

Notes.

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 *συντελεστῆ*, 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 συντελεστῆ 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 πληρωτῆ 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 συντελεστῆ τῶν καλῶν θεῶ 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:—

Hodegus. 2 (Patrol. Graec. LXXXIX. p. 196, ed. Migne). τοῦ ἁγίου Ἰγνατίου ἐπισκόπου Ἀντιοχείας· ἔασατε 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 *ἔασατε* and read *ἡμῶν* for *μου*. It is easy to see how *με* dropped before *μιμητην*.

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 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 Phillips 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' ἑμαυτὸν μετρῶ, ἵνα μὴ ἐν καυχίσει ἀπόλωμαι.

The extract stands without a name to it and is followed without intermission by the following sentence : *καὶ Ἀδὰμ ποτὲ τὸν προπάτορα ὁ ἐχθρὸς παρασκευάσας ἰσοθείαν φαντασθῆναι, ἐξήνεγκε παραδείσου καὶ μέχρις ἄδου πυθμένων κατήγαγε.*

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 extract under π. xiii. p. 650, he notes on the margin, *Ἰγνατίου. R. et Mel.*, which I take to mean that he found this passage ascribed to Ignatius in the Rupefucald 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 neutrá 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. Ἰγνατίου.
- a. xviii. τοῦ ἁγ. Ἰγν. ἐκ τῆς πρὸς Ἐφεσ.
- a. xxi. Ἰγνατίου.
- ε. xvii. Ἰγνατίου.
τοῦ αὐτοῦ πρὸς Πολύκαρπον Σμύρνης
τοῦ αὐτοῦ
- ε. xxviii. τοῦ ἁγίου Ἰγνατίου.
- κ. vii. No title.
- π. x. Ἰγνατίου.
- π. xiii. Ἰγνατίου.
- σ. xi. Ἰγνατίου.
- υ. ix. Ἰγνατίου.
- χ. iv. Ἰγνατίου.

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

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 τοῦ before κοινοῦ, omitting τοῦ before θεοῦ and τὸ before πλείον.

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

τοῦ ἁγίου Ἰγνατίου · οὐ πᾶν τραῦμα τῇ αὐτῇ ἐμπλάστρω θεραπεύεται.

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

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

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

τοῦ ἁγ. Ἰγνατίου τοῦ θεοφόρου πρὸς τὸν ἅγιον Πολύκαρπον · εἴ τις δύναται ἐν ἀγνεΐᾳ μένειν εἰς τιμὴν τῆς σαρκὸς τοῦ κῦ ἐν ἀκαυχησίᾳ μενέτω · καὶ ἐὰν γνωσθῇ πλεὸν τοῦ ἐπισκόπου ἔφθαρται · πρέπει δὲ τοῖς γαμοῦσι καὶ ταῖς γαμουμέναις μετὰ γνώμης τοῦ ἐπισκόπου τὴν ἔνωσιν ποιείσθαι · ἵνα ὁ γάμος ἢ κατὰ θῦ καὶ μὴ κατ' αἰσχροὺς ἐπιθυμίαις.

πρὸς Ἀντιοχεῖς · Παρθενίας ζυγὸν μηδενὶ ἐπιτιθεῖ. ἐπισφαλὲς γὰρ τὸ πρᾶγμα καὶ δυσφύλακτον καὶ μάλιστα ὅταν κατ' ἀνάγκην γίνεται ·

ἐκ τῆς αὐτῆς ἐπιστολῆς · τοῖς νεωτέροις ἐπιτρέπε γαμεῖν πρὶν ἢ διεφθαρῶσιν εἰς ἑταίρας.

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

Ἰγνατίου · χριζῶ πρᾶότητος ἐν ᾧ καταλύεται ὁ ἄρχων τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου διαβόλος.

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 σαρκικοί τὰ πνευματικὰ πρῶσσειν οὐ δύναται, οὔτε οἱ πνευματικοὶ τὰ σαρκικά.

On the same page under χ. xxi. change the ἐφεσίους in title to μαγνησίους. 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 ἐαντοῦ 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 ἁγ. Ἰγνατ. ἐκ τῆς πρὸς Μαγνησίους¹ 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 ἁγίου Ἰγνατίου.

οὐδὲν ἔστιν ἄμεινον εἰρήνης, ἐν ᾗ πᾶς πόλεμος καταργεῖται.

f. 73 b. Ἰγνατίου.

τῷ Καίσαρι ὑποτάγητε, ἐν οἷς ἀκίνδυνος ἡ ὑποταγή.

f. 191 b. τοῦ ἁγίου Ἰγνατίου πρὸς Σμυρναίους· πάντες τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ ἀκολουθεῖτε ὡς Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς τῷ πατρί· καὶ τῷ πρεσβυτερίῳ ὡς τοῖς ἀποστόλοις· τοὺς δὲ διακόνους ἐντρέπεσθε (cod. ἐντρεπεσθαι) ὡς θεοῦ ἐντολῆν· μηδεὶς χωρὶς ἐπισκόπου τι πρασάτω τῶν ἀνηκόντων εἰς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν· ἐκείνη βεβαία εὐχαριστία ἡγείσθω, ἡ ὑπὸ τὸν ἐπίσκοπον οὔσα· ὅπου ἐὰν φανῇ ὁ ἐπίσκοπος, ἐκεῖ τὸ (cod. τω) πλήθος ἦτω, ὡσπερ, ὅπου ἂν χριστὸς Ἰησοῦς ἐκεῖ ἡ καθολικὴ ἐκκλησία· οὐκ ἐξόν ἔστι χωρὶς τοῦ ἐπισκόπου οὗτ βαπτίζειν οὔτε ἀγάπειν (sic) ποιεῖν· ἀλλ' ὁ ἂν ἐκεῖνος δοκιμάσῃ τοῦτο καὶ τῷ θεῷ εὐάρεστον· ὁ τιμῶν ἐπίσκοπον ὑπὸ θεοῦ τετίμηται.

