

lead many to come and see, by showing them that Christianity includes and finds a place for the affirmative assertions of all the other creeds; while by rejecting their negations, their exclusion that is, of it and of each other, it is more comprehensive, as a theory of the world, and therefore presumably more true. And in doing this we are not acting in any spirit of extorted concession; but reasserting the primitive doctrine, that the Eternal Word who created all things has been present from the beginning in the material world; in the course of philosophic thought; in the secular progress of mankind; in the wills, in the minds, in the bodies, in the whole persons of His saints; revealing more fully, in each new stage of universal evolution, "the mystery which from the beginning of the world hath been hid in God—Who created all things by Christ Jesus, to the intent that now unto the principalities and powers in heavenly places might be known by the Church the manifold wisdom of God, according to the eternal purpose which He purposed in Christ Jesus, our Lord.

J. R. ILLINGWORTH.

A. Harnack

LIGHTFOOT ON THE IGNATIAN EPISTLES.

II. GENUINENESS AND DATE OF THE EPISTLES.

2. HERESY. In his seventh proposition, Lightfoot maintained that the types of false doctrine which Ignatius combated, afford an evidence of the genuineness of the Epistles. In vol. i. pp. 359-368, he has carefully examined the statements in the Epistles regarding heresy,¹ and has reached the conclusion, that Ignatius has considered only one class of heretics, namely, *Judaistic Docketists*. Since now such heretics have been combated also in the Epistle

¹ See also pp. 368-375.

to the Colossians and in the Pastoral Epistles, while they do not appear at a later period, there is found in this a sure proof of the extreme antiquity of the Ignatian Epistles.¹

Lightfoot is certainly right in calling attention to the absence of any polemic against Basilides, Valentinus, and Marcion as a negative sign of the genuineness.² But from the characteristics of the heretics no positive argument can be obtained for the genuineness of the Epistles; for the statement that Ignatius combats the Judaistic Doketists in the Epistles is in my opinion incorrect. His polemic against the Judaists and his polemic against the Doketists should not be mixed up together. Since Lightfoot, however, can appeal on behalf of the contrary opinion to the consensus of most scholars of modern times,³ this point demands a more careful examination.⁴

In two of the seven Epistles—in the Epistle to Polycarp and in that to the Romans—generally speaking there is no delineation of the heretics.⁵ This is explained in the former case, by Ignatius having dealt very fully with heresy in the Epistle to the members of the Church of Smyrna, written about the same time; and in the latter case, from the fact that there was no heresy then existing in Rome.⁶ Nevertheless, he employs even in these Epistles formulæ and expressions which show clearly that he has constructed

¹ See vol. i. p. 368. "The strongly marked type of Doketism assailed in these letters, so far from being a difficulty is rather an indication of an early date."

² The very trace of a polemic against Valentinus vanishes when the correct text in Magnes. chap. viii. has been restored: λόγος ἀπὸ συγκῆς προελθὼν.

³ Pre-eminently to Zahn (*Ignatius von Antiochien*, p. 356 sq.); and also to Lipsius, Uhlhorn, and others.

⁴ Hilgenfeld (*Apostol. Väter*, S. 231 sq.) is in agreement with my view to which I had already given expression in my work, *Die Zeit des Ignatius*, S. 2.

⁵ In the Epistle to Polycarp (chap. iii.) there is to be found only the following general exhortation:—οἱ δοκῶντες ἀξιόπιστοι εἶναι καὶ ἐτεροδιδασκαλοῦντες μὴ σε καταπλησθέντων.

⁶ See the Address of the Epistle to the Romans in which Ignatius congratulates the Church on its being free from all strange doctrines.

his own system of theology in opposition to Doketism.¹ The confession regarding the reality of the historical appearing of Christ, His suffering, death, and resurrection, is with Ignatius the fundamental Christian confession, not only in opposition to heresy, but also in and for itself. All blessings, which the Christian possesses, spring from "the suffering of our God;" the flesh of Christ, "who is of the seed of David," is our meat, etc. Since Ignatius also uses such formulæ in the Epistle to the Romans, it is evident that one must not conclude from the employment of them in the Epistles, that in the Churches addressed Doketists were actually present. Only in cases where Ignatius expressly warns against them can the existence of such Doketists be regarded as proved. Just as the preaching of justification by faith alone in a Protestant Church does not prove the presence in that Church of crypto-catholics—because this preaching can be opposed to all heresies, and because it must ever be repeated apart altogether from heresies—even so the anti-Doketic propositions of Ignatius in and by themselves do not prove that Doketism existed in the Churches to which he wrote.² After this indispensable preliminary remark, we proceed to consider the Epistles to the Ephesians, Trallians, Smyrnæans, Magnesians, and Philadelphians. Lightfoot's most important service consists in his having brought out distinctly the individuality of the several Epistles. But in his treatment of the question of heresy, he has not remained faithful to the method which otherwise he has so successfully employed.

