

*BISHOP LIGHTFOOT'S "IGNATIUS AND
POLYCARP."*

“THE present work arose out of a keen interest in the Ignatian question which I conceived long ago. The subject has been before me for nearly thirty years, and during this period it has engaged my attention off and on in the intervals of other literary pursuits and official duties. Meanwhile, my plan enlarged itself so as to comprehend an edition of all the Apostolical Fathers; and the portion comprising S. Clement (1869), followed, after the discovery of Bryennios, by an Appendix (1877), was the immediate result. But the work which I now offer to the public was the motive and is the core of the whole.” With these words Lightfoot begins the preface to his edition of the Epistles of Ignatius and Polycarp, for the appearance of which we have been earnestly looking, and which we now hail with delight. We may say, without exaggeration, that this work is the most learned and careful Patristic monograph which has appeared in the nineteenth century; that it has been elaborated with a diligence and knowledge of the subject which show that Lightfoot has made himself master of this department, and placed himself beyond the reach of any rival. A considerable part of the second volume was printed as early as the end of the year 1878,¹ yet there is nothing in the work that is not up to date, and the whole treatise forms a well knit unity. If all investigators in the department of Ancient Church History would go to work

¹ The author himself gives an account of the origin of the work in his Preface, p. v. sq.

with the same specialist acquirements and the same circumspection as Lightfoot, the number of points which are now the subject of controversy would be wonderfully reduced.

I cannot attempt to describe chapter by chapter the contents of this large treatise of more than 1,800 pages. It may be enough here to say, that the arrangement is excellent, and that in this work exhaustive information is given on almost all the questions which concern its subject. It would be impossible for me to indicate all the passages in which the author has contributed something new and important. I believe I shall much more fittingly express my thanks to him for the valuable instruction he has given, by pointing out, (1) the advance that has been made by this edition of the Epistles of Ignatius and Polycarp as compared with earlier editions; and, (2) giving a closer examination to the two principal questions, those, that is to say, which concern the genuineness and the date of the Epistles.

I. In regard to the Greek manuscripts and the Versions of the Epistles,—including the *Acta Martyrii Ignatii*, and the Epistle to the Members of the Church of Smyrna, on the death of Polycarp—Lightfoot has given more exact information¹ than any of his predecessors, of whom Zahn is the most distinguished. He has also, either himself, or by one deputed by him, compared almost all the important manuscripts, and he has critically examined, and for the most part copied out, all recensions of the text, as well as the Versions. Thus his work forms a *Corpus Ignatianum* in the most exact sense of the word. While Zahn depends largely upon previous editions, we get everything here at first hand. Lightfoot has not certainly been able to make any considerable addition to the materials for the criticism of the text, and he has been anticipated by others in many a particular

¹ See vol. i. pp. 70-126; 530-535. Vol. ii. pp. 1-11; 363-472; 711-717; 897-904; 937-946, etc.

which, if his work had appeared five years earlier, he would have brought out for the first time. One thing, however, is new,¹ and most deserving of recognition. Lightfoot has given special attention to the collection of quotations and references which are to be found in writers between the second and ninth century.² These quotations are of importance not only for the constitution of the text, but also for determining the question of the genuineness and the date of the Epistles, for which reason among previous editors great attention was paid to them, especially by Zahn. The collection made by Lightfoot is so complete that I know of nothing that can be added to it except the passage from the writing of Marcellus of Ancyra,³ which in the second volume, at p. 126, Lightfoot himself has quoted. Indeed, one might say that the collection is too complete. Lightfoot, as well as Zahn, is in danger of overstraining the thing in his endeavour to leave out nothing. Among the witnesses for the Epistles of Ignatius and Polycarp, Lucian, Melito, the Author of the Epistle to the Churches of Vienne and Lyons, Athenagoras, Theophilus, Clement of Alexandria, the Author of the Acts of Perpetua and Felicitas, Tertullian, and Cyril of Jerusalem, are enumerated. In my opinion it is impossible to prove that all these writers were acquainted with the Epistles. The passages adduced by Lightfoot, and in part previously by Zahn and others, are not sufficient to establish such a conclusion.⁴ It is, however, by no means a matter of indifference whether one quotes a cloud of witnesses for the Epistles before the times of Origen, or confesses that only Irenæus was acquainted with them. Just for the sake of rendering the proof for the

¹ See, the Preface, p. ix., in reference to collations made by the the author.

