

SOME NEW MEMBERS OF THE 'FERRAR GROUP' OF MSS OF THE GOSPELS.

THE history of the criticism of the Ferrar group of New Testament MSS is somewhat sharply marked by three publications.

There is first of all Ferrar and Abbott's edition in 1877, which reconstructed in a tentative manner the archetype of the group, and proved beyond doubt that the four MSS 13, 69, 124, 346, which are the primary members of the group, have a common ancestor of an early and interesting type.

Secondly, there is the Abbé Martin's pamphlet, *Quatre manuscrits importants* (Paris, 1886), which localized three out of the four MSS in Calabria or possibly Sicily. And lastly there is Dr. Rendel Harris' tract, *The origin of the Ferrar group*, which pointed out that a Syriac element is proved in this group by (1) the stichometric reckoning of *ρήματα*; (2) various readings which seem to be due to retranslation from the Syriac, and, moreover, from a Syriac which was influenced by Tatian's Diatessaron.

Both the Abbé Martin and Dr. Rendel Harris also draw attention to other MSS which may possibly belong to this group, the former instancing 348 and 211, while the latter suggests an examination of all the MSS, which, at the end of each Gospel, add the number of *ρήματα*¹.

During a recent visit to Italy I found it possible to do a little towards following up these suggestions, by looking at 211, 826, and 828.

As to 211, a Graeco-Arabic MS of the twelfth century now at Venice, I can only claim a secondhand knowledge. I had only time to glance at it myself, but a friend, Mr. Wathen, of Peterhouse, who was with me, kindly spent some little time over it, and made plain the following points:—

1. Postponing for a moment the consideration of the text, the external indications of affinity to the Ferrar group are exceedingly strong. It possesses the calculation by *ρήματα* as well as by *στίχοι*, while the headings, both of Matthew and Mark, are *ἐκ τοῦ κατὰ Μ.*; it also contains practically the same matter at the end as codd. 69, 346². The *τίτλοι* are distinguished by the yellow transparent wash of ink which is characteristic of Calabrian MSS, and the menology contains Gregory of Agrigentum, though the other saints taken by the Abbé Martin as

¹ In his *Adversaria Critica* (Cambridge, 1893, pp. xvi-xxii, 1-59), Dr. Scrivener pointed out that 543 (Scr. 556), a twelfth-cent. MS bought in Epirus, and now belonging to the Baroness Burdett-Coutts, is another of the group.

² The list is given by Zacagni. The text of the description of the patriarchates as compared with the passages given by the Abbé Martin from 346 had sufficient variants to show that the relation with 346 is not the closest possible, though undoubted.

typical of a Calabrian or Sicilian source were not to be found. But no full collation of the menology could be made for lack of time. Coupled with the proved Calabrian origin of the other MSS of similar character, and with the fact that 211 is a Graeco-Arabic MS, there seems little reason for doubting the accuracy of the Abbé's suggestion that 211 was written in Calabria or Sicily, by either an Arabic scribe, or some writer or writers who were interested in Arab settlers in that district¹.

2. So far as the text goes the result is less certain and interesting. A collation of the *pericope adulterae* renders it hard to believe that there is no connexion, for it has practically no differences from the Ferrar group text². But beyond this there is little sign of resemblance so far as a superficial examination showed. Taking the passages quoted³ in Dr. Rendel Harris' monograph, only one was found to agree, and that imperfectly. This was Mc. viii 17, where the addition was found *τι διαλογίσεθε ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ὑμῶν ὀλιγοπίστοις*, which (with the obvious correction *ὀλιγόπιστοι*) is found in D 124 (13, 69, 346, 826, 828) lat vet syr-harcl *cum asterisco*. This is, according to Dr. Rendel Harris' probable hypothesis, due to the influence of Tatian, and is found in the Arabic harmony.

A collation of Mc. iii was made in order to see if there were grounds for thinking that the more violent peculiarities of the Ferrar group had been corrected, while small points had remained, but the result confirmed the absence of distinctively Ferrar elements. The only point of contact with the group is the addition of *τὸν τελώσῃν* in *ϑ* 13, and this is not distinctive. But at the same time there were the significant readings *τί ἔξεστιν* in *ϑ* 4, and the addition *ὅτι ἤδεισαν αὐτὸν ἄν αὐτὸν εἶναι* in *ϑ* 12. For the former (which is also found in the 1-209 group) is probably traceable to Tatian, being found in the Arabic, while the latter is only found elsewhere in C, 2^{ps}, and in a more or less modified form in the European Old Latin. There seems no direct evidence to connect it with Tatian, though it is clearly the kind of semi-harmonistic reading which might be expected.