In the most comprehensive and most carefully elaborated

¹ See Polyc. chap. iii. : *προσδόκα τὸν ἀχρονον, τὸν ἀόρατον, τὸν δι' ἡμᾶς ὁρατὸν, τὸν ἀψηλάφητον, τὸν ἀπαθῆ, τὸν δι' ἡμᾶς παθητὸν, τὸν κατὰ πάντα τρόπον δι' ἡμᾶς ὑπομέναντα.* Rom. chap. vi. : *ἐκείνον ζητῶ, τὸν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἀποθανόντα, ἐκείνον θέλω, τὸν δι' ἡμᾶς ἀναστάντα . . . ἐπιτρέψατέ μοι μιμητὴν εἶναι τοῦ πάθους τοῦ Θεοῦ μου.* Chap. vii. : *ἄρτον Θεοῦ θέλω, ὃ ἐστὶν σὰρξ τοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ ἐκ σπέρματος Δαυεὶδ, καὶ πόμα θέλω τὸ αἶμα αὐτοῦ, ὃ ἐστὶν ἀγάπη ἀφθαρτος.*

² Ignatius would first meet with and learn to abhor Doketic Christology, not in Asia Minor, but in Syria.

Epistle, that to the Ephesians, Ignatius appeals to the testimony of the Ephesian bishop, that no heresy existed in the church, and that they refused to listen to false teachers.¹ *Εἰώθασιν γάρ τινες*—he continues in the seventh chapter—*δόλω πονηρῶ τὸ ὄνομα περιφέρειν, ἄλλα τινὰ πρᾶσσοντες ἀνάξια Θεῶν οὓς δεῖ ὑμᾶς ὡς θηρία ἐκκλίνειν εἰσὶν γὰρ κύνες λυσσῶντες λαθροδῆκται, οὓς δεῖ ὑμᾶς φυλάσσεσθαι ὄντας δυσθεραπεύτους.* This exhortation is repeated four times in the Epistle,² for he warns against *κακοδιδασκαλία*, and, *e.g.* in chap. ix. at the beginning, he expressly points to false teachers who had been passing through Ephesus.³ But this is all that we here learn of the heretics. Ignatius says nothing in any single passage regarding the nature of their false teaching. But he does give expression in several passages in the most decided way to the anti-Doketic confession,⁴ and since, once, in chap. ix., the warning against heresy follows immediately, it may be conjectured that here at least he has the Doketists in view. Still this conclusion is not quite certain, since an anti-Doketic confession stands in chapter xx. without having in this connexion any reference to heretics. Faith in the reality of the historical appearing of “our God,” together with subordination to the bishop, appears to Ignatius as the means of salvation from all evil, and as the source of all blessings. But it is deserving of special notice that there is not a single word about Judaists, or any warning against Judaism.

The state of matters in the Epistle to the Trallians is quite clear. This Church is warned against Doketists, and against them only.⁵ Ignatius wishes by this warning to

¹ See chap. vi.

² See chap. viii., beginning; chap. ix., beginning; chap. xvi.; and chap. xvii., beginning.

³ *Ἐγγων παραδύσαντάς τινας ἐκέλευν, ἔχοντας κακὴν διδαχὴν.* What place is to be understood by *ἐκέλευν* is uncertain.

⁴ See especially, chaps. ix., xviii., and xx.

⁵ See chaps. vi.—xi., espec. chap. x.: *εἰ δέ, ὥσπερ τινὲς ἀθεοὶ ὄντες, τουτέστιν ἄπιστοι, λέγουσιν τὸ δοκεῖν πεπονημένοι αὐτόν, κ.τ.λ.*

prevent a *possible* seduction. He says expressly that hitherto the Church has continued pure. Here again there is not the slightest reference to Jews or Judaists.