² See vol. i. pp. 127-221; 536-561.

³ In vol. i. p. 140.

⁴ While Lightfoot seeks to prove that Peter of Alexandria was acquainted with the Epistles (vol. i. p. 137; ii. p. 337), it may be that the words, *οὐ πῶς τραύμα τῇ αὐτῇ ἐμπλάστρω θεραπεύεται*, had passed into a proverbial saying.

genuineness of the Epistles generally indisputable, Lightfoot ought here to have sharply distinguished between the certain and the possible. But above all, Lucian should be struck out. I confess that I cannot imagine how writers go on citing Lucian as a witness for the Epistles. The coincidences are vague and far scattered, and they are so easily explained from the coincidences in the actual history of the Peregrinus and Ignatius (or Polycarp), that the hypothesis of Lucian having heard Ignatius and Polycarp, or having seen the Epistles of Ignatius, and having made use of this knowledge in his Peregrinus, is to be regarded as utterly groundless. Hence, welcome as the witness of Lucian would be—for it would in fact be the earliest—we are obliged to set it aside.

This remark, however, ought not to detract from the value of the actual collection of quotations and references for the constitution of the text. Its value in this respect is very high. The principles on which Lightfoot has here proceeded are unquestionably correct, and they are so admirably carried out in detail, that the text of the seven Epistles in the shorter Greek recension, as Lightfoot gives it (vol. ii. pp. 1-360), far excels the text accepted and given forth by others, and only leaves a few points undecided. Lightfoot has established the text quite independently of Zahn, and is in many respects in thorough agreement with him. In these cases a strong guarantee is given on behalf of the correctness of the accepted reading. On the other hand, there are a number of passages in which Lightfoot differs from Zahn.¹ In a great number of instances the difference is caused by Lightfoot assigning to A (the Armenian Version), and to Σ (the Syrian Version), or to Ag. (g=the longer Greek recension), a higher authority than is

¹ Passing over matters of less importance—even questions of punctuation are frequently not unimportant—Lightfoot's text is distinguished from that of Zahn, throughout the seven Epistles of Ignatius, in about 148 passages.

allowed to them by Zahn. In his edition Zahn had already acknowledged that G (a Greek text of the seven Epistles contained in one Manuscript), and L (a Latin version of the seven Epistles), presented an impure text, disfigured here and there by extensive interpolations. Lightfoot has confirmed and established this position.

In order fairly to estimate the advance made by Lightfoot's edition, I have selected the text of the Epistle to the Ephesians, and have instituted a careful comparison between it and the texts of Dressel and Zahn. In 46 places they show different readings; in 13 passages Zahn and Lightfoot differ from Dressel; in 22 passages Lightfoot differs from Dressel and Zahn; in 7 passages Zahn differs from Dressel and Lightfoot; and in 4 passages the three critics all adopt different readings.¹ In the 13 passages where the two more recent critics agree in correcting Dressel's text, the proper readings are undoubtedly hit upon. As to the 7 passages where Lightfoot has retained Dressel's text in opposition to Zahn,² in the first six cases we agree with Lightfoot, and the seventh cannot altogether be very positively decided. The case is the same with the 4 passages where all the three critics adopt different readings;³ still, here the preference may be given to Lightfoot's readings, with the exception of that in chap. viii. (p. 50, sq.). Finally, in regard to the 22 passages in which Lightfoot differs from Dressel and Zahn, almost all are here to be recognised as improvements which have been for the most part achieved by Lightfoot being in a position to quote the authority of G and L against the

¹ So Zahn differs from Dressel's text in 24 passages, Lightfoot in 39. In 33 passages Lightfoot differs from Zahn's text.

