"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, 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...
with the same specialist acquirements and the same circum-
spection 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 excel-
lent, 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 im-
portant. 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 inform-
ation\(^1\) 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 manu-
scripts, 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 consider-
able 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, 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. 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, 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. 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 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, καὶ τὴν ἑμπλάσμα ἑαυτῆς, 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) ἐξῆτε; chap. iv. (p. 42, 4) μετέχητε; chap. v. (p. 45, 2) Θεοί; chap. ix. (p. 56, 1) ἐν ἐντολαίς; chap. xi. (p. 62, 4) συνήκεσται; chap. xiv. (p. 68, 6) εὑρεθῇ εἰς; chap. xx. (p. 86, 2) ἀποκαλύφη δὲ.
³ Chap. i. (p. 31, 4) διὰ τοῦ ἐπιτυχέων δωρηθῶ μαθητής εἶναι; chap. viii. (p. 50, 1) καὶ ἀγίοις ἡμᾶς ἡμῖν; chap. ix. (p. 56, 3) καὶ συγχαρήθαι ὑμῖν κατ' ἀνθρώπων βίων; chap. x. (p. 59, 9) τὸς κλέων ἀδικηθῇ 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) ἣνωμένη καὶ ἐκλεσθημένη; chap. i. (p. 27, 5) Ἀπολύσεως [ἡμῶν] ἐν Θεῷ . . .; chap. i. (p. 28, 1) the addition ἐν γνώμῃ ὁμοῖα καὶ; chap. viii. (p. 49, 5) ἐπιθυμία; chap. ix. (p. 53, 6) λίθοι ναοῦ προστοιμασμένοι; chap. xv. (p. 70, 4) Θεός without ἡμῶν; chap. xvi. (p. 72, 1) κακοδιδασκαλία; chap. xviii. (p. 75, 5, sq.) οἰκονομία without Θεοῦ; chap. xx. (p. 86, 4) ἐν Ἡσυχ Χριστῷ. In the most important passage, chap. vii. (p. 48, 1) it is very difficult to decide whether ἐν σαρκί 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 gleaning. 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) τὸς πλέον down to ἀδετηθῇ, be fairly struck out? In Smyrn. chap. iv. (p. 300, 3) should not Ἡσυχ Χριστοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡμῶν (so A and S3) be read instead of τοῦ τελείου ἀνθρώπου, since the expression, ὁ τελειος ἀνθρωπος does not elsewhere occur in Ignatius? Then again, in the Address of the Epistle to the Trallians (p. 152, 1), I would decidedly, with G. L. A., accept the reading, αὕματι. 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) σδω (instead of ἰδῶν); chap. iii. (p. 114, 1) φρονίμωφ (instead of φρονίμους); chap. viii. (p. 124, 3) κατὰ Ιουδαίσμον (instead of κατὰ νόμον Ιουδαίσμον); chap. xiii. (p. 138, 5) τῷ πατρί (instead of τῷ πατρί καὶ
In the Epistle to the Trallians, chap. vi. (p. 167, 3) καὶ ἵππος seems to me a very happy conjecture; further, in chap. vi. (p. 168, 1) ἀδεός (instead of ἡδέως); in chap. vii. (p. 169, 7) the words ὁ δὲ ἐκτὸς θυσιαστήριον δῶν οὐ καθαρός ἑστιν, which Zahn has not received, are necessary; chap. vii. (p. 170, 1) διακόνων (instead of διακόνου); chap. xii. (p. 180, 3) οὕτε έγκειμαι (instead of οὗ 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 τόπῳ); chap. i. (p. 196, 1) εὖν πέρατος (instead of εὖν πέρατος 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 λαλοῦντων (instead of τῶν μάταια λαλοῦντων); chap. vii. (p. 268, 1) ὄς προειδότα (instead of ὄς προειδότα); chap. xi. (p. 282, 3) πνεύματε (omitted by Zahn). In the Epistle to those of Smyrna, chap. i. (p. 288, 3) δοξάζω (instead of δοξάζων); chap. i. (p. 290, 3) γεγενημένον (instead of Θεοῦ γεγενημένον); chap. iii. (p. 297, 4) αἴματί (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 ἐτύγχανον); chap. xiii. (p. 324, 1) πατρός (instead of πνεύματος); chap. xiii. (p. 324, 3) Ταουίας (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 τῆς προσευχῆς); chap. vii. (p. 356, 1) αἰτήσει (instead of ἀναστάσει); chap. vii. (p. 356, 4) καταξιώσατε (instead of καταξιώσατε).

I cannot for want of space enter into a particular account.

1 Lightfoot accepts with Zahn in Magnes. chap. vi. (p. 119, 6) τόπον, and in chap. viii. (p. 125, 8) λόγος απὸ σιγῆς προελθὼν. 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) Φιλίππος (Zahn, Φιλίππος); chap. ii. (p. 908, 1) τὰς ὁσφύας (Zahn adds ἕμων); chap. vi. (p. 918, 1) τῶν σκανδαλῶν (Zahn omits τῶν); chap. vii. (p. 919, 10) κρίσειν (Zahn κρίσιν εἴναι). 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 retranslilation 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.


\(^3\) See vol. ii. p. 904.

\(^4\) Ibid.

