

book of exegesis compiled early in the fifth century. On the one hand, every line of Adrian can be illustrated from Theodore of Mopsuestia or Theodoret; on the other, every one of the technical points raised by the Macedonians finds illustration and justification in Adrian. The *Isagoge*, indeed, is simply a study of those *ιδιώματα* of Hebrew utterance which the exegete must be prepared to detect; one of its three parts is entirely devoted to an enumeration of the *τρόποι*, and among the *τρόποι* are found precisely those locutions upon which the Macedonians laid such excessive emphasis: *κατάχρησις*, *μετωνυμία*, *προσωποποιία*, and the rest.

That this sort of exegetical science is older than Lucian might be shewn by examples of early Monarchian exegesis. It will suffice here to refer to Eus. *H. E.* v 28, where the anonymous anti-Monarchian writer quoted by Eusebius has just the same complaint against his opponents that we find in Didymus: like the Macedonians in later days they are addicted to *ἀριστοτελική δεινότης* and to *αἱ ἐξωθεν τέχναι*—they are admirers of Aristotle and Theophrastus, *ταῖς τῶν ἀπίστων τέχναις εἰς τὴν τῆς αἰρέσεως αὐτῶν γνώμην ἀποχρώμενοι, καὶ τῇ τῶν ἀθέων πανουργίᾳ τὴν ἀπλήν τῶν θείων γραφῶν πίστιν κατηλεύοντες.*

H. N. BATE.

ON THE PUNCTUATION OF ST JOHN VII 37, 38

IT is true as well as trite to say that there is more to be done for our better understanding of ancient documents in the way of improving the punctuation than in the way of emending the text: and of this the Fourth Gospel offers some striking examples. Long ago I tried to shew that in Jo. i 14 those editors went quite wrong who, in order to connect *πλήρης* at the end with *ὁ λόγος* at the beginning of the sentence, treated the intervening words *καὶ ἐθεασάμεθα τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ, δόξαν ὡς μονογενοῦς παρὰ πατρός* as a parenthesis, whereas *πλήρης* is there used indeclinable and belongs to either *δόξαν* or *μονογενοῦς*.¹ On the present occasion my object is to make a similar attempt to go back upon the current editorial tradition with regard to Jo. vii 37, 38, and, as before, to accumulate a mass of early evidence in favour of another grouping of the clauses. The patristic evidence for this passage is not so unanimous as for Jo. i 14: but on the other hand the improvement in the sense and connexion seems to me even more undeniable.

In Westcott and Hort's edition (and I find no material difference in Tischendorf, in R. V., in A. V., or in the ordinary Vulgate texts²) the text is printed thus:

¹ *J. T. S.* i (Oct. 1899, July 1900) pp. 120, 561.

² That is, with regard to the punctuation of the clauses, with which alone I am here dealing. There is, of course, a well-known variation of reading in verse 39,

Ἐν δὲ τῇ ἐσχάτῃ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ μεγάλῃ τῆς ἑορτῆς ἰστήκει ὁ Ἰησοῦς, καὶ ἔκραξεν λέγων Ἐάν τις διψᾷ ἐρχέσθω πρὸς με καὶ πινέτω. ὁ πιστεύων εἰς ἐμέ, καθὼς εἶπεν ἡ γραφή, ποταμοὶ ἐκ τῆς κοιλίας αὐτοῦ ῥέουσιν ὕδατος ζῶντος. Τοῦτο δὲ εἶπεν περὶ τοῦ πνεύματος οὗ [margin δ] ἔμελλον λαμβάνειν οἱ πιστεύσαντες εἰς αὐτόν· οὐπω γὰρ ἦν πνεῦμα, ὅτι Ἰησοῦς οὐπω ἐδοξάσθη.

