̂ áríov 'I $\gamma$ vatióo.


f. 373. тov̂ áyiov 'I Iyvatiov.
 $\left.\lambda{ }^{\prime}{ }_{\xi} \epsilon \nu \nu\right)$.




The chief features of interest in the foregoing are the ascription of the two passages on virginity to Polycarp; Rup. refers them to the epistle to the Antiochenes. It is possible that the reference is to a lost letter of Ignatius to Polycarp.

Notice further the most remarkable ascription of the passage
 referred by Lightfoot to the interpolated epistle to the Trallians, on account of the added word doaßódov at the close. But this may be
only a question of reading. What we have to notice is that the passage is indeed from Trallians, but from that part of Trallians subjoined to the Epistle of Romans in the shorter version. Hence our MS. may be regarded as correct in its reference, and we have thus our first testimony to the existence of the shorter version in Greek. Nor does there seem any reason to doubt the genuineness of the description. For there is no other passage in the neighborhood whether of Paul or of Ignatius with which a confusion could arise. Hence we are obliged to conclude in favor of the existence of the shorter version in Greek or to assume that the title was attached by some person who was acquainted with the shorter version in Syriac and gave the ascription from his recollection of that version; for the probability is very slight that a wrong ascription being given instead of Trallians should light precisely upon Romans instead of any other. If we do not then accept the conclusion of the existence of a shorter version in Greek, we must at least add to the evidence for the currency of the shorter version in Syriac. This conclusion is important.

Then further, with reference to Lightfoot's remarks on the origin and parentage of the Collections of Parallels: Lightfoot says, "In the Vatican extracts there is use made of the Long Recension (Ps. Trall. 4) as well as of the Middle Form. In the Rochefoucald extracts, on the other hand, though the writer quotes the spurious epistle to the Antiochenes, there is no distinct example of the use of the interpolated epistles."

Now I have shown reason to believe that the passage Ps. Trall. 4 is quoted by all three recensions of Parallels; and therefore, as far as it is concerned, they all quote either from the Long Form or some other, and no distinction is to be made between the recensions in handling a passage which clearly belongs to the common nucleus. And there is reason to believe that this nucleus took the passage not from Trallians, either Middle or Long, but from Romans (Short). It seems further that no conclusion can properly be drawn from the texts quoted as to the order in which the epistles ought to stand until some further investigation has been made with reference to the original Parallel-book from which all our recensions are derived.


[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ The name is, I think, abbreviated in the MS.