The verdict on 211 must therefore be that in all probability it represents the work of two scribes, one a Calabrian Greek, the other a North African, who adopted much of the additional matter frequently connected with the Ferrar text as well as the reckoning of the *ῥήματα*. There is a somewhat less degree of probability for supposing that he knew the Ferrar text, but only used it in the *pericope adulterae*,

¹ I have not been able to find any definite Arab settlement to which this would point. Mr. Cowley and Mr. Gray tell me that the Arabic hand seems to them to be that of a North African.

² The single exception is *λιθοβολεῖν* in 211, where the Ferrar reading is *λιθάσειν*.

³ These are Mt. xvii 5, Mc. ix 3, ix 28, Jo. xx 20, Mc. viii 17, Mt. i 16.

preferring to use another text which seems to have had some curious readings perhaps connected with Tatian.

The interesting question remains for some Arabic scholar to settle, whether this Tatianic element is due to the influence of the Arabic text, and how far the Arabic text agrees with or differs from the Greek.

But if Venice did not add any MSS with a definitely Ferrar text, the reverse was true of the monastery of Grotta Ferrata, where owing to the kindness of Padre Rocchi, I was able to work for several hours. There are there two MSS. which I have little doubt will prove to be primary members of the group, and if the learned *bibliothecarius* be right in ascribing them to the eleventh century they are older than 13, 124, 346, and of course than 69. But I am bound to add that Gregory assigns them to the twelfth century, and the hands certainly reminded me strongly of the facsimile of cod. 13, though this may have been merely imagination, as I had no facsimile with me, nor have I a photograph of the Grotta Ferrata MSS.

They are:—Grotta Ferr. A. a. γ = Gregory 826, and Grotta Ferr. A. a. ϵ = Gregory 828. Both of them are clearly Calabrian MSS.

826, according to Gregory, has been partially collated by Mr. Simcox, but I do not know where his work can be seen: it would appear, however, that he only worked on St. Luke, but was satisfied that it was a Ferrar MS. As Gregory is silent on the point, he must have neglected to look at the subscriptions, which contain the *ρήματα* after all as well as the *στίχοι*. It is noteworthy that this MS is free from the clerical error of 346, which reads at the end of John $\overline{\mu\pi\lambda\eta}$ for $\overline{\mu\ \acute{\alpha}\lambda\eta}$ (13, 69, 124 are deficient). Also the beginning of Matthew is *ἐκ τοῦ κατὰ Μ*. Precisely the same remarks apply to 828, except that the beginning and subscription of Matthew are wanting.

That the text of both MSS is that of the Ferrar group is, I think, certain. Both possessed (1) the transpositions of Jo. vii 53–viii 11 to Lc. xxi 38, and Lc. xxii 43, 44 to Mt. xxvi 39; (2) the reading $\overline{\phi\ \mu\eta\sigma\tau\epsilon\upsilon\theta\epsilon\iota\sigma\alpha\ \pi\alpha\rho\theta\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omicron\varsigma\ \mu\alpha\rho\iota\acute{\alpha}\mu\ \acute{\epsilon}\gamma\acute{\epsilon}\nu\eta\eta\sigma\epsilon\upsilon\sigma\epsilon\upsilon\ \overline{\iota\upsilon}\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\sigma\ \lambda\epsilon\gamma\acute{o}\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\upsilon\sigma\ \chi\eta\upsilon}$, otherwise only found in Greek in 346 and 543; (3) the addition *καὶ ἐν τῷ προσεύχεσθαι αὐτοὺς* in Mc. ix 3, and all the other passages quoted by Dr. Rendel Harris, except in Jo. xx 20, where 828 agreed with the T. R.; (4) the subscriptions to the Gospels as follows:—(i) *Ἐκ τοῦ κατὰ Ματθαίου εὐαγγελίου ἐγραφή ἑβραϊστὶ ἐν Παλαιστίνῃ μετὰ ἧ ἑτη τῆς ἀναλήψεως τοῦ κυ. ἔχει δε ρήματα βφκβ ἔχει δε στίχους βφξ.* (ii) *Εὐαγγέλιον κατὰ Μάρκον ἐγραφή ῥωμαιοῖσι ἐν ῥωμῇ κατὰ ἰβ ἑτη τῆς ἀναλήψεως τοῦ κυ. ἔχει δε ρήματα μχυε στίχους αχίς.* (iii) *Εὐαγγέλιον κατὰ Λουκᾶν ἐγραφή ἐλληνιστὶ εἰς ἀλεξάνδριαν τὴν μεγάλην μετὰ ιε ἑτη τῆς ἀναλήψεως τοῦ κυ. ἔχει δε ρήματα ἰγωγ στίχους βψκ.* (iv) *Εὐαγ̄ ἐκ τοῦ κατὰ Ἰω̄ ἐγραφή ἐλληνιστὶ εἰς ἐφεσον μετὰ ἑτη λ̄ τῆς ἀναλήψεως τοῦ κυ. ἔχει δε ρήματα μα ἄλη ἔχει δε στίχους βκδ̄ ἐπὶ δομητιανοῦ βασιλέως.*