So pointed, the scriptural citation 'out of his belly shall flow rivers of living water' applies to the believer: from him the flood of the Spirit is to proceed and spread. But if we place the full stop not after πινέτω but after ἐμέ, and construct the clause ὁ πιστεύων εἰς ἐμέ with the verb πινέτω, the reference of the 'Scripture' is then transferred to Christ: from Christ shall flow the living waters of the Spirit which will refresh the thirsty believer. And this system of arrangement and interpretation of the text (reasonable, as it seems to me, in itself) has much authority of ancient exegesis in its favour—more I think than has been generally recognized. I propose in this paper to examine the early patristic evidence. I cannot but think that it adds weight to what, even without it, appears to me the only tenable view: the living waters are the Spirit, and the Spirit flows from Christ as source.

ORIGEN is the great pillar of the 'received' interpretation. In many passages of his works he cites Jo. vii 37 down to the word πινέτω: in *Io.* tom. vi 17 (10), 18 (10); in *Jerem.* hom. xviii 9; *Selecta in Psalm.* iii 5, xli 3; and (in Latin translation) in *Genesim* hom. x 3. In yet other passages he cites verse 38 beginning with the words ὁ πιστεύων ('qui credit in me'): in *Genesim* hom. xiii 3, in *Numeros* hom. xii 1 (cf. in *Ezech.* hom. xiii 4), in Latin; but the context in each case shews that he referred ἐκ τῆς κοιλίας αὐτοῦ to the believer. It will suffice to quote a couple of examples, (1) *Hom. in Num.* xvii 4 'iis quibus datus fuerit [Spiritus], flumina de ventre eorum procedant', and (2) a catena fragment on Jo. iii 5 (printed in Brooke, *Orig. in Io.* ii 250): after quoting verses 38 and part of 39, he comments εἰ γὰρ περὶ τοῦ πνεύματος εἴρηται ὡς ὕδωρ ζῶν ποταμῶν δίκην ἐκπορευόμενον ἐκ τοῦ πιστεύοντος . . .

CYRIL of Alexandria *ad loc.* adopts the same punctuation and exegesis.

But from the early Western Church a series of writers can be adduced,

where to πνεῦμα one or both of two additions, the relatively less important ἅγιον and the more important δεδομένον, are made in various authorities: Tischendorf and R. V. go with Westcott and Hort, but A. V. adds 'Holy' (not 'given'), Vulgate (both in the ordinary texts and in Wordsworth and White) adds 'given'. To the Latin evidence against δεδομένον add Tyconius *Regula* III (ed. Burkitt 22. 1) 'revera non erat Spiritus sanctus': and I am quite sure that St Jerome's version ought really to be reckoned in the same category—'non enim erat spiritus' is the reading of six of Wordsworth's best MSS (Δ F G S* Y Z*), as well as of the best perhaps of all witnesses for the Vulgate Gospels, the St Gall fragments, and this is surely a case where 'brevior lectio potior'.

representing different churches and all earlier than the year A. D. 260, who agree in punctuating after *eis ἐμὲ*, and either directly or by implication refer the 'Scriptural' promise to Christ.

ANONYMUS *de Rebaptismate* (about A. D. 256, Italian or even Roman) § 14 'ex uno atque eodem fonte procedant flumina baptismatis Dominici, ut omnis qui sitit veniat et bibat; sicut scriptura dicit, flumina de ventre eius currebant¹ aquae vivae. quae flumina primum apparuerunt in Domini passione, cuius de latere . . . sanguis et aqua manavit . . . ita ut impleatur Spiritu sancto quicumque credens biberit ex utroque flumine.'

ANONYMUS *de montibus Sina et Sion* (Roman of the first half of the third century?) § 9 'percussus in lateris ventre: de latere sanguis et aqua mixtus profusus affluebat, unde sibi ecclesiam sanctam fabricavit, in quam legem passionis suae consecrabat, dicente ipso Qui sitit veniat, et bibat qui credit in me: flumina de ventre eius fluebunt aquae vivae'. In this case Hartel adopts the ordinary punctuation with full stop after bibat: but the reference to the flowing of blood and water from the side of Christ (just as in the previous quotation) with the echo of ventre . . . de ventre, seems to fix the meaning of eius beyond any doubt.

