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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 which Lightfoot refers has nothing to do with the translator but is itself a translation of a scribe's verse. **Consummatori** evidently stands for **συντελεστή**, 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

\[ τῷ συντελεστῇ τῶν καλῶν ἔργων ἀμήν. \]

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:

\[ δόξα τῷ πληρωτῇ τῶν καλῶν. \]

This MS. apparently bears the date 1105.

The exact subscription of the Montacute MS. is found in Cod. Reg. 2458 as follows:

\[ τῷ συντελεστῇ τῶν καλῶν θεῷ χάρις. \]
This MS. is dated 1286. 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 12th century.

II.

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

_Hodegos._ 2 (Patrol. Graec. LXXXIX. p. 196, ed. Migne). τοῦ ἀγίου Ἰγνατίου ἐπισκόπου Ἀντιοχείας· ἔσασε μιμητὴν γένεσθαι τοῦ πάθους τοῦ θεοῦ μου. (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 με after ἔσαστε and read ημῶν for μου. It is easy to see how με dropped before μιμητὴν.

III.

On pp. 204–210 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 Rupefulcaldina 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 Rupefulcaldinus. 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 κ. vii. p. 566.

_πολλὰ φρονῶ ἐν θεῷ, ἀλλ’ ἐμαυτὸν μετρῶ, ὅνα μὴ ἐν καυχήσει ἀπό-κλωμαι._
The extract stands without a name to it and is followed without intermission by the following sentence: καὶ Ἀδὰμ ποτὲ τὸν προτάτορα ὁ ἔχθρος παρασκευάσας ἵσοθείαν φαντασθήναι, ἐξήνεγκε παραδείσου καὶ μέχρις ἥδου πυθμένων κατῆγαγε.

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 Rupesficald 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 extract under π. xiii. p. 659, he notes on the margin, 'Ἰγνατίου. R. et Mel., which I take to mean that he found this passage ascribed to Ignatius in the Rupesficald MS. and in Antony Melissa.

Under π. x. p. 642 Leq. notes as follows:—

"Haec Melissa perinde Ignatio tribuit: nec aliunde accipi poterunt, quam ex alterutra epistola ad Polycarpum: cum tamen in neutra occurrant: sed nec in epistola ad Antiochenos ad quam pertinent 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 Rupesficald 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. Ἰγνατίου.
a. xviii. τοῦ ἄγ. Ἰγν. ἐκ τῆς πρὸς Ἐφεσ.
a. xxi. Ἰγνατίου.
ε. xvii. Ἰγνατίου.
   τοῦ αὐτοῦ πρὸς Πολύκαρπον Σμύρνης
   τοῦ αὐτοῦ.
ε. xxviii. τοῦ ἄγιου Ἰγνατίου.
k. vii. No title.
π. x. Ἰγνατίου.
π. xiii. Ἰγνατίου.
σ. xi. Ἰγνατίου.
v. ix. Ἰγνατίου.
χ. iv. Ἰγνατίου.

And the passage previously alluded to (κ. vii.) must be added.
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2. Rupefucald Parallels.

On p. 206: omit the heading ἐκ τῆς αὐτῆς from the second extract from Trallians.

Under δ. xxxiv. correct the transcription of Lequien by adding τὸν before κοινοῦ, omitting τὸν before θεῶν and τὸ before πλεῶν.

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

τοῦ ἀγίου Ἰγνατίου· οὗ πᾶν τραύμα τῇ αὐτῇ ἐμπλάστρῳ θεραπεύεται.

On p. 206 (7th line from end) add οὗ before γεωργεῖ, which is an accidental omission of Lequien.

On p. 208 correct the second heading by omitting πρὸς Μαγνησίως.

On p. 209 under π. xxxvii. add from Rup. f. 243 as follows:—

τοῦ ἀγ. Ἰγνατίου τοῦ θεοφόρου πρὸς τὸν ἄγιον Πολύκαρπον· ἐὰν τις δύναται ἐν ἁγιαίᾳ μένειν εἰς τιμὴν τῆς σαρκὸς τοῦ κύριου ἀκαυχησίᾳ, μενέων· καὶ εἰν ἡγεσθῇ πλεον τοῦ ἐπισκόπου ἐνθαρτάπτει· πρέπει δὲ τοῖς γαμοῦσι καὶ ταῖς γαμομέναις μετὰ γνώμης τοῦ ἐπισκόπου τῆς ἐνώσεως ποιεῖσθαι· ἢν ὁ γάμος ἢν κατὰ θῷ καὶ μῆ κατ᾽ αὐτῷ ἐπίθυμαι.

πρὸς Ἀντιοχείας· Παρθενίας Ἰενόν μιθέω ἐπίστησα· ἐπισφάλεις γὰρ τὸ πράγμα καὶ δυσφόλακτον καὶ μάλιστα δὴν κατ᾽ ἀνάγκην γίνεται· ἐκ τῆς αὐτῆς ἐπιστολῆς· τοῖς νεωτέροις ἐπιτρέπει γαμέων πρὶν ἢ διεφθαρώσῃ εἰς ἑταῖρας.

Insert also on the same page under π. xli. from Rup. f. 245 the sentence which the Vatican Parallels give under π. xiii.

Ἰγνατίου· χρῆσις προφότητος ἐν ὧ καταλῦεται οἱ ἄρχον τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτον διαβύλους.