The text of both in the *pericope adulterae* is that of the Ferrars. But the impression borne on my mind from a hasty glance over a few pages was that 828 was slightly more true to the type in small points than 826. I could only quote Mc. iii 1-16 in proof of this, as I had no time to do much writing.

It only remains to add that the menology in either, if compared with the remarks in the Abbé Martin's book, is definitely Calabrian. 826 has very little menology left, but it contains St. Elias of Spilea, while the fragments in 828 supply all the other saints quoted by the Abbé except St. Marcellus.

It is highly probable then that there are at Grotta Ferrata two primary members of the Ferrar group, perhaps slightly earlier in date than any of the others. Whether a complete collation would do more than establish the already known readings of the group is of course a question which cannot be answered.

K. LAKE.

I. ON ΠΛΗΡΗΣ IN ST. JOHN i 14.

It is given to few to restore from ancient authority at once the true reading and true interpretation of a passage in the New Testament, as Dr. Field restored *καθαρίζων πάντα τὰ βρώματα* from Origen and St. Chrysostom in Marc. vii 19. The present note makes, in regard to a well-known passage in St. John's prologue, a similar appeal to an equally unnoticed catena of ancient authorities; but its scope is limited to questions of grammar and punctuation, and does not extend to the reading.

John i 14 runs as follows:—*καὶ ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο καὶ ἐσκήνωσεν ἐν ἡμῖν καὶ ἐθεασάμεθα τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ δόξαν ὡς μονογενοῦς παρὰ πατρός πλήρης χάριτος καὶ ἀληθείας.*

Here *πλήρης* is an evident difficulty. What word does it agree with? Erasmus (see Wetstein, *ad loc.*) was so dissatisfied with any of the apparent alternatives that he connected the four words *πλήρης χάριτος καὶ ἀληθείας* with the succeeding verse *Ἰωάννης μαρτυρεῖ*, as though it were the Baptist who is said to be 'full of grace and truth.' This interpretation need hardly be considered, and the field has been divided between those who, like Wetstein and Bishop Westcott, connect *πλήρης* directly with *λόγος*, making all the words from *καὶ ἐθεασάμεθα* to *παρὰ πατρός* parenthetical, and those who, with Meyer, Winer, Alford, Plummer, and others, simply sacrifice the grammar and connect it with *αὐτοῦ*. The latter method is obviously unsatisfactory; that the former is so too is shown by the number of those who adopt the second in preference to it.

The real explanation lies in the recognition of the indeclinable use of *πλήρης*, a use which no one appears to have noticed with two illustrious

exceptions, Hort and Blass. Hort writes on Marc. iv 28 (Westcott and Hort, *New Testament: Appendix*, p. 24), 'This strange confusion [between *πληρη σιτον*, *πληρες σιτον*, *πληρες σιτος*, *πληρης σιτος*, *πληρης σιτου*] is easily explained if the original reading was *πλήρης σίτον*, as in C* (apparently) and two good lectionaries. *Πλήρης* is similarly used as an indeclinable in the accusative in all good MSS of Acts vi 5 except B, and has good authority in the LXX.' Similarly Blass (*Grammatik des Neutestamentlichen Griechisch*, p. 81; English translation, p. 81), with special reference to John i 14 (though it does not appear whether he does not after all prefer to construct the sentence with a parenthesis, and so keep *πλήρης* in the nominative)—'Hier kommt ein Wort in Frage, welches in merkwürdig grossem Umfange im N. T. und auch auf Papyrusurkunden indeklinabel erscheint: Act. vi 5 *ἄνδρα πλήρης (-ρη B C²) πίστειως*: Act. vi 3 *πλήρεις (-ρης A E H P) πνεύματος*: Act. xix 28 *γενόμενοι πλήρεις (-ρης A E L) θυμοῦ*: Marc. viii 19 *κοφίνους πλήρεις (-ρης A F G M) κλασμάτων*: 2 Jo. 8 *μισθὸν πλήρη (-ρης L)* . . . Papyr. Berol. no. xiii 8 *ἄπερ ἀπέσχαμεν πλήρης*: Ixxxi 27 *ἀς παραδώσω πλήρης*: cclxx 9, ccclxxiii 13, 21.'