CYPRIAN *ep.* lxxiii 11 'Clamat Dominus ut qui sitit veniat et bibat de fluminibus aquae vivae quae de eius ventre fluxerunt'. So also *ep.* lxxiii 8, where the water is interpreted to mean baptism; in baptism the Holy Spirit is received. So also *Test.* i 22, where the quotation consists only of the words 'Si quis sitit veniat et bibat qui credit in me', the remainder of the verse, though it appears in the editions, not being part of the genuine Cyprianic text.² Hartel indeed prints the words 'sicut dicit . . . aquae vivae' in his text, though within brackets: but as they are contained in no single one of his five MSS, nor in any other MS that I have examined, they have absolutely no claim to be regarded as genuine.

With St Cyprian agrees the reading of the principal representative of the African Bible extant at this point, the codex Palatinus (*e*); the arrangement of the clauses on the page of the MS, as Dr Armitage Robinson has pointed out,³ being conclusive as to the connexion of qui credit in me with the preceding word bibat.

HIPPOLYTUS *in Dan.* i 17 (this part is extant only in the Old-Slavonic

¹ Should we not read *currebunt*, like the *fluebunt* of the next quotation, which is equally destitute of other authority (Neue-Wagener³ iii 282)?

² So also the quotation of the verse in Firmicus Maternus—doubtless derived from the *Testimonia*—breaks off at 'credit in me'.

³ In *Texts and Studies* i 2, *The Passion of St Perpetua* (1891) p. 98. In the same context it is pointed out, on Prof. Burkitt's authority, that the *Speculum* of pseudo-Augustine (*m*) also implies this interpretation, since the verse is cited as one of the proof-texts under the heading 'Quod Dominus fons vitae nuncupetur'.

version: I translate the German of the Berlin edition by Bonwetsch and Achelis, *Hippolytus Werke* i p. 29) 'A river flows of never-failing water, and four rivers part from it, watering the whole earth. So we can see in the Church. For Christ, who is the river, is by the fourfold Gospel proclaimed throughout the whole world, and watering over the whole earth He sanctifies all who believe on Him, as also the prophet says "rivers flow from His body".'

IRENAEUS should, I feel no doubt, be quoted on the same side. In III 24. I (38. 1) 'communicatio Christi, id est Spiritus sanctus . . . qui non participant eum . . . neque percipiunt de corpore Christi procedentem nitidissimum fontem', Harvey refers to Jerem. ii 13, Dr Swete¹ (*History of the doctrine of the Procession of the Holy Spirit* p. 53 n. 4) to Apoc. xxii 1: but it seems to be beyond question that the allusion is also to our text in St John, the only passage where both the Spirit is identified with the stream, and stress is laid (on our interpretation) on the body of Christ as the source of the stream. Another echo is v 18. 1 'Spiritus et ipse est aqua viva, quam praestat Dominus in se recte credentibus': the equation of the Spirit with 'living water', and the promise of the gift of It by Christ to those that believe in Him, point in combination to Jo. vii 37, 38 and to no other passage.²

The LETTER OF THE CHURCHES OF LYONS AND VIENNE (ap. Eus. *H. E.* v 1. 22) was first adduced as an authority for this verse and this interpretation by Dr Armitage Robinson in his just cited edition of the Acts of St Perpetua p. 98: ὑπὸ τῆς οὐρανόθεν πηγῆς τοῦ ὕδατος τῆς ζωῆς τοῦ ἐξέλιοντος ἐκ τῆς νηδύος τοῦ Χριστοῦ δροσιζόμενος καὶ ἐνδυναμούμενος.

These early Western authorities represent Africa, Gaul, and in all probability Italy as well: nor is testimony of later Latins wanting on the same side.