² Chap. iv. (p. 41, 9, of Lightfoot's edition) *ῥῆθητε*; chap. iv. (p. 42, 4) *μετέχητε*; chap. v. (p. 45, 2) *Θεοῦ*; chap. ix. (p. 56, 1) *ἐν ἐντολαῖς*; chap. xi. (p. 62, 4) *συνήνεσαν*; chap. xiv. (p. 68, 6) *εὐρεθῆ ἐς*; chap. xx. (p. 86, 2) *ἀποκαλύψῃ ἔτι*.

³ Chap. i. (p. 31, 4) *διὰ τοῦ ἐπιτυχεῖν δυναθῶ μαθητῆς εἶναι*; chap. viii. (p. 50, 1) *καὶ ἀγρίζομαι ὑμῶν*; chap. ix. (p. 56, 3) *καὶ συγχαρῆναι ὅτι κατ' ἀνθρώπων βίω*; chap. x. (p. 59, 9) *τίς πλέον ἀδικηθῆ κ.τ.λ.*

other witnesses. As the most important of these readings may be mentioned: Address to the Epistle to the Ephesians (p. 25, 2) ἡνωμένη καὶ ἐκλελεγμένη; chap. i. (p. 27, 5) Ἀποδεξάμενος [ὑμῶν] ἐν Θεῷ . . .; chap. i. (p. 28, 1) the addition ἐν γνώμῃ ὀρθῇ καί; chap. viii. (p. 49, 5) ἐπιθυμία; chap. ix. (p. 53, 6) λίθοι ναοῦ προητοιμασμένοι; chap. xv. (p. 70, 4) Θεός without ἡμῶν; chap. xvi. (p. 72, 1) κακοδιδοσκαλίᾳ; chap. xviii. (p. 75, 5, sq.) οἰκονομίαν without Θεοῦ; chap. xx. (p. 86, 4) ἐνὶ Ἰησοῦ Χριστῷ. In the most important passage, chap. vii. (p. 48, 1) it is very difficult to decide whether ἐν σαρκὶ γενόμενος Θεός (G L) or ἐν ἀνθρώπῳ Θεός ought to be read. Lightfoot has decided for the latter reading because the external evidence for it is stronger. Of conjecture Lightfoot has made a sparing but very happy use.

It would lead us too far to enumerate in the same way the improvements that have been made in the text of the other six Epistles. The general impression remains with us that Lightfoot has left to future critics only a very modest gleanings. Perhaps these will abandon in some places yet more of the readings of G and L. Might not the words, Eph. chap. x. (p. 59, 9) τίς πλέον down to ἀθετηθῆ, be fairly struck out? In Smyrn. chap. iv. (p. 300, 3) should not Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡμῶν (so A and S₂) be read instead of τοῦ τελείου ἀνθρώπου, since the expression, ὁ τέλειος ἄνθρωπος does not elsewhere occur in Ignatius? Then again, in the Address of the Epistle to the Tralians (p. 152, 1), I would decidedly, with G. L. A., accept the reading, αἶματι. The most important and the best supported departures from Zahn's text in the other six Epistles are the following. In the Epistle to the Magnesians, chap. i. (p. 108, 1) ἄδω (instead of ἰδών); chap. iii. (p. 114, 1) φρονίμῳ (instead of φρονίμους); chap. viii. (p. 124, 3) κατὰ ἰουδαϊσμόν (instead of κατὰ νόμον ἰουδαϊσμόν); chap. xiii. (p. 138, 5) τῷ πατρὶ (instead of τῷ πατρὶ καὶ