With regard to the Septuagint, *πλήρης* appears from the Concordance to be used—in other cases than the nominative masculine or feminine, as to which, of course, there is no question—in about seventy places; and in nearly half of these some one of the MSS collated for Dr. Swete's edition gives the form *πλήρης*. So Gen. xxvii 27 D E, xli 24 D; Exod. xvi 33 B; Lev. ii 2 B; Num. vii 13 F, vii 19 N, vii 20 B N*, vii 62 A B, vii 67 B, vii 79 B, vii 86 B F, xxiv 13 A; IV Reg. vi 17 A; Job xxi 24 N A B C, xxxix 2 B; Ps. lxxv (lxxv) 8 (9) N^{ca}; Sap. v 22 (23) N, xi 18 (19) N; Eccus. xix 26 (23) N^{ca} B C, xlii 16 N B; Isa. i 15 Γ, xxx 27 N, li 20 B, lxiii 3 A B Q*; Hierem. v 27 N Q; III Macc. vi 31 V*. Some of these may doubtless be explained away as instances of assimilation, or itacism, or what not; in other cases the reading *πλήρης* is so strongly supported that it is probably right; but anyhow the mass of evidence at least proves this much, that the indeclinable use of *πλήρης*, whether originally due to the septuagint translators or only to scribes, was not unfamiliar in the earliest centuries of our era.

As to the parallel cases in the New Testament, the passage already cited from Dr. Blass exhausts the evidence of the MSS, but a patristic commentary on Acts vi 5 (where the MSS of the Greek Testament are strongest for *πλήρης*) merits attention, as it shows the progressive tendency first of the scribes of later date, and secondly of the editors of our own day, to wander from the true tradition. Didymus of Alexandria's comment (in Cramer's *Catena*, *ad loc.*) ought in fact to be printed thus:

Στίφανος γοῦν μαρτυρεῖται τῆς ἐκλογῆς τετυχηκέναι διὰ τὸ πλήρης εἶναι πίστειως καὶ πνεύματος· οὐ παντὸς τοῦ ὁπωσδήποτε πιστεύοντος πλήρης ὄντος πίστειως,

εἶρηται γὰρ περὶ τίνος ὀφθέντος τῷ Πέτρῳ πίστιν ἔχοτος οὐ μὴν πλήρης αὐτῆς ὄντος.

‘Stephen is recorded to have been selected because he was “full of faith and the spirit,” not every believer of any sort being “full of faith,” for mention is made of one who was seen by Peter to “have faith,” but not to be “full” of it.’ The last words appear to refer to Acts xiv 9, where however it is St. Paul who sees that the lame man at Lystra ἔχει πίστιν τοῦ σωθῆναι. Worse treatment could not have befallen the latter part of this quotation from Didymus than the MS and the editor between them have managed to inflict. For punctuation they have put a colon after πιστεύουτος, another after ὄντος πίστεως, and a comma after τῷ Πέτρῳ, and it is not possible to say who should bear the blame; but for the reading the original hand of the MS apparently had πλήρης in all three cases, though the η has been erased at the second and third occurrence of the word, while the editor on the third occasion boldly substitutes πλήρους.

Outside the LXX and New Testament the following instances may be noted where the manuscript tradition of πλήρης indeclinable has proved a stumbling-block to editors:—

(i) Gizeh fragment of the Book of Enoch: read with the MS in xxviii 2 (ed. Charles, p. 367) αὐτὸ ἔρημον καὶ αὐτὸ μόνον πλήρης δένδρων, in xxxi 2 (Charles, p. 369) πάντα τὰ δένδρα πλήρης.

(ii) Gospel of Nicodemus or Acts of Pilate, in Tischendorf, *Evangelia Apocrypha*, A.D. 1853, p. 253, A.D. 1876, p. 272: read with the oldest MS (B) καὶ εἶπεν Ἰωσήφ Τῇ παρασκευῇ περὶ ὥραν δεκάτην ἐνεκλείσατέ με καὶ ἔμεινα τὸ σάββατον πλήρης.