From the Epistle to the Smyrnæans it seems that this Church was most severely threatened with danger from the seductions of heretics, but had hitherto shown itself valiant. In this Epistle Ignatius begins immediately with a polemic against the heretics, and continues it down to the seventh chapter. That these were Doketists admits of no doubt,¹ but we discover in this Epistle other characteristics of these heretics. They are people puffed up with pride, carried away by their heavenly knowledge, and despising faith in the blood of Christ. In regard to this, he says: *περὶ ἀγάπης οὐ μέλει αὐτοῖς, οὐ περὶ χήρας, οὐ περὶ ὀρφανοῦ, οὐ περὶ θλιβομένου, οὐ περὶ δεδεμένου ἢ λελυμένου, οὐ περὶ πεινώτος ἢ διχῶντος· εὐχαριστίας καὶ προσευχῆς ἀπέχονται διὰ τὸ μὴ ὁμολογεῖν τὴν εὐχαριστίαν σάρκα εἶναι τοῦ σωτήρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, τὴν ὑπὲρ τῶν ἀμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν παθοῦσαν, ἣν τῇ χρηστότητι ὁ πατὴρ ἤγειρεν.* Here we have the picture of the Gnostics with which we are familiar in Irenæus and Tertullian; they are the assembly of the knowing ones, and they put out of sight the practical tasks of Christianity. There is nowhere any reference to Judaisers.²

The conclusions to be drawn from what we have seen are these: in the Epistles to the Trallians and to the Smyrnæans, and probably also in the Epistle to the Ephesians, Dokeretic Gnostics are combated; in the Epistle to the Smyrnæans, these are most distinctly characterised. There were teachers gathering about who sought to found a sect within the Churches; and for them Ignatius can only give

¹ See chap. ii.; ἀληθῶς ἔπαθεν, ὡς καὶ ἀληθῶς ἀνέστησεν ἑαυτόν· οὐ ὡς περ ἀπιστοὶ εἶνες λέγουσιν τὸ δοκεῖν αὐτὸν πεπονθέναι, αὐτοὶ τὸ δοκεῖν διγτες.

² The words (chap. v.): οὐδ' οὐκ ἔπεισαν αἱ προφητεῖαι οὐδὲ ὁ νόμος Μωσέως, ἀλλ' οὐ μέχρι νῦν τὸ εὐαγγέλιον (see also chap. vii. p. 308)—might be uttered against any heresy.

expression to the deepest abhorrence: ¹ they ought not to be received, yea, wherever possible, one should not even once meet with them. There is not the slightest intercourse between them and Ignatius. *That they recommend the observance of the law of Moses, and are connected with the Jews, is affirmed in no single passage, or even hinted at.* Least of all in the Epistle to the Smyrnæans, in which the heretics are so carefully delineated, would their Judaism have been overlooked, if they had been Judaists.

An entirely different picture is preserved in the Epistle to the Magnesians. In chapters i. to vii. and xii. to xv. there is no allusion made to any sort of heretics. On the other hand the section embracing the 8th, 9th, and 10th chapters begins with the words: *Μὴ πλανᾶσθε ταῖς ἑτεροδοξίαις μηδὲ μυθεύμασιν τοῖς παλαιοῖς ἀνωφελέσιν οὐσιν· εἰ γὰρ μέχρι νῦν κατὰ Ἰουδαϊσμόν ζῶμεν, ὁμολογοῦμεν χάριν μὴ εἰληφέναι,* and ends with the words: *Ἄτοπον ἐστὶν Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν λαλεῖν καὶ Ἰουδαίῳ· ὁ γὰρ Χριστιανισμὸς οὐκ εἰς Ἰουδαϊσμόν ἐπίστευσεν, ἀλλ' Ἰουδαϊσμός εἰς Χριστιανισμόν, ᾧ πᾶσα γλῶσσα πιστεύσασα εἰς Θεὸν συνήχθη.* The subject treated of here is the danger of falling back into the Jewish mode of life in respect of the ceremonial law. Hence we find in this section clear notions which one would seek for in vain in the Epistles to the Ephesians, Trallians, and Smyrnæans, namely: *μυθεύματα τὰ παλαιά* (chap. viii.), *παλαιά πράγματα* (chap. ix.), *ἡ κακὴ ζύμη, ἡ παλωθεῖσα καὶ ἐνοξίσασα* (chap. ix.), *νέα ζύμη* (chap. x.), *καινότης ἐλπίδος* (chap. ix.), *σαββατίζειν* (chap. ix.), *κατὰ κυριακὴν ζῶντες* (chap. ix.), *κατὰ Χριστιανισμόν ζῆν* (chap. x.), *Ἰουδαίῳ* (chap. x.), etc. It is further said, that the Old Testament Prophets themselves

¹ Eph. chap. vii. *θηρία, κύνες λυσσῶντες, λαθροδῆκται, δυσθεράπενται.* Chap. xvii. *δυσώδια τῆς διδασκαλίας τοῦ ἀρχόντος τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου.* Trall. vi. *θανάσιμον φάρμακον.* Chap. viii. *αἱ ἐνέδραι τοῦ διαβόλου.* Chap. xi. *καρπὸς θανατηφόρος.* Chap. x. *ἄθεοι, ἄπιστοι.* Smyrn. chap. ii. *ἄπιστοι, ὄντες δαιμονικοί.* Chap. iv. *θηρία τὰ ἀνθρωπομόρφα.* Chap. v. *συνήγοροι τοῦ θανάτου,* etc.