\(^5\) The reading Ἅγιος Ἰησοῦς Χριστός (chap. xii. p. 929, 18) 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. 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) κολαζόμενοι (instead of κολαζόμενοι); chap. ii. (p. 952, 2) Lightfoot has struck out δ' τύραννος; chap. iii. (p. 952, 4) οὖν (Zahn has οὐκ); chap. iv. (p. 954, 3) προδιόντας εαυτόν (Zahn προσιόντας ἐκουσίους); chap. vi. (p. 956, 1) ἐπιλε­γόμενος (Zahn omits); chap. x. (p. 965, 11) καν (Zahn καὶ): chap. xii. (p. 967, 15) ἔπειθο (Zahn ἔβοα); chap. xiii. (p. 969, 17) [ἐν] παντὶ γὰρ ἀγαθὴς ἕνεκεν πολιτείας καὶ πρὸ τῆς τολᾶς (Zahn here παντὶ γὰρ καλῷ ἀγαθῆς ἕνεκεν 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 ἐπελεώθη (Zahn omits καὶ); chap. xx. (p. 983, 10) ἐπουράνιον (Zahn αἰώνιον); chap. xxii. (p. 984, 7) omit καὶ πατρὶ καὶ ἀγίῳ πνεύματι; (p. 986, 13) τούτων (Zahn τούτων). 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 Μαρκίωνος (chap. xx. p. 982, 5) must be retained. Lightfoot with all the Codices (except the Mosq.), gives Μαρκίανοὺ and says: “The change into Μαρκίωνος 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 περιστερά καὶ. 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 ἀν φανῇ ὁ ἐπίσκοπος, ἐκεῖ τὸ πλήθος ἑστώ, ὅσπερ ὅπου ἂν ἡ 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—πάντας ταῖς κατὰ πάντα τόπον τῆς ἁγίας καὶ καθολικῆς ἐκκλησίας παρον-\[...

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

in the second passage (chap. viii.) we read—πάσης τῆς κατὰ τὴν ὁικουμένην καθολικῆς ἐκκλησίας; in the third passage (chap. xvi.) we read—ἐπίσκοπος τῆς ἐν Σμύρνη καθολικῆς ἐκκλησίας; in the fourth passage (chap. xix.) we read—ποιμένα τῆς κατὰ τὴν ὁικουμένην 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 ὁικουμένην, 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 Σμύρνη ἅγιας ἐκκλησίας; and this is in accordance with Μ (L), and against G Ep. But if καθολικῆς 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 ἅγιας and not καθολικῆς. I therefore suppose that at a very early period καθολικῆς has been substituted for ἅγιας 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 (Εὐσεβίου, vi. 11, 5), τῆς ἅγιας ὑμῶν τῶν Ἀντιοχέων 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* 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 περὶ έαρ ωμένης (vol. ii. pp. 90-94), on the Asiarachate (vol. ii. pp. 987-998), on λόγος ἀπὸ σειρῆς, on Ἐφ. xii. 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. Only on one important point have I discovered any want of

1 *Vol. ii. pp. 999-1047.*

2 A remark may be here permitted. May not the words (Philad. vi. p. 264, 2) ἐάν δὲ ἐμφάνησεν περὶ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ μὴ ἀληθῶς, οὗτοι ἑμῶν στήλαι εἰς καὶ τάφοι νεκρών, ἐφ’ ὑμᾶς γέγραπται μόνον οὐδέμενα ἄνθρωπος, have a reference to the words in the Epistle to the Church of Philadelphia in the Apocalypse of St. John (chap. iii. 13), ὁ θεός ποιήσει αὐτῶν στήλην ἐν τῷ ναῷ τοῦ Θεοῦ μου, καὶ ἐκείνῳ μὴ ἔχετε ἐπί, καὶ γράψω ἐπ’ αὐτῶν τὸ δόμα τοῦ Θεοῦ μου, καὶ τὸ δόμα 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, ἂφεσιν ἀμαρτίων, 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 μονογενὴς υἱός—only in one passage he has Ἰησοῦν Χριστοῦ τοῦ μόνου υἱοῦ (Rom. Address). In the Symb. Rom. we find μονογενὴς υἱός. 5. Next to Pontius Pilate, Ignatius (Smyrn. i.) has named the Tetrarch Herod—ἄληθῶς ἐπὶ Ποντίου Πιλάτου καὶ Ἡρώδου τετράρχου καθηλωμένου. 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. 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 πατρός, ἕθεν ἐρχέται κρίνας ἓν 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 πατήρ 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:—Παντεύσομεν εἰς Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν (al. Χρίστου Ἰησού), τὸν Κύριον ἡμῶν, τὸν κατὰ σάρκα ἐκ σπέρματος (al. γένους) Δαυειδ πνεύματος δὲ ἁγίου, ὑίου ἀνθρώπου καὶ υἱοῦ θεοῦ, γεγεννημένον ἐκ Μαρίας (al. ἐκ παρθένου), βεβαπτισμένου ὕπ' Ἰωάννου, παθόντα καὶ ἀναστάντα (ἐκ [al. ἀπὸ] νεκροῦ) ἐπὶ Πνεύμον Πλάτου (καὶ Ἡμῶν τετράρχου). 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 πατήρ 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.