AMBROSE *de Spiritu sancto* iii 20 (153, 154) after quoting Apoc. xxii 1 interprets the river 'proceeding from the throne of God and the Lamb' as the Holy Spirit 'quem bibit qui credit in Christum, sicut ipse ait [he quotes Jo. viii 37, 38]: ergo flumen est Spiritus'. And the same interpretation of the clauses seems to underlie an earlier passage in the same treatise, i 16 (176, 177): 'flumen dictum Spiritum sanctum secundum quod lectum est flumina de ventre eius fluent aquae vivae . . . ergo flumen est Spiritus sanctus, et flumen maximum quod secundum Hebraeos de Iesu fluxit in terris, ut ore Esaiæ accepimus prophetatum'. The Benedictine edition notes two variant readings of importance, 'internis' for 'in terris', and for the last clause 'ut ore sepe accepimus prophetarum'. If 'internis' is right, the reference of 'de

¹ I owe several of my references in this note to Dr Swete's book—it is a veritable mine of patristic references.

² On the Irenaeus passage I have also written in the forthcoming *Nouum Testamentum Sancti Irenaei* p. 252.

Iesu internis' can only be to ἐκ τῆς κοιλίας αὐτοῦ: and even without this reading 'de Iesu fluxit' seems by itself to imply that the stream is understood to flow direct from Christ. But though the exegesis in these two passages is fairly clear on one side, there are other passages where St Ambrose seems to desert the Western view. By the end of the fourth century the older tradition of the West was being ousted by the influence of the exegesis of the Eastern Church writers. Thus

JEROME *Comm. in Ecclesiasten* xi 1 'aliter: in quocumque homine illam aquam videris, de qua dicitur Flumina de ventre eius fluent aquae vivae'.

Of the Greek writers of the fourth century, Eusebius adopts, as we should expect he would, the view of Origen, *Dem. Ev.* vi 18. 48.

The Catenae of Corderius and Cramer *ad loc.* offer little new that bears on our problem. But the brief extract from THEODORE OF HERACLEA, an early and able representative of the Antiochene school, rather suggests that he did not take the view of Origen. His comment, εἰς τὰς γραφὰς παραπέμπει ἵνα ἐκ τῆς ἐκείνων περὶ αὐτοῦ προρρήσεως ἀναχθῶσιν εἰς πίστιν, seems to imply that he interpreted the 'scripture' as referring to Christ and not to the believer. And the conclusion is reinforced from his next words, where the ποταμοὶ ὕδατος ζῶντος are explained to 'indicate the unstinted abundance of grace'.

But the later and better-known representatives of the Antiochene school attach themselves to the now common exegesis. Thus CHRYSOSTOM *in loc.* takes the same interpretation as Origen, and refers τῆς κοιλίας αὐτοῦ to the believer, though he adopts a punctuation of his own. As the Scripture nowhere says that 'rivers shall flow out of his belly', it results that the words καθὼς ἡ γραφή λέγει must be constructed not with what follows but with what precedes, and we must put a light stop (ὑποστιῆσαι δεῖ) after λέγει, and translate 'He that believes on Me in the full sense in which Scripture foretold Christ—as Son of God, and Creator of all things, and coeternal with the Father, and coming as Man and as Redeemer—out of his belly shall flow rivers of living water'. But in spite of St Chrysostom's eminence as a commentator, and in spite of the assent of later Greeks like THEOPHYLACT who adopted his view, we may say confidently that whatever arrangement of the words is right, this arrangement is certainly wrong.

It should be added that the punctuation here recommended has the authority of Dr Westcott; see the final edition of his commentary on St John *ad loc.*

Dr Burney in his *Aramaic Origin of the Fourth Gospel* (which has appeared since this note was in type) discusses these verses on p. 109. With the main point he wishes to make I am not here concerned: but I see that he adopts the same punctuation as myself.

C. H. TURNER.