τῷ πνεύματι); chap. xiv. (p. 139, 12) διὰ τῆς ἐκτενείας (instead of διὰ τῆς ἐκκλησίας).¹ In the Epistle to the Trallians, chap. vi. (p. 167, 3) καὶ ἰῶ seems to me a very happy conjecture; further, in chap. vi. (p. 168, 1) ἀδεῶς (instead of ἡδέως); in chap. vii. (p. 169, 7) the words ὁ δὲ ἐκτὸς θυσιαστηρίου ὧν οὐ καθαρὸς ἐστίν, which Zahn has not received, are necessary; chap. vii. (p. 170, 1) διακόνων (instead of διακόνου); chap. xii. (p. 180 3) οὐπερ ἔγκειμαι (instead of οὐ περίκειμαι). In the Epistle to the Romans, the departures from Zahn are particularly numerous (35). In the Address (p. 190, 2) τόπῳ is rightly adopted (instead of τύπῳ); chap. i. (p. 196, 1) ἐὰν πέρατος (instead of ἐάνπερ χάριτος); chap. vi. (p. 217, 6) πέρατα (instead of τερπνά); chap. vi. (p. 219, 6) κολακεύσητε (instead of ἐξαπατήσητε. In the Epistle to the Philadelphians, chap. i. (252, 4) τῶν λαλούντων (instead of τῶν μάταια λαλούντων); chap. vii. (p. 268, 1) ὡς προειδὸτα (instead of ὡςπερ εἰδὸτα); chap. xi. (p. 282, 3) πνεύματι (omitted by Zahn). In the Epistle to those of Smyrna, chap. i. (p. 288, 3) δοξάζω (instead of δοξάζων); chap. i. (p. 290, 3) γεγεννημένον (instead of Θεοῦ γεγεννημένον); chap. iii. (p. 297, 4) αἵματι (instead of πνεύματι); chap. iv. (p. 300, 3) τοῦ τελείου ἀνθρώπου (instead of τοῦ τελείου ἀνθρώπου γενομένου); chap. ii. (p. 320, 3) ἐτύγχανον (instead of ἐτύγχανεν); chap. xiii. (p. 324, 1) πατρός (instead of πνεύματος); chap. xiii. (p. 324, 3) Γαουίας (instead of Ταουίας). In the Epistle to Polycarp, chap. iv. (p. 344, 5) Θεοῦ γνώμης (Zahn omits γνώμης); chap. vii. (p. 355, 5) τῆς προσευχῆς (instead of τὴν προσευχήν); chap. vii. (p. 356, 1) αἰτήσει (instead of ἀναστάσει); chap. vii. (p. 356, 4) καταξιώσαι (instead of καταξιούσθαι).

I cannot for want of space enter into a particular account

¹ Lightfoot accepts with Zahn in Magnes. chap. vi. (p. 119, 6) τύπον, and in chap. viii. (p. 125, 8) λόγος ἀπὸ σιγῆς προελθών. Lightfoot has convinced me that the latter is the correct reading; but in the former passage τόπον, as the more difficult reading, seems to me to deserve the preference.

of the text of the *Acta Martyrii Ignatii*, although its treatment forms a brilliant part of the work.¹ For the same reason I must pass over the Appendix *Ignatiana*,² which contains the Anglo-Latin version of the Epistles of Ignatius, the Syriac Epistles and Acts, the long Recension, the Coptic Fragments, and Acts, the Arabic extracts, and the Laus Heronis. The Epistle of Polycarp to the Philippians (pp. 895-934) demands our attention. In contrast to the critical problems in connexion with the Ignatian Epistles, the problem here is unfortunately a very simple one. Even Lightfoot has not added to the material, and especially has not been able to find a complete Greek manuscript. Hence he rightly says: ³ "There is not indeed much scope for improvement, or even for variation, where the materials belong so exclusively to the same family." Nevertheless he has been able in some places to improve the text. In the Address (p. 905, 2) *Φιλίππους* (Zahn, *Φιλίπποις*); chap. ii. (p. 908, 1) *τὰς ὁσφύας* (Zahn adds *ὑμῶν*); chap. vi. (p. 918, 1) *τῶν σκανδαλῶν* (Zahn omits *τῶν*); chap. vii. (p. 919, 10) *κρίσιν* (Zahn *κρίσιν εἶναι*). The portions of the Epistle to the Philippians that are wanting in the original text, are rendered into Greek by Lightfoot from the Latin, as had been done before by Zahn. In regard to this he says very modestly: ⁴ "Some years before Zahn's edition appeared, I had myself retranslated these portions into Greek, and this retranslation I now publish. It is entirely independent of Zahn's; and for this reason the very general agreement of the two may perhaps be accepted as a presumption that they fairly represent the original of Polycarp." In reality his retranslation is excellent, and in many passages surpasses that of Zahn.⁵ Lightfoot has also given a new recension of the

