
A table of contents for *The Churchman* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_churchman_os.php

carefully getting at the idea contained in the words for service and for a memorial of the children of Israel before Jehovah, for both *ziccaron* (memorial) and *abodah* (service) have their meanings connected with sacrifice, we may obtain a more practical and faithful notion of the atonement than we can derive from the classical meaning of the word "ransom."

ROBERT HELME.

ART. V.—THE IGNATIAN EPISTLES.

(*Concluded from page* 441.)

OUR first observation here is that the eagerness with which Ignatius invited martyrdom rather represents the fanatical spirit of Tertullian and the Montanists than that of the immediate successors of the Apostles. It is in direct opposition to the doctrine laid down in the letter on the martyrdom of Polycarp, in the words, "We do not approve of those who voluntarily offer themselves, for this the gospel does not teach us to do" (C. iv.). We have no earlier instance of the contrary teaching than that of Tertullian, represented in the tractates "*De coronâ militis*" and "*de Fugâ in persecutione*," both the products of his new Montanistic teaching. This, and the extraordinary knowledge of angels and supercelestial beings, and the resemblance of the acts of Ignatius' martyrdom to those of St. Perpetua and Felicitas, who are admitted both by Roman Catholic and Protestant critics to have been Montanists, lead us to conclude that a Montanistic spirit pervades the Ignatian legend, and that so great a departure from the Apostolic principles could hardly have been made immediately after the Apostolic age. But the edict of toleration which had been published by Trajan at the very moment when Ignatius' persecution began, presents no less a difficulty, as this must have been in as full force at Antioch as in Rome, and in all the cities which Ignatius is said to have passed through during his journey to Rome. The personal controversy which he is alleged to have had with the Emperor bears also a suspicious affinity to those which St. Peter, St. Paul, and St. John are described, in their spurious acts, to have maintained with the emperors Nero and Domitian. In all these apocryphal writings, some king or ruler is brought face to face with the martyr, and the fiction of a personal tribunal takes the place of the regular courts of the empire. All intermediate jurisdictions are passed

over in order to present the grand spectacle of a member of the most despised sect of the then civilized world confronted with the supreme majesty of the empire; and in the case of Ignatius, at a time when the emperor was preparing for the most gigantic and perilous expedition he ever undertook. Such a picture is ideal rather than real, and needs much corroborative evidence of an independent character to sustain it, ere we can admit its credibility. Nor was Trajan in any respect a cruel man, as his act of toleration very clearly indicates. The whole course of his life, as its historians represent it, would have made the declaration of so cruel a sentence by himself, and in his own person, a violation of the principles of all his life.

But the events and incidents of the journey present no less serious difficulties. The object of the narrator, which is scarcely disguised in any part of his relation, is to exhibit Ignatius, as a second St. Paul, traversing Asia Minor, visiting the churches during his progress, and writing letters to them with the same freedom and with the same supreme authority as that of the Apostle whose mission was immediately from Christ, and extended to the whole world. After a journey greatly resembling one of St. Paul's progresses, he is described as reaching Puteoli, and desiring thence to go on foot to Rome, that he might exactly tread in the footsteps of the great Apostle—a passage corresponding with the wish declared in the Epistle to the Ephesians (ch. xii.), "that I may be found in his footsteps." Here, as everywhere, the letters and the acts are in such close agreement as to strengthen Dr. Baur's conclusion that they must stand or fall together.

We next observe the inexplicable fact, or rather miracle, that under circumstances of such severe restraint, in the hands of guards whom he compares to leopards, and whose cruelties towards him increased daily during his journey, he was able to exhort all the churches through which he passed, and to dictate letters to them which were faithfully delivered by his friends. Exhortation was, indeed, possible, however difficult, on such occasions as these, for the faithful doubtless gathered round the martyr during the different stages of his journey. St. Chrysostom, however, though frequently referring to these oral communications, makes no mention of the fact that they were immediately followed up by letters. Nor, indeed, is it usual to enforce exhortations, when fresh upon the minds of the hearers, by means of letters, even when the opportunity exists. The epistles of St. Paul, though he was a free agent, did not thus immediately follow his visits to the churches. And Ignatius, in chains and under the severest captivity, could have little opportunity of thus recording his recent