πρὸς Πολύκαρπον.

πάντας βάσταζε, ὡς καὶ σε ὁ κύριος· πάντων ἀνέχου ἐν ἀγάπῃ· προσευχαῖς σχολάζε ἀδιαλείπτως· αἰτοῦ σύνεσιν πλείονα ἢς ἔχεις· γρηγόρει, ἀκοίμητον (cod. ἀκυμητον) πνεῦμα κεκτημένος.

πάντων τὰς νόσους (cod. νόσους) βάσταζε, ὡς τέλειος ὁ ἀθλητής· ὅπου πλείον κόπος, πολὺ κέρδος· καλοὺς μαθητὰς ἐὰν φιλήσῃ, χάρις σοι οὐκ ἔσται· μᾶλλον τοὺς ἀπειθεστέρους (cod. ἀπιθεστερους) ἐν πραότητι ὑπότασσε· οὐ πᾶν τραῦμα τῇ αὐτῇ ἐμπλάστρω θεραπεύεται. τοὺς παροξυσμοὺς ἐν εὐχαῖς παῦε· διὰ τοῦτο σαρκικὸς εἶ καὶ πνευματικὸς ἵνα τὰ φαινόμενά σοι εἰς πρόσωπον κολακεύσῃ (cod. κολακεύεις) τὰ δὲ ἄορατα αἴτει ἵνα σοι φανερωθῇ, ἵνα μηδενὸς λείπῃ.

f. 151. τοῦ ἁγίου Ἰγνατίου.

κἂν ἐρρωμένος (cod. ἐρωμενος) ᾧ τὰ κατὰ θεὸν, πλείον με δεῖ φοβεῖσθαι, καὶ προσέχειν τοῖς εἰκῇ φυσώσιν (cod. φυσιουσιν) με· ἐπαινοῦντες γάρ με μαστιγοῦσιν.

f. 216. The ascription of this next passage is doubtful for the following reasons ; we have as follows :—

τοῦ ἁγίου Ἰγνατίου τοῦ θεοφόρου πρὸς Τραλλεῖς· τι ὡς ἄνθος χόρτον παρελεύσεται· ἀνέειλεν γὰρ ὁ ἥλιος σὺν τῷ καύσωνι καὶ ἐξήρανε τὸν χόρτον καὶ τὸ ἄνθος αὐτοῦ ἐξέπεσεν καὶ ἡ εὐπρεπεία τοῦ προσώπου ἀπόλετο· οὕτως καὶ ὁ πλούσιος ἐν ταῖς πορείαις αὐτοῦ μαρανθήσεται.

τοῦ αὐτοῦ Ἰγνατίου· πολλὰ φρονῶ ἐν θεῷ ἀλλ' ἑμαυτὸν μετρῶ ἵνα μὴ ἐν καυχῇσι ἀπόλλωμαι.

Νείλου· γωξῆθ'· Καὶ Ἀδὰμ ποτέ κτέ.

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. 278. τοῦ ἁγίου Ἰγνατίου πρὸς Πολύκαρπον.

παρθενίας ζύγον μηδενὶ ἐπιτίθει (cod. ἐπιτιθε)· ἐπισφαλές γὰρ τὸ κτῆμα καὶ δυσφύλακτον, ὅταν κατ' ἀνάγκην γίνεταί.

τοῖς νεοῖς ἐπίτρεπε γαμῆν, πρὶν διαφθαρῶσιν εἰς ἐτέρας.

f. 286 b. τοῦ ἁγίου Ἰγνατίου πρὸς Ῥωμαίους.

χρήζω πραότητος, ἐν ἣ καταλύεται ὁ ἄρχων τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου διάβολος.

f. 308 b. τοῦ ἁγίου Ἰγνατίου πρὸς Ἐφεσίους.

οἱ σαρκικοὶ τὰ πνευματικὰ πράσσειν οὐ δύνανται, οὐδὲ οἱ πνευματικοὶ τὰ σαρκικὰ ὥσπερ οὐδὲ ἡ πίστις τὰ τῆς ἀπιστίας οὐδὲ ἡ ἀπιστία τὰ τῆς πίστεως.

f. 346 b. τοῦ ἁγίου Ἰγνατίου.

μηδαίς ὑμῶν κατὰ τοῦ πλησίον ἐχέτω τι· μὴ ἀφορμὰς δίδοτε τοῖς ἔθνεσιν, ἵνα μὴ δι' ὀλίγουσ ἄφρονας τὸ ἔνθεον πλήθος βλασφήμηται.

f. 373. τοῦ ἁγίου Ἰγνατίου.

χριστιανὸς ἑαυτοῦ ἐξουσίαν οὐκ ἔχει, ἀλλὰ τῷ θεῷ σχολάζει (cod. σχολάζειν).

f. 350 b. Βασιλείου (sic) πρὸς Πολύκαρπον.

στῆθι ἐδραῖως ὡς ἄκμων τυπτόμενος· μεγάλου ἐστὶ ἀθλητοῦ δέρεσθαι καὶ νικᾶν· μάλιστα δὲ ἔνεκε θεοῦ πάντα δεῖ ἡμᾶς ὑπομένειν.

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 *χρήζω πραότητος κτέ.* 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.