lived after Christ Jesus (chap. viii.), that they were disciples of Christ and waited for Him (chap. ix.), that Jesus Christ is not merely a man, such as we are, but the Son of God and the Logos of God ἀπὸ σιγῆς προελθὼν (chap. viii.). From this it follows that Ignatius here combats a tendency to fall back into Ebionitism. In this connexion it is to be observed: (1) that he warns emphatically not against a false doctrine but against a false life; (2) that he here utters no word of abhorrence and revolt, but in a calm, fatherly, friendly address combats the Judaizing, and (3) that he does not speak of false teachers who press into the Church from without, but of a danger that can happen to a Church only as proceeding from the bosom of the Church itself.¹ *We have here a totally different picture from that presented to us in the Epistle previously examined.* But are there not here certain features, which show that this Ebionitism was associated with Doketism? Lightfoot affirms this, but wrongly. He appeals, first of all, to this that Ignatius speaks of *πλανᾶσθαι, ἑτεροδοξίαι, κενοδοξία*, as in the other Epistles; but it is difficult to understand why the Judaistic danger should not be so indicated, particularly as to *ἑτεροδοξίαις* is added *μυθεύμασι τοῖς παλαιοῖς*. Lightfoot thinks, secondly, that in chap. ix. (p. 130, 1 sq.), an allusion to Doketism must be admitted. But, (1) the true reading is not *ὃν τινες ἀρνοῦνται*, but *ὃ τινες ἀρν.*; so that it will refer to the whole preceding sentence; (2) Zahn has already correctly perceived that *ὃ τινες* is the beginning of a parenthesis of Ignatius which extends to p. 134, 4; it can therefore scarcely be made use of as indicating a characteristic of the danger. But even apart from this, that which Ignatius has here said, may very well be said of Judaists. There is therefore absolutely no ground for the assertion that in the Magnesian Epistle, Ignatius has uttered a warning against

¹ See chap. xi; ταῦτα δὲ οὐκ ἐπεὶ ἔγνωσαν τινὰς ἐξ ὑμῶν οὕτως ἔχοντας ἀλλ' ὡς μικρότερος ὑμῶν θέλω προφυλάσσεισθαι ὑμᾶς.

Judaistic Dokerism.¹ He has uttered a warning against Judaism and has combated it by reference to a Pauline thought (chap. viii. p. 124, 2 sq.), by maintaining that already the Prophets had lived after Jesus Christ, and by the reminder that Jesus Christ is the perfect revelation of the one God (*υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ ὃς ἐστὶν αὐτοῦ λόγος ἀπὸ συγῆς προελθών*). These arguments have absolutely nothing to do with Dokerism. The Judaists, then, in the Epistle to the Magnesians were certainly not Dokerists, and the Dokerists described in the Epistles to the Ephesians, Trallians, and Smyrnæans were not Judaists.

This fact would indeed be misunderstood by no one, if the Epistles of Ignatius had come to us without the Epistle to the Philadelphians. It is in fact this Epistle which has led scholars astray. It is the least calm and the worst arranged of all the seven Epistles: The news which Ignatius, while upon his journey, had received at Troas, from Philadelphia, were in part painful to him. He wrote the letter in haste, and this accounts for its abruptness in many passages. Still even here it may be shown that there is no foundation for the idea that Ignatius combats Judaistic Dokerists. Chapter ii. 4, contains quite general warnings against heretical and schismatical intrigues.² A new section evidently begins with chapter v.

¹ Lightfoot still appeals to chap. xi. (p. 135, 10 sq.). From the confession of Ignatius it follows that even in Magnesia the danger of Dokeric error was present. But what has been observed above should here be taken into account, that nothing can be concluded from the anti-Dokeric confessions of Ignatius. Just as in the present day, at German Pastoral Conferences, the discussion of the various forms of modern theological systems is regularly concluded by the recitation of the Apostles' Creed, so too Ignatius is ever repeating in season and out of season his *ἀληθῶς πραχθέντα*. Moreover in regard to chap. xi. in particular it is still to be observed,—(1) that the anti-Dokeric element in this Confession does not bulk very largely (see on the other hand, *e.g.* Eph. vii. and Smyrn. i.), and (2) that Ignatius has already in chap. x. ended the description of the peril that threatened the Church.