¹ See vol. ii. pp. 365-526. I shall speak further on of the date of Ignatius' martyrdom.

² See vol. ii. pp. 585-894.

³ See vol. ii. p. 904.

⁴ *Ibid.*

⁵ The reading *Θεὸς Ἰησοῦς Χριστός* (chap. xii. p. 929, 16) I am not able to

Epistle to the Smyrnæans on the martyrdom of Polycarp, since partly he has brought forward new materials and has turned to account, as well as those of others, my researches on the Latin manuscripts.¹ The text given by Lightfoot differs from that of Zahn in 35 places. The most important departures are the following. In chap. ii. (p. 951, 13) *σβεννύμενον* (Zahn *σβεννύμενον πῦρ*); chap. ii. (p. 952, 1) *κολαγιζόμενοι* (instead of *κολαζόμενοι*); chap. ii. (p. 952, 2) Lightfoot has struck out *ὁ τύραννος*; chap. iii. (p. 952, 4) *οὖν* (Zahn has *οὐκ*); chap. iv. (p. 954, 3) *προδιδόντας ἑαυτοῦς* (Zahn *προσιόντας ἑκουσίους*); chap. vi. (p. 956, 1) *ἐπιλεγόμενος* (Zahn omits); chap. x. (p. 965, 11) *κἀν* (Zahn *καί*): chap. xii. (p. 967, 15) *ἐπεβόα* (Zahn *ἐβόα*); chap. xiii. (p. 969, 17) [*ἐν*] *παντὶ γὰρ ἀγαθῆς ἔνεκεν πολιτείας καὶ πρὸ τῆς πολιᾶς* (Zahn here *παντὶ γὰρ καλῶ ἀγαθῆς ἔνεκεν πολιτείας καὶ πρὸ τῆς μαρτυρίας*); chap. xiv. (p. 971, 17) *με μέρος* (Zahn *μέρος*); chap. xvi. (p. 976, 4) *Πολύκαρπος* (Zahn *μάρτυς Πολύκαρπος*); chap. xvi. (p. 976, 7) *καὶ ἐτελειώθη* (Zahn omits *καί*); chap. xx. (p. 983, 10) *ἐπουράνιον* (Zahn *αἰώνιον*); chap. xxii. (p. 984, 7) omit *καὶ πατρὶ καὶ ἀγίῳ πνεύματι*; (p. 986, 13) *τούτων* (Zahn *τούτου*). In all these passages the reading given by Lightfoot has a better or at least an equal right with that given by Zahn. On the other hand, the reading *Μαρκίανος* (chap. xx. p. 982, 5) must be retained. Lightfoot with all the Codices (except the Mosq.), gives *Μαρκιάνου* and says: "The change into *Μαρκίανος* in one manuscript is explained by the fact that Marcion's name appears in the context of that same manuscript." But the reverse change is yet more easily explained. The old copyist looked on the name Marcion as that of the heretic Marcion, and therefore could not let the name stand. In

approve in spite of Josephus and Severus, for all the Latin manuscripts have "dei filius," and in the parts of the Epistle preserved to us in Greek, Christ is never called Θεός. In chap. xii. (p. 930, 3) "et Deum" seems to me an interpolation.