(iii) Synodal letter from Antioch to the Emperor Jovian, A.D. 364, in Socrates, *Hist. Eccl.* iii 25: διὸ συνετάξαμεν τῆδε ἡμῶν τῇ ἀναφορᾷ καὶ τὸ ἀντίγραφον τῆς πίστεως τῆς ἐν Νικαίᾳ . . . ἧτις ἐστίν· Πιστεύομεν εἰς ἕνα θεὸν πατέρα παντοκράτορα· καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ τοῦ μαθήματος πλήρης. In this case the editors have not tampered with the text, but Valesius notes: *Vox autem πλήρης nullum hic locum habet; melius meo quidem iudicio poneretur post verba quae paullo supra leguntur ἧτις ἐστίν.*

(iv) Epiphanius, *Haer.* li 16: read βαπτισθέντος αὐτοῦ κατ’ Αἰγυπτίους ὡς ἔφημεν Ἄθῳρ δωδεκάτῃ πρὸ 12 εἰδῶν Νοεμβρίων τούτεστι πρὸ ἐξήκοντα ἡμερῶν πλήρης τῆς ἡμέρας τῶν Ἐπιφανίων . . . ἦν γὰρ τῷ μὲν ὄντι εἰκοσιενεῖα ἐτῶν καὶ μηνῶν δέκα ὅτε ἐπὶ τὸ βάπτισμα ἦκε, τριάκοντα μὲν ἐτῶν ἀλλ’ οὐ πλήρης· διὸ λέγει Ἀρχόμενος ὡς ἐτῶν τριάκοντα. Here the manuscript tradition twice gives πλήρης: in the second instance the editors retain it, doubtless understanding it wrongly as nominative instead of genitive; in the first, where the case intended is beyond doubt—‘sixty full days before the Epiphany’—Petavius brackets the word, Dindorf omits it, and Oehler alters it into πληρῶν.

The mass of evidence now accumulated will have shown that there is nothing improbable in itself in the use of πλήρης indeclinable by St. John. It remains to inquire what positive support antiquity gives to the view that πλήρης is actually so used in John i 14.

That only those well acquainted with Greek could interpret πλήρης in this way is evident enough; there is therefore nothing remarkable in the fact that Latin and Syriac translators for the most part take it as a nominative. It should be noted, however, that the two Old Latin MSS *a* and *e* both read *Verbum . . . plenus gratia et ueritate*, which (if it does not point to an earlier *sermo* for *uerbum*) shows that there was no thought on their part of connecting πλήρης with ὁ λόγος. D has πλήρη, which suggests that the Latin *d*, here unfortunately defective, read *plenam*, and therefore connected it with *gloriam*. The Curetonian Syriac seems to connect πλήρης with λόγος; the Lewis is defective; the Peshitto, on the other hand, appears to connect πλήρης with μονογενοῦς, 'the only-begotten which is from the Father which is full of grace and truth.'

We fall back then on the Greek Fathers, though in fact two of the seven who will be here quoted are extant in full only in translations, Irenaeus in Latin, Theodore in Syriac.

(i) St. Irenaeus, *adv. Haer.* V xviii 2, '*Et Verbum caro factum est et habitauit in nobis: et iterum intulit Et uidimus gloriam eius, gloriam quasi unigeniti a patre, plenum gratia et ueritate.*' Here the representation of πλήρης by *plenum* is of course due to the translator. The author obviously separated the clauses καὶ θεασάμεθα . . . πλήρης χάριτος καὶ ἀληθείας from the preceding words, and cannot therefore have taken πλήρης with λόγος. What he did understand by it is clear from another passage, I viii 5: '*Cuius gloriam uidimus et erat gloria eius qualis erat unigeniti quae a patre data est ei plena gratia et ueritate*'¹, or in the original Greek as preserved by Epiphanius, *Haer.* xxxi 29, οὗ τὴν δόξαν θεασάμεθα, φησί, καὶ ἦν ἡ δόξα αὐτοῦ οὕα ἦν ἡ τοῦ μονογενοῦς ἡ ὑπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς δοθεῖσα αὐτῷ πλήρης χάριτος καὶ ἀληθείας. The weight of the evidence is not diminished if Irenaeus is here, as is probable, quoting verbally from the Valentinians.

(ii) Origen's Commentary on St. John is not extant in this place; but a passage preserved in Corderius' *Catena*, *ad loc.* (printed with fresh

¹ Massuet reads *plenum* (which makes nonsense) without any manuscript authority, and is somewhat severe upon Grabe, Petavius, and Billius, 'doctissimos alioqui uiros,' for connecting πλήρης with δόξαν. Yet Grabe had pointed out that Cyril of Alexandria and Theophylact (see below) do the same as Irenaeus; though, not knowing that πλήρης can be indeclinable, he was bound to add that they had misinterpreted St. John. Massuet's remarks, which are adopted by Stieren (not however by Harvey), are an unpleasant reminder of the truth that later editors and commentators have sometimes been further from the mark than earlier ones.

manuscript authority in Brooke's edition, ii 219), Οὗτος δὲ μονογενὴς παρὰ πατρός πάντως πλήρης χάριτος καὶ ἀληθείας εἶρηται, suggests at least that he took πλήρης as genitive in agreement with μονογενοῦς.