² Lightfoot wishes to conclude from the greeting that Ignatius refers to Dokerists. I dissent from this. See above.

which reaches down to chapter vi. (p. 265, 8). It is in thorough agreement with Magnes. chap. viii.-x. Here there is a warning against Judaism and against nothing else. Even Lightfoot has not been able to discover in this section any traces of Doketism. Chapter vi. (p. 265, 8-12) brings forward quite suddenly a personal remark, with which is joined a self justification of Ignatius which is somewhat dark to us. It deals with the attempt of some schismatics, who are not more particularly designated, to win over Ignatius to their side. This had happened at the time when he was in Philadelphia. He did not allow himself to be talked over by them, but had his answers ready for them: τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ προσέχετε καὶ τῷ πρεσβυτέρῳ καὶ διακόνοις (chap. vii.). After his departure, however, some one represented it as if he had not been sufficiently decided in opposition to these people. How can any one suppose that these were the same Doketists whom he combated in the Epistle to the Smyrnæans! How very differently had he spoken against these, from what we find in the seventh chapter! No, they were enthusiasts, separating from the fellowship of the Church, who sought to win him over. They were neither Judaists, nor Doketists, nor Judaistic Doketists. The unity of the Philadelphian Church was thus threatened, (1) by Judaism, (2) by enthusiastic schismatics. But yet a third danger was present; and this forms the subject of a section in chapters viii. and ix. (p. 269, 13, to p. 276, 4). There were contentious people¹ in the Church who would on no account set up the Jewish manner of life,—it is not such that are referred to—but who, like the Apologists in later times, made their faith in the gospel dependent upon the Old Testament prophecy. They

¹ Consider the introduction of the section: παρακαλῶ δὲ ὑμᾶς μηδὲν κατ' ἐριθείαν πράσσειν, ἀλλὰ κατὰ Χριστομαθίαν. Here the question is not about heretics or schismatics in the strict sense of the word, but about theologians who underestimated the supremacy of the gospel over against the Old Testament.

would only believe that which had been prophesied in the Old Testament.¹ In regard to this Ignatius admits, on the one hand, that everything is written down in the Old Testament, that has been fulfilled in the gospel; but he confesses, on the other hand, that the supreme authority is Jesus Christ Himself, His cross, His death, His resurrection, and that the men of God of the Old Testament are in no particular over Christ, but had need of Him as the door of entrance to God. There is absolutely no reference to Docketism.

From the Epistle to the Philadelphians then we obtain a much more complicated picture of the Church, than from the Epistles to the Ephesians, Trallians and Magnesians. Ignatius here combated very different errors, and shows us a Church which is agitated by different movements. This is not surprising, *if Ignatius was acquainted with the Church at Philadelphia from personal knowledge, but not so with those others.*

To gather up the results thus reached: the identification of the Judaists and the Gnostics in the Ignatian Epistles is quite inadmissible. Ignatius combats the Docketists in the Epistles to the Ephesians, the Trallians, and Smyrnæans, while in the Epistles to the Magnesians and Philadelphians he warns against the Ebionistic danger. In the last named Epistle especially he warns against other tendencies which threatened the unity of the Church.

When Lightfoot affirms that "the earliest forms of Christian Gnosticism were Judaic," I will not contradict him.² The Ignatian Epistles, however, do not show us those

¹ Such cultured Christians were numerous in the second century. Augustine in a well known passage has said; *evangelio non crederem, nisi me commoveret ecclesiæ catholicæ auctoritas.* In regard to those Christians, especially in regard to the Apologists, the words may be used in an altered form: *evangelio non crederem, nisi me commoveret Veteris Testamenti auctoritas.* It is this view that Ignatius combats.

² Lightfoot refers to the errors combated in the Epistle to the Colossians, and in the Pastoral Epistles.

earliest forms, but the usual Gentile forms of Christian Gnosticism. Therefore, an argument for the genuineness of the Epistles can no more be obtained here than from the delineation of the Episcopate.

ii. THE DATE OF THE EPISTLES.

The Epistles of Ignatius and the Epistle of Polycarp are no forgeries; they are written by the men by whom they profess to have been written,—by an Antiochian Bishop Ignatius, and by the Polycarp, Bishop of Smyrna, of whom Irenæus, Polycrates, and Tertullian have spoken with great respect, whose martyrdom has been described to us by eye-witnesses. But when were these Epistles composed? Lightfoot answers, in the age of Trajan (A.D. 100–118), for he regards a more exact determination of the date as impossible. He reaches this conclusion on the ground of researches, which in regard to scholarship must awaken the astonishment and admiration of all.¹ I feel specially called upon to thank him for the painstaking consideration he has given to my work, *Die Zeit des Ignatius*.²

But is this judgment pronounced by Lightfoot with such confidence one that can stand the test? I believe that it cannot; and further, I think the admittedly profound learning of Lightfoot has contributed little or nothing to the main question, and that he has not rightly comprehended the problem. After he has convinced himself and his readers of the genuineness of the Epistle of Polycarp, Lightfoot seeks immediately to clear away the objections, which are brought against assigning the Epistle to the age of Trajan. But this is not the proper method. In the entire Ignatian controversy, the Epistle of Polycarp is the one

¹ See vol. ii. pp. 433–470.