¹ See vol. ii. pp. 935-998.

the celebrated passage, chap. xvi. p. 975, 3, Lightfoot has placed within brackets the words *περιστερὰ καί*. He is inclined to regard them (with Zahn and others) as a later addition intended as a correction (instead of *περὶ στύρακα*). But all the manuscripts have the words, and the omission of them by Eusebius is easily explained. To the cultured Church historian the miracle seemed a rude affair.¹ But in conclusion, I would bring forward a very important point in regard to the text of the Epistle. In the previous editions we read the words *ἡ καθολικὴ ἐκκλησία* in four places, namely, in the Address, in chap. viii., chap. xvi. and chap. xix. The opponents of the genuineness of the Epistle have appealed to these passages, and declared that it follows from them, that the Epistle was not written before the end of the second century. In reply it has been fairly said, that the words *ἡ καθολικὴ ἐκκλησία* meant at first nothing else than the universal Church, that this idea was undoubtedly already present in the apostolic age, and that therefore it could not be but that the name should very soon make its appearance. In the sentence (Ignat. ad Smyrn. viii. p. 310, 1), *ὅπου ἂν φανῆ ὁ ἐπίσκοπος, ἐκεῖ τὸ πλῆθος ἔστω, ὡσπερ ὅπου ἂν ᾖ Χριστὸς Ἰησοῦς, ἐκεῖ ἡ καθολικὴ ἐκκλησία*,—the last words evidently mean the universal Church in contrast to the particular congregations, and cannot therefore be opposed on historical grounds.² It would have been altogether different, had the term catholic already received the meaning of orthodox (in contrast to heresy). This sense of the word in all probability, first came into use a long while after the middle of the second century. How then does it appear in our Epistle? In the first passage (in the Address) we read—*πάσαις ταῖς κατὰ πάντα τόπον τῆς ἀγίας καὶ καθολικῆς ἐκκλησίας παροι-*

¹ Compare *Eusebius*, ii. 10, 6, where Eusebius has converted the owl of which Josephus tells the story into an angel.

² See vol. i. p. 398 sq. Vol. ii. p. 310 sq.

κίαις; in the second passage (chap. viii.) we read—*πάσης τῆς κατὰ τὴν οἰκουμένην καθολικῆς ἐκκλησίας*; in the third passage (chap. xvi.) we read—*ἐπίσκοπος τῆς ἐν Σμύρνῃ καθολικῆς ἐκκλησίας*; in the fourth passage (chap. xix.) we read—*ποιμένα τῆς κατὰ τὴν οἰκουμένην καθολικῆς ἐκκλησίας*. In all these passages—as is evident from the third—catholic means not universal, but orthodox; for otherwise there would be here a tautology, when it was said—*κατὰ τὴν οἰκουμένην*, or *κατὰ πάντα τόπον—καθολικῆ*. This tautology would be all the more extraordinary as, with the exception of the first passage, the earliest designation of the Church, “holy,” is wanting. Now the genuineness of the Epistle is so well established that even that word catholic appearing in the sense of orthodox cannot overthrow it; but the question is, did it stand from the first in these four passages in the Epistle? I doubt it, and at least in one passage Lightfoot also doubts it. In chap. xvi. (p. 976, 6) he gives as the text—*ἐπίσκοπος τῆς ἐν Σμύρνῃ ἁγίας ἐκκλησίας*; and this is in accordance with M (L), and against G Ep. But if *καθολικῆ* is shown in one passage to be an interpolation, then the others too fall under suspicion! all the more since in chap. xix. (p. 982, 2) the Mosquensis gives *ἁγίας* and not *καθολικῆς*. I therefore suppose that at a very early period *καθολικῆς* has been substituted for *ἁγίας* in the second, third, and fourth passages, and that the same hand added the words *καὶ καθολικῆς* in the Address. In later times the predicate holy did not seem so necessary as the predicate catholic. Lightfoot¹ himself admits “a tendency to substitute *καθολικῆς*.” On the other hand, the phrase “holy Church” was usual in early times; see, for example, the Epistle of Alexander to the Church at Antioch (*Eusebius*, vi. 11, 5), *τῆς ἁγίας ὑμῶν τῶν Ἀντιοχείων ἐκκλησίας*, and it could scarcely be omitted.²

¹ Vol. ii. p. 977.

² Outside of the N. T., see Barnab. xiv. 6; Hermas, Vis. i. 3, 4; i. 1, 6; the

The Appendix *Polycarpiana*¹ is a supplement that might have been dispensed with, for the fragments which it contains are as uninteresting as they are worthless, and the *Vita Polycarpi per Pionium* is almost too much honoured by being here reprinted. On the other hand, the philologico-historical commentary, with which Lightfoot accompanies all the literary fragments edited by him, deserves the highest praise. It is worked up with unequalled scholarship, so that the reader does not know which is most wonderful, the profound knowledge of the Greek language, or the familiarity with all problems of antiquity, ecclesiastical as well as profane. Nowhere is a difficulty passed over, but rather the most difficult points are examined with the greatest care. Some "notes" will be found perfect mines of the most minute scholarship. I would only refer to the elaborateness of detail in the discussions on *γεννητός καὶ ἀγέννητος* (vol. ii. pp. 90-94), on the Asiarchate (vol. ii. pp. 987-998), on *λόγος ἀπὸ συγῆς*, on Eph. xix. at the beginning, on Romans (the Address), on Philad. chap. viii. etc. The pains bestowed by Lightfoot have resulted in rendering thoroughly intelligible difficult passages in the Epistles of Ignatius, and many passages that had been left hitherto unexplained. The material which Lightfoot has brought forward for the purpose of exposition is such that one can scarcely hope to make any considerable addition to it.² Only on one important point have I discovered any want of

Symbolum Romanum; Justin, *Dial.*, 119; *Ignat. ad Trall.*, inscri.; *Theoph. ad Autol.*, ii. 14, a very important passage; *Apoll. in Euseb.*, v. 18, 5; *Tertull. adv. Marc.*, iv. 13, v. 4; *de Pud.*, i.; *Clem. Alex.*; *Cornelius in Euseb.*, vi. 43, 6; *Cyprian*, etc. etc.

¹ Vol. ii. pp. 999-1047.

² A remark may be here permitted. May not the words (Philad. vi. p. 264, 2) *ἐὰν δὲ ἀμφοτέροι περι Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ μὴ λαλώσω, οὗτοι ἐμοὶ στήλαι εἰσω καὶ τάφοι νεκρῶν, ἐφ' οἷς γέγραπται μόνον ὀνόματα ἀνθρώπων*, have a reference to the words in the Epistle to the Church of Philadelphia in the Apocalypse of St. John (chap. iii. 12), *ὁ νεκρῶν ποιήσω αὐτὸν στυλὸν ἐν τῷ ναῷ τοῦ Θεοῦ μου, καὶ ἔξω οὐ μὴ ἐξελεθῆ ἔτι, καὶ γράψω ἐπ' αὐτὸν τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ Θεοῦ μου, καὶ τὸ ὄνομα τῆς πόλεως τοῦ Θεοῦ μου?*

thorough investigation and exact statement, namely in the passages which seem to have been taken from a creed or symbol containing the Christian *κήρυγμα* (see, especially Eph. vii. 18–20; Magnes. xi.; Trall. ix.; Rom. vii.; Philad. viii.; Smyrn. i. etc.). A whole series of questions here emerges, which it is extremely important to have discussed, the settlement of which is also of great value with reference to the genuineness of the Epistles. I shall only mention the following:—1. Ignatius has nowhere shown that he was acquainted with a Symbol which ended with the words *ἀγίαν ἐκκλησίαν, ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν, σαρκὸς ἀνάστασιν*: for of forgiveness of sins, for example, he has even in general discourse scarcely ever spoken; but in connexion with the *κήρυγμα*, in no single passage. 2. In the *κήρυγμα* (Symbol) of Ignatius the baptism of Christ by John had still a place (see Eph. xviii.; Smyrna i.), which is a proof of extreme antiquity, for as all know, in the Apostle's Creed the baptism is no longer present. 3. Ignatius has so regularly in his Formula used the expression *ἐκ γένους (σπέρματος) Δαυεὶδ* (Eph. xviii., xx.; Trall. ix.; Rom. vii.; Smyrn. i.), that it must be admitted that these words formed an integral part of the *κήρυγμα* (Symbol), and this would suit the earliest times. In the Apostle's Creed (Symbolum Romanum) these words are wanting. Even in the second century they were suppressed by some, and not by the heretics only. 4. Ignatius does not show himself acquainted with the phrase *μονογενῆς υἱός*—only in one passage he has *Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ μόνου υἱοῦ* (Rom. Address). In the Symb. Rom. we find *μονογενῆς υἱός*. 5. Next to Pontius Pilate, Ignatius (Smyrn. i.) has named the Tetrarch Herod—*ἀληθῶς ἐπὶ Ποντίου Πιλάτου καὶ Ἡρώδου τετράρχου καθηλωμένον*. This corresponds to Acts iv. 27, and to Justin, *Dial.*, 103, but is not found in later writers. 6. Ignatius nowhere refers to the Ascension of Christ; he speaks only of the Resurrection—the *ἀνάστασις*—while the Acts of the Apostles, Barnabas, Justin, etc., are all

acquainted with the story of the Ascension.¹ All these particulars thus indicated point to the extreme antiquity of the Epistles, and they prove—if here there is still any need of proof—that these could not have proceeded from a Roman source. This brings us to the question of the genuineness of the Epistles, but what we have to say on this must be reserved for next paper.

Giessen.

A. HARNACK.

¹ That Ignatius has not referred to the Ascension is the more extraordinary for this reason, that in several passages of his Epistles (espec. Smyrn. iii.) he had an opportunity of mentioning it. Also the formula, *καθήμενον ἐν δεξιᾷ τοῦ πατρὸς, ὁθεν ἔρχεται κρῖναι ζῶντας καὶ νεκρούς* is not found in Ignatius, but yet is in Polycarp (Philipp. 2). On the other hand, Ignatius has alluded in some passages to the *descensus ad inferos* (see Lightfoot on Magnes. ix. p. 131). Finally, it may be mentioned, that the Trinitarian formula was known to Ignatius (Eph. ix.; Magnes. xiii; Philad., Address), but that, neither in his writings nor in Polycarp's, is the phrase *πατὴρ παντοκράτωρ* to be found, but only in the Epistle to the Church at Smyrna on the death of Polycarp (chap. xix. p. 981, 20). At this point one may make an attempt to reconstruct the *κήρυγμα* of Ignatius regarding Christ:—*Πιστεύομεν εἰς Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν* (al. *Χριστόν Ἰησοῦν*), *τὸν Κύριον ἡμῶν, τὸν κατὰ σάρκα ἐκ σπέρματος* (al. *γένους*) *Δαβίδ πνεύματος δὲ ἁγίου, υἱὸν ἀνθρώπου καὶ υἱὸν Θεοῦ, γεγεννημένον ἐκ Μαρίας* (al. *ἐκ παρθένου*), *βεβαπτισμένον ὑπὸ Ἰωάννου, παθόντα καὶ ἀναστάντα* (ἐκ [al. ἀπὸ] *νεκρῶν*) *ἐπὶ Ποντίου Πιλάτου* (καὶ Ἑρώδου τετραρρχοῦ). In order to prevent misunderstanding, I may say that in my opinion it by no means establishes the notion that Ignatius had before him a formulated Symbol. It is not at all probable that in Antioch the *κήρυγμα* of Christ had, at so early a period, been crystallized into a confession of the Father, Son, and Spirit (Θεὸς *πατὴρ* is the stereotyped formula). The above collection of passages should therefore only embrace the propositions which are acknowledged by Ignatius as, next to the confession of Father, Son, and Spirit, the most important Christian truths, which therefore he was wont to repeat in stereotyped form. If we compare them with the old *Symbolum Romanum*, there appears agreement on the one hand, and the most marked difference on the other. But this is not the place to enter more fully into these questions.