(iii) St. Athanasius, it would seem, like Irenaeus (Chrysostom) Cyril and Theophylact, understood πλήρης to refer back to δόξα: *de decretis Nicaenae synodi* 15 (ed. Bened., i 221) ὁ δὲ Ἰωάννης εἰρηκῶς καὶ ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο· ἐπήγαγεν εὐθύς καὶ ἰθεασάμεθα τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ δόξαν ὡς μονογενοῦς παρὰ πατρός πλήρης χάριτος καὶ ἀληθείας; and *fragm. in Psalm.* lxiv 10 (ed. Bened., ii 1257) καὶ ἰθεασάμεθα τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ πλήρης χάριτος καὶ ἀληθείας.

(iv) A Syriac version of Theodore of Mopsuestia on St. John has lately been printed from a Paris MS by M. J.-B. Chabot. The commentary treats the second half of John i 14 (καὶ ἰθεασάμεθα &c.) quite independently of the first, and reads, as represented by the translator, 'And we beheld his glory like of the only-begotten which is from the Father which is full of grace and truth.' This apparent connexion of πλήρης with μονογενοῦς may be borrowed by the translator from the Peshitto, but at least the separation from ὁ λόγος must go back to the original.

(v) St. Chrysostom in his Homilies on St. John makes a separate heading for Hom. XII. [XI.] (ed. Bened. viii 66) with the half-verse καὶ ἰθεασάμεθα . . . πλήρης χάριτος καὶ ἀληθείας, and twice (69 D, 70 C) quotes it καὶ ἰθεασάμεθα . . . πλήρη χάριτος καὶ ἀληθείας, so that he must have connected πλήρης with δόξαν.

(vi) St. Cyril of Alexandria in his Commentary on St. John (ed. Pusey, i 142) heads a section with the same words as St. Chrysostom; and that he too took πλήρης with δόξαν results from the phrase πλήρης¹ χάριτος ἔχει τὴν δόξαν ἔφη τὸν υἱὸν ὁ πνευματόφορος, 'the inspired writer said that the Son has his glory "full of grace"' (Pusey, i 143 fin.).

(vii) Theophylact in his Commentary on the Four Gospels writes *ad loc.*: Οὕτως οὖν κἀνταῦθα τὸ Ὡς μονογενοῦς ὀφειλομένην νῆσαι ἀντὶ τοῦ Ἡ δόξα ἦν ἰθεασάμεθα ὡς τῷ ὄντι κατὰ ἀλήθειαν υἱοῦ δόξα ἦν πλήρης χάριτος καὶ ἀληθείας· χάριτος μὲν πλήρης, καθὼ καὶ ὁ λόγος αὐτοῦ κεχαριτωμένος ἦν ἵν' οὕτως εἴπω, καθὰ καὶ . . . ὁ εὐαγγελιστὴς ὅτι Ἐθαύμαζον πάντες ἐπὶ τοῖς λόγοις τῆς χάριτος . . . ἀληθείας δὲ πλήρης ἦν, καθὼ καὶ . . . ὁ χριστὸς ἃ ἔλεγε καὶ ἔπραττεν ἅπαντα ἀληθείας πλήρη, αὐτόχαρις ὢν καὶ αὐτοαλήθεια . . . ἐν πᾶσιν οἷς ἔπραττε καὶ ἔλεγεν ἔβλεπον τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ. 'So then here too we ought to understand the phrase "As of an only-begotten" as equivalent to the phrase, "The glory which we beheld as in very truth was glory of a son, full of grace

¹ So Aubert, probably rightly: of Pusey's two MSS, E has πληρης, B (and Pusey) πλήρη. In the next line for ποῖ ποτε προκύψει τὸ πληρης; πλήρης should be read with Pusey's B. But whichever form Cyril used himself, it is clear that he supposed St. John to be connecting πλήρης with δόξαν.

and truth": glory full of grace just as his speech was with grace, as the evangelist says, "They wondered at the words of grace"; and glory full of truth, just as everything that the Christ said or did was full of truth, since he was Very Grace and Truth itself: in all that he said or did they "saw his glory."

It cannot be doubted on this catena that Greek antiquity did not connect *πλήρης* with *ὁ λόγος*; it can hardly be doubted that it did connect it with *δόξα*.