Insert on the same page under σ. iv. from Rup. f. 254 b the sentence found under σ. xi. in the Vatican Parallels, with the heading Ἰγνατίου τοῦ θεοφόρου· οἱ σαρκικοὶ τὰ πνευματικὰ πρῶσουν οὐ δύναται, οὕτε οἱ πνευματικοὶ τὰ σαρκικά.

On the same page under χ. xxi. change the ἐφεσίως in title to μαγνησίως. It is an error of Lequien's.

On the same page under χ. xxi. insert from Rup. f. 278 the sentence given in the Vatican Parallels under χ. iv.: τοῦ αὐτοῦ ἐκ τῆς πρὸς Πολύκαρπον.

χριστιανὸς ἐκατοῦ ἐξουσίαν οὐκ ἔχει· ἀλλὰ τῷ θεῷ σχολάζει.

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

τοῦ ἀγ. Ἰγνατ. ἐκ τῆς πρὸς Μαγνησίως ἐπιστολῆς.

1 The name is, I think, abbreviated in the MS.
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. 923 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 Vatican Parallels, as the following series of extracts will show:

3. Extracts from Parallels in Cod. Reg. 923.

f. 72. τοῦ ἀγίου Ἰγνάτιου.
οὐδὲν ἐστιν ἀμένον εἰρήνης, ἐν ἣ̂ πᾶς πόλεμος καταργεῖται.

f. 73 b. Ἰγνάτιου.
τῷ Καίσαρι ὑποτάγητε, ἐν οἷς ἀκίνδυνος ἡ ὑποσχή.

f. 191 b. τοῦ ἀγίου Ἰγνάτιου πρὸς Σιμωνίδους: πάντες τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ ἄκο-
λουθεῖτε ὡς Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς τῷ πατρί· καὶ τῷ πρεσβυτερῷ ὡς τοῖς ἀπο-
στόλοις· τοὺς δὲ διακόνους ἐντρέπεσθε (cod. ἐντρέπεσθαι) ὡς θεοῦ ἐντολήν·
μηδεὶς χωρὶς ἐπισκόπου τι πρασότετο τῶν ἀνηκόντων εἰς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν·
ἐκείνη βεβαιά εὐχαριστία ἤγεισθο, ἢ υπὸ τὸν ἐπίσκοπον οὕτα· ὅπως ἐὰν
φανῇ ὁ ἐπίσκοπος, ἐκεῖ τὸ (cod. τῷ) πλήθος ἥτω, ὡσπερ, ὅπως ἂν ἄν
ἐκαθοῦς Ἰησοῦς· ἐκεῖ ἡ καθολικὴ ἐκκλησία· οὐκ ἔζον ἐστὶ χωρὶς τοῦ ἐπισκόπου οὐτ
βαπτίζειν οὕτε ἅγαπεν (sic) ποιεῖν· ἀλλ’ ὅ ἂν εἰκεὶς δοκιμάσῃ τότε καὶ
τῷ θεῷ εὐαρέστου· τῷ τιμῶν ἐπίσκοπον ὑπὸ θεοῦ τετίμηται.

πρὸς Πολύκαρπον.

πάντας βάσταζε, ὃς καὶ σε ὁ κύριος· πάντων ἀνέχου ἐν ἅγαπῇ· προ-
σευχαῖς σχίλαζε ἀδιαλείπτοις· αἰτῶν σύνεσιν πλείονα ἡς έχεις· γρηγορεῖ,
ἀκαίμητον (cod. ἀκυμήτου) πνεύμα κεκτημένος.

πάντων ταῖς νόσσους (cod. νόσσους) βάσταζε, ὃς τέλειος ὁ θελητής·
ὅπου πλείον κόπος, πολὺ κέρδος· καλοῦς μαθητας ἐὰν φιλήσῃ, χάρις σοι οὐκ
ἔσται· μᾶλλον τοὺς ἀπειθέστεροις (cod. ἀπειθέστερους) ἐν πραγματείᾳ ὑπό-
τασθε· οὐ πάν τρωμα τῇ αὐτῇ ἐμπλάστηρι θεραπεύεται· τοὺς παροξυσμοὺς
ἐν εὐχαίς πάνε· διὰ τούτῳ σαρκίκος εἰ καὶ πνευματικός ἴνα τὰ φαινόμενα
σοὶ εἰς πρώτον πουλακεύες (cod. κολακεύεις) τὰ δὲ ἀόρατα αἰτε ινα σοί
φανερωθῇ, ἵνα μηδενὸς λείτυ.

f. 151. τοῦ ἀγίου Ἰγνάτιου.

κἂν ἐρωμένοις (cod. ἐρωμενοις) ὡ τὰ κατὰ θεον, πλείον με δεῖ φοβεῖ-
σθαι, καὶ προσέχειν τοῖς εἰκή φυσώσιν (cod. φυσιοσιν) με· ἐπαινοῦτες
γὰρ με μαστιγοῦν. 
The ascription of this next passage is doubtful for the following reasons; we have as follows:

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 chopped, whose title survives here; or that this is the misplaced title of the following passage to which an additional title has therefore become necessary.

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 to the Epistle to the Romans. Now this is referred by Lightfoot to the interpolated epistle to the Trallians, on account of the added word διαβόλου 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 Rochefoucauld 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.