² Leipzig, 1878. See also my Article in the *Theol. Lit. Zeitung*, 1884. No. 6.

fixed point. From it, therefore, without reference to the Ignatian Epistles, we must proceed in determining the chronological question.¹

1. What does the external evidence tell us of the date of the Epistle of Polycarp? It tells us absolutely nothing. No ecclesiastical writer has mentioned the Emperor during whose reign the Epistle was written, or has otherwise given any indication of its date. So the letter may have been written any time between A.D. 100–155.

2. What does the Epistle itself say about the time of its composition? Directly it says nothing at all. The state of matters in Philippi, which it presupposes, may have existed just as well in A.D. 150 as in 100. But certain indications are yet discernible. (1) Polycarp has freely used all the Pauline Epistles with the exception of Colossians, Philemon, 1st Thessalonians, and Titus, and likewise the Epistle of Clement of Rome, written about the year A.D. 96, and also, though without naming the authors, 1st Peter and 1st John. It may be assumed with great probability that Polycarp had before him the thirteen Pauline Epistles. It is certainly *possible* that these Epistles had been already collected by the years A.D. 100, but there is no probability in favour of this view. The use of the First Epistle of Clement also proves this opinion. (2) Polycarp writes in chap. vii.: Πᾶς γὰρ ὃς ἂν μὴ ὁμολογῇ Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν ἐν σαρκὶ ἐληλυθέναι, ἀντιχριστός ἐστιν· καὶ ὃς ἂν μὴ ὁμολογῇ τὸ μαρτύριον τοῦ σταυροῦ, ἐκ τοῦ διαβόλου ἐστίν· καὶ ὃς ἂν μεθοδεύῃ τὰ λόγια τοῦ κυρίου πρὸς τὰς ἰδίας ἐπιθυμίας, καὶ λέγῃ μῆτε ἀνάστασιν μῆτε κρίσιν, οὗτος πρωτότοκος ἐστὶ τοῦ Σατανᾶ. Whoever considers these words without reference to the Ignatian Epistles, will regard them as pointing

¹ Lightfoot proceeds by the directly opposite method. See, for example, his treatment of Polyc. chap. vii. "The passage in the Epistle, if genuine, must have been written before A.D. 118." Why? Lightfoot answers: "Because the Epistles of Ignatius were certainly written before 118." But this is just the question.

not to the time of Trajan, but to that of Hadrian and Antoninus Pius. Of "Judaic-Christian Gnosis," there is no mention here at all. We have rather the repudiation of the most important characteristics of cultured, Gentile-Christian Gnosticism, the Doketism from which proceeded the evaporating of the redeeming work of Christ, and the corrections for a purpose (*tendenzios*) of the traditional words of the Lord, regarding the resurrection of the body and the dramatic judgment of the world. With some probability, we may here even take a step further. These words suit no one better than Marcion, who must have been already working in Asia Minor in A.D. 130-140. Yea, so far as we know, the description of full-blown Doketism in combination with the *μεθοδέειν τὰ λόγια τοῦ κυρίου*, applies to him only in Asia Minor. Of him also the strong expressions—*ἀντίχριστος, υἱὸς τοῦ διαβόλου, πρωτότοκος τοῦ Σατανᾶ*—can be appropriately used. Justin, too, the earliest opponent of Marcion known to us, designates Marcion alongside of Simon Magus and Menander, as a messenger of the demons.¹ Now we know on abundant testimony that Polycarp calls Marcion *πρωτότοκος τοῦ Σατανᾶ*.² Polycarp certainly in his long life may have applied this expression to other heretics, but we have no instance of this. If it be regarded not as a mere general abusive term, but as one to be taken in its strict sense, only one can be the first-born of Satan.³ Lightfoot, however, seeks by two arguments to demonstrate the impossibility of

¹ See *Apol.*, i. 26.

² See Irenæus iii. 3, 4: *καὶ αὐτὸς δὲ ὁ Πολύκαρπος Μαρκίωνι ποτὲ εἰς δψιν αὐτῷ ἐλθόντι καὶ φήσαντι, ἐπιγνώσκει ἡμᾶς; ἀπεκρίθη· ἐπιγνώσκω σε τὸν πρωτότοκον τοῦ Σατανᾶ.*

³ Lightfoot shelters himself under the following possibility; he says (vol. i. p. 572), "Irenæus, as he tells us in the context, was acquainted with the Epistle, and it is quite possible that in repeating the story of Polycarp's interview with Marcion he inadvertently imported into it the expression which he had read in the Epistle." Fortunately Lightfoot himself regards this desperate expedient as not very probable.

referring the expression in chap. vii. to Marcion.¹ In the first place, Marcion was a rigid ascetic; hence Polycarp cannot say of him, that he alters the words of the Lord "according to his own carnal lust." In the second place, it is not true of Marcion, that he denied the Judgment, for according to Marcion, the God of the Jews is the Judge. I regret that Lightfoot should have brought forward these two arguments. Why should *πρὸς τὰς ἰδίας ἐπιθυμίας* be understood in a carnal sense? In many places *ἐπιθυμία* means the wilful, evil affections of the heart, without any idea of fleshly lusts being present. I refer only to 2 Tim. iv. 3: *ἔσται γὰρ καιρὸς ὅτε τῆς ὑγιαίνουσῃς διδασκαλίας οὐκ ἀνέξονται, ἀλλὰ κατὰ τὰς ἰδίας ἐπιθυμίας ἑαυτοῖς ἐπισωρεύσουσιν διδασκάλους.* As regards the Judgment, we may compare *Tertull. adv. Marc.*, i. 27: "Marcionitæ interrogati, quid fiet peccatori cuique die illo? respondēt abjici illum quasi ab oculis." This *abjectio* they expressly distinguished from the Judgment. Hence Tertullian in a long discussion shows that there must be a judgment, and that Marcion involves himself in self-contradictions. The Jewish God is certainly *judicialis* according to Marcion, but that is not the point here in question. The matter under discussion here is whether Marcion denied that great final Judgment which Jesus and the apostles had preached. Thus the words of Polycarp, *λέγη μήτε ἀνάστασιν μήτε κρίσιν*, are thoroughly applicable to Marcion, who struck out or explained away all the passages of Luke's Gospel which referred to the resurrection of the body, and to the Judgment day of the Father of Jesus Christ.

The result of what we have said is this: *There are no arguments of undoubted certainty to show that Polycarp's Epistle was written after 130, but all indications of time point to this date, and make it very probable that the Epistle*

¹ See vol. i. p. 570 sq.

was not composed earlier.¹ On the other hand, not even a single observation can be quoted which recommends the assigning of the Epistle to the period between A.D. 100–130, or still less, between 100 and 118.²

We pass now to the Ignatian Epistles. These *must*—and here we agree with Lightfoot—have been written some time before the Epistle of Polycarp. But has Lightfoot brought forth any argument from the Epistles themselves on behalf of the opinion that they originated between A.D. 100 and 118? In his large work I have not found one. The Epistles do not name any emperor, any pro-consul, any year. They leave us, therefore, at perfect liberty to bring them down to the first half of the second century, where we can best understand them. There will still be always present in them an element enigmatical enough, wherever we place them; but the direction which Polycarp's Epistle affords us is still very helpful. No one can deny that the Ignatian Epistles correspond better with what we know of the earliest Church history if we assign it to the year 130 rather than to an earlier date. We find it more conceivable that at that time the monarchical episcopate had already obtained a firm footing in Asia Minor; the sentence—*οἱ ἐπίσκοποι οἱ κατὰ τὰ πέρατα ὀρισθέντες* (Eph. iii.)—is less difficult; that the Gnostic Doketism was already so widely spread is more easily comprehended. That Ignatius did not speak of the Apostle John in the Epistle to the Ephesians is less of a stumbling block, if it was written about A.D. 130–140, than if it had been written about A.D. 100. That Ignatius wrote of the *λόγος ἀπὸ σιγῆς προελθών*, and combated those Christian teachers who would put faith in the Gospel only on the ground of the au-

¹ I do not believe it would have occurred to any one to assign the Epistle of Polycarp to the age of Trajan, if the Ignatian Epistles had not existed.

² Even Lightfoot has not been able to quote any single passage from Polycarp's Epistle, which would make it probable that this Epistle was written between the years 100 and 118.

thority of the Old Testament, is more in accordance with the age of the Apologists than with that of Trajan. In a word, the indications of time which have led us to assign the Epistle of Polycarp to the year 130, are confirmed by the Ignatian Epistles, while no single passage in the seven Epistles of Ignatius can be pointed to as supporting the view that they could not have been written later than the age of Trajan.

If, however, we should convince ourselves that the Epistles were composed in the age of Trajan, we should take the more difficult step, and assign the Epistles of Ignatius and Polycarp to the age of John, because a hundred years later Origen named Ignatius as the second bishop of Antioch after Peter, and because two hundred years later Eusebius asserted that Ignatius had suffered martyrdom under Trajan.

I have shown in my work on the Age of Ignatius that we do not possess other authorities for the date of Ignatius' martyrdom, and Lightfoot has acknowledged this. Setting aside what is disputed,¹ let us estimate the value of these two witnesses.

(1) Before Eusebius, that is, before the beginning of the fourth century, no one, so far as we know, associated Ignatius with Trajan. From the statement of Origen it can only be concluded that he possessed a list of Antiochian bishops in which Ignatius was named as the second bishop after Peter.² When Origen says that Ignatius fought *ἐν τῷ διωγμῷ* at Rome with wild beasts, this naturally is no independent statement, but is taken from

¹ It is possible that Hort is right in his modification of my hypothesis as to the relations of the Antiochian and Roman lists of bishops (see vol. ii. p. 461 sq.). I shall not here enter further into the question, but shall assume Hort and Lightfoot's standpoint that Eusebius was acquainted with the fact that Ignatius suffered martyrdom under Trajan. I shall even set aside Julius Africanus, as I have not found time to work up the whole subject.

² According to Athanasius, however (*de Synod. Arimini et Seleucia*, 47), Ignatius is *ὁ μετὰ τοὺς ἀποστόλους ἐν Ἀντιοχείᾳ κατασταθεὶς ἐπίσκοπος*.

the Epistles of Ignatius.¹ The chronological statements regarding Ignatius therefore begin, not with an account of the date of his martyrdom, but with a statement of his position in the record of Antiochian bishops. But such statements deserve no credence in and by themselves, but must first prove their credibility. A cautious critic will be just as slow to accept the chronology of a list of Antiochian bishops first appearing in the third century, as to admit that Linus was the first bishop of Rome. The truth of the statement that Ignatius was the second bishop of Antioch, we have no means of sifting.

(2) Eusebius in his Church History has not expressly said that it was under Trajan that Ignatius suffered martyrdom. He has not placed Ignatius in any distinct connexion with Trajan. He has indeed appealed to vague tradition about Ignatius in connexion with the Epistles;² but he has not in his Church History founded any chronological result upon this tradition.

(3) In his Chronicle—I take the most favourable instance—Eusebius, on the ground of a tradition that had reached him (not on account of an arbitrary arrangement), placed in the time of Trajan the martyrdom of Ignatius, whom he reckons, as in the Church History, the second of the Antiochian bishops, and this notice is the source of all later assertions of the same date. Even if we were not in the position to gainsay this statement, ought we to suspend by spider's thread of a fourth century *Λόγος* the weight of a decision, which sets for us a hundred questions? Should we give no consideration to all internal grounds? Still it is possible to traverse this position. First of all, the report is demonstrable that Ignatius was the second of the

¹ In opposition to Lightfoot who regards himself as justified in concluding from this expression that Origen puts the martyrdom of Ignatius, either under Domitian, or under Trajan.

² *Hist. Eccles.*, iii. 36, 3: *Λόγος δ' ἔχει τοῦτον ἀπὸ Συρίας ἐπὶ τὴν Ῥωμαίων πόλιν ἀναπεμφθέντα θηρίων γενέσθαι βορὰν τῆς εἰς Χριστὸν μαρτυρίας ἔκεκεν.*

bishops of Antioch; then, a hundred years later, comes the report that he died in the persecution under Trajan. Now where but in the time of Trajan should chronologists of the third century place the death of the second bishop of Antioch? The time of Domitian was too early and that of Hadrian or of Antoninus Pius was too late. In the two propositions, that Ignatius suffered martyrdom in a persecution, and that he was the second bishop of Antioch, we have the premisses of Eusebius' declaration that he suffered death under Trajan.

To sum up my judgment:—*The Epistles of Ignatius and Polycarp were probably written after the year A.D. 130; that they had been composed so early as A.D. 100 or 118, is a mere possibility, which is highly improbable, because it is not supported by any word in the Epistles, and because it rests only upon a late and very problematic witness.*

I here conclude my notes on this work. If I have allowed expressions of dissent to bulk more largely than indications of agreement, it is not because the former are in excess of the latter. But just because on so many points I agree with the author, I have felt under obligation to examine fully those questions, on which he has not convinced me. I close with the expression of my heartiest thanks for the pleasure which I have obtained from the study of this admirable work.

Giessen.

A. HARNACK.