2. ON GELASIVS OF CYZICUS.

THE *History of the Nicene Council* by the fifth-century writer, Gelasius of Cyzicus, is printed in the larger conciliar collections: Labbe-Coleti ii 117-296, Mansi ii 759-946. Among the authorities of whom he claims to have made use is 'Rufinus, a presbyter of Rome, who, like Eusebius, took part in that holy synod' of Nicaea. The *Dictionary of Christian Biography* (ii 622 a) doubts whether the well-known Rufinus of Aquileia is really concealed under this description; the *Real-Encyclopädie* (vi 477) on the other hand considers that no other Rufinus can be meant; but in neither case does it appear to have been noticed that considerable portions of Gelasius are simply an amplified translation into Greek of Rufinus' *Ecclesiastical History*. Indeed, the whole of the narrative of Rufinus that deals with the Council—*Hist. Eccl.* x 1-5—is incorporated directly into Gelasius' second book: Rufinus x 1 = Gelasius ii 2, Ruf. x 2 = Gel. ii 8, Ruf. x 3 = Gel. ii 13, Ruf. x 4 = Gel. ii 9, Ruf. x 5 = Gel. ii 10, 11 (first part), 24 (last part), 26 (near to end). The source of Gel. ii 10, 11 is wrongly ascribed in the margin of the editions to Socrates, *Hist. Eccl.* i 12; as a matter of fact, both Socrates and Gelasius (as a moment's comparison suffices to show) derived their account of Bishop Spyridon of Cyprus from Rufinus.

It is also worth noticing that in the words immediately preceding the last adaptation from Rufinus in Gelasius ii. 26 (Labbe-Coleti ii 234, Mansi ii 880), we have a fragment of the original Greek of a note appended to the Nicene Creed in some of the old Latin collections of canons, and in Armenian and Coptic¹, but not, so far as I know, preserved elsewhere in Greek: *Αὕτη ἐστὶν ἡ πίστις ἣν ἐξέθεντο οἱ ἐν Νικαίᾳ ἄγιοι ἡμῶν πατέρες οἱ ὀρθόδοξοι ἐπίσκοποι, πρῶτον μὲν κατὰ Ἀρείου βλασφημοῦντος καὶ λέγοντος κτίσμα τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ, καὶ κατὰ Σαβελλίου τε καὶ Φωτεινοῦ καὶ Παύλου τοῦ Σαμοσατέως καὶ Μανιχαίου καὶ Οὐαλεντίνου καὶ Μαρκίωνος, καὶ κατὰ πάσης δὲ αἵρέσεως ἣτις ἐπανάστη τῇ καθολικῇ καὶ ἀποστολικῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ· οὗς [λεγε ἄς?] κατέ-*

¹ Coptic in Pitra's *Spirilegium Solesmense*, i 514; Armenian in Gelzer, Hilgenfeld and Cuntz, *Patrum Nicaenorum nomina . . . armeniace*, p. 184.

κρινεν ἢ ἐν τῇ Νικαίῳ πάλαι συνηγμένῃ τῶν ἁγίων ὀρθοδόξων σύνοδος, ὡν τὰ ὀνόματα καὶ τῶν ἐπαρχίῶν αὐτῶν ἐστὶν ὑποτεταγμένα. The mention of Photinus shows that the origin of the note must be decidedly posterior to the date of the Nicene Council.

3. ON EUSEBIUS OF VERCELLI.

THE following notes on Eusebius of Vercelli make no claim to express in any sense settled opinions; they are only intended to serve, if it may be, as starting-points for those more familiar than myself with the Latin dogmatic literature of the fourth and fifth centuries. But at least this much may be said confidently, that Eusebius must have been a more important personage than we are accustomed to think.

1. The authorship and date of the Creed *Quicumque vult* have always been matter of dispute, but the amount of labour which has been devoted to their elucidation during the last five and twenty years ought to be bringing us near to a final solution of the problem. A generation ago it was possible—though no doubt even then only under the influence of strong prejudices—to defend a date as late as the eighth century. Such a view seems quite antiquated now, when scholars have learnt to discuss the historical questions of date and authorship of the Creed without reference to its suitability or unsuitability for public recitation. Even the ascription to Hilary of Arles (c. 440 A. D.) in Waterland's classical treatise brings it down too late in the view of the best recent investigators. Mr. Ommanney selects a slightly earlier date with the authorship of Vincent of Lerins; Mr. Burn sees no trace of reference to Nestorianism, and pushes the formula back to the decade 420-430 A. D., and to the authorship of Honoratus of Arles; Dr. Kattenbusch sees similarly no trace of the influence of St. Augustine, and moves back a decade further still, c. 415 A. D. The two last-named scholars appear to agree in limiting the heresies principally combated to Sabellianism, Arianism, Macedonianism, and Apollinarianism. Pending a completely satisfactory theory—a hint thrown out in the *Revue Bénédictine* suggests that we may look for something final from Dom Morin and his coadjutors—it may not be amiss to call attention to the statement, precise in one sense if confused in another, of an anonymous mediaeval writer.