addresses, and certainly could not have had any necessity for so doing. It was far more likely that the words spoken were recorded from memory by those whom Athanasius couples with Ignatius, but whose names he does not give, comprising them in the suggestive description, *τινὲς τῶν μετὰ Ἰγνάτιον διδασκάλοι.* The "Acts of the Martyrdom" make very slender reference to the written letters, though they dwell much upon the verbal exhortations. Here the account of Hegesippus is fuller in its details, both enumerating the letters and the places from which they were written. That these were unknown at Antioch, even in the age of Chrysostom, appears from the great value he attaches to the translated relics of the martyr, while he makes no mention of his posthumous writings. The profound silence which reigned in the Church during this period, in regard to the Ignatian letters, gives us a clue to the inquiry into their real origin.

We recall the fact that the words of the Martyr are almost always referred to as sayings—even the words which are now embodied in the letters, one of which St. Chrysostom describes as uttered in the hours of his martyrdom, and which, therefore, could not have been recorded in his life-time. We are led from this, and also from the different versions of the letters and their infinite varieties of reading, to conceive that the letters in their earliest type were attempts to put together the scattered utterances of Ignatius in a written form. That they grew on rapidly under the influence of Hegesippus and Papias, the great depositaries of the most doubtful of the traditions of the Church, we may as readily conjecture. To the Nicene period we must assign the introduction of a more precise and technical theology than could possibly have existed in the Apostolic age, while to the conflicts of jurisdiction which arose after the connection of the Church with the State, and to the anti-episcopal movement of Aerius, we must assign that assertion of the almost pontifical character of the episcopate which, to the advocates of the Epistles of Ignatius, has ever been their most captivating feature.

In the letter I addressed to the Bishop of Worcester (then Dean of Peterborough), I urged the argument that no necessity, or even occasion, could have arisen for the assertion of so autocratic an authority, which could be only justified by the fact that a general rebellion had arisen against the episcopate, and that one Order in the Ministry had come into collision with another, as the heads of the diaconate did with the presbyters in the days of St. Jerome.

But no question had arisen or could arise at this time on the relations between one Order or another in the Christian

body. This is a preliminary historic difficulty which does not seem to have been weighed by the advocates of the authenticity of the Ignatian letters. If we compare their teaching with that of the exquisite Epistle to Diognetus, which is held by the greatest divines of every Church to be a document as early as the close of the second century,[1] a contrast of the most striking character presents itself to the most ordinary reader. This early picture of the Church of Christ is as far removed in spirit from the fanatical sensationalism of the Ignatian letters as it is in the actual features it exhibits to the eye. It represents the Church as in a pilgrim state, agreeing herein with the inscription of the Epistle of Clement —"the Church sojourning in Rome"—having no local delimitations, and being rather in a wayfaring than in a settled state. In direct opposition to this view of it, we find in Ignatius a Church established and localized, a resident hierarchy, and even diocesan divisions. For he speaks of ἐπισκόποι οἱ κατὰ τὰ πέρατα ὁρισθέντες (Eph. iii.), and addresses bishops as having fixed sees, as though *jurisdiction* and *order* had become distinct powers in the primitive Church. Similar anachronisms to this were pronounced to be fatal in the case of the Interpolated Epistles, in which the lesser orders of the ministry are described as fully developed in the Apostolic Church. They were fatal in their results upon the Donation of Constantine, the Decretal Epistles, the Apostolic Constitutions, the Dionysian and countless other forgeries. Why should we refuse to apply the same critical tests to the Ignatian Epistles?

The attempt to rehabilitate writings which by the consent of the whole Church have been adjudged to be spurious or apocryphal, is one which has been often made before, but never with any permanent success. We have already referred to the quotation from Ignatius in the pages of the pseudo-Dionysius, and the difficulty which this occasioned even to the less critical minds of the seventh or eighth century. In the beginning of the last century an energetic effort was made to establish the Dionysian writings, and a work appeared at Rome in 1702 by a man equal in erudition to the modern advocates of Ignatius, Father Laurentius Cozza, a work *multæ eruditionis refertum*, as the reviewer of it in the "Acta Eruditorum" of Leipzig (a. 1703, pp. 401-10) admits.[2] In learning and in controversial skill this production, though

[1] The learned Dr. Lipsius, of Jena, writes to me of this Epistle: "Ich glaube dass sie aus dem ende des zweiten Jahrhunderts stammt." No other age can be assigned to Ignatius' "Letters