In the Irish *Liber Hymnorum* lately published by the Henry Bradshaw Society occurs a statement (ii p. 92) attached to the *Quicumque* to the effect that 'The synod of Nicaea made this Catholic faith: three bishops of them alone made it, viz. Eusebius and Dionysius *et nomen tertii nescimus,*' &c. I cannot doubt that the two bishops

named are meant for Eusebius of Vercelli and Dionysius of Milan, both of whom were exiled by Constantius about A. D. 355–356 for refusing to condemn Athanasius. Of the fate of the latter nothing seems known; the former assisted in the great Alexandrine synod of A. D. 362, was restored soon afterwards to his see, and is said to have died about A. D. 375. As is well known, the Codex Vercellensis (*a*) of the Old Latin Gospels is traditionally attributed to his hand. In the parallel case of the *Te Deum* the notice of the same *Liber Hymnorum* runs (ii p. 22), ‘Niceta, successor of Peter, made this canticle, and in Rome it was made,’ &c. The true author of the *Te Deum* was probably Bishop Niceta of Remesiana in Dacia, *c.* A. D. 400, and the confusion of his see with Rome—*Remesianae civitatis, Romanae civitatis*—occurs also elsewhere.

Now if the Irish Book has in this involved way preserved traces of a true record of the authorship of the *Te Deum*, may not the case be exactly parallel for the *Quicumque*? The connexion with Nicaea must be wrong: but may not the name of Eusebius be right?

To make the Eusebian authorship possible, it would be necessary to prove first that Dr. Kattenbusch is right as against Mr. Burn in making the Creed earlier than St. Augustine. I am wholly without such special knowledge as would entitle me to intervene in this discussion, but I may note that Mr. Burn himself writes (*Introduction to the Creeds*, p. 146) that he has ‘often wondered whether the following sentence referred to a formal profession’; ‘Sed in ea nonnulli perturbantur cum audiunt Deum Patrem et Deum Filium et Deum Spiritum sanctum, et tamen hanc Trinitatem non tres Deos sed unum Deum’ (*De Trinitate* I v 8).

It would be necessary next to show as against both Mr. Burn and Dr. Kattenbusch that there is nothing to prevent our pushing back the Creed as much as a generation before St. Augustine. As regards the subject-matter of the Creed, the heresies against which these two scholars agree that it was directed were all condemned by that Alexandrine synod of A. D. 362 at which Eusebius, as we have seen, was present. There, if not before, he must have mastered the theology of Athanasius, to reproduce it perhaps later on for the West in the form of the Athanasian Creed: at least it is worth noting that in describing the confession of this synod, Rufinus falls almost into the very language of the *Quicumque*: ‘ut eiusdem substantiae ac deitatis, cuius Pater et Filius, etiam Spiritus sanctus crederetur, nec quicquam prorsus in Trinitate aut creatum aut inferius posteriusue diceretur’ (*H. E.* x 29).

One difficulty, such as it is, would find an easy solution if the conjecture here thrown out as to the authorship of the Creed is correct. The attribution to St. Athanasius of a statement of the Faith composed

on the basis of his teaching by his friend and contemporary Eusebius of Vercelli would be the most natural thing in the world.

2. When working at the MSS of canons in the Vatican Library this spring, I had occasion to examine Vaticanus 1319, a MS of the twelfth century. It contains at the end some portions (Books I II VI VII) of the writing *de Trinitate* printed under the name of the late fifth-century writer, Vigilus of Thapsus, and between Books II and III (VI of 'Vigilius') occurs the name 'Sancti Eusebii.' I now find that the same phenomenon had attracted Dom Morin's attention, and that he has discussed the question in the *Revue Bénédictine* for January 1898, giving the additional information that Eusebius is also named as author in the list that heads the volume. He is decidedly of opinion that the *terminus a quo* for Books I-VII of 'Vigilius' *de Trinitate* need not be brought down later than the Council of Rimini in A.D. 359, and appears to think not unfavourably of the chances that Eusebius of Vercelli may be the real author.

Yet another topic therefore demanding consideration is this work of pseudo-Vigilius on the Trinity, both in relation to other documents and also in relation to the *Quicumque* itself. It is in the hope that some one may throw light on all these questions that I have ventured to print this note.

C. H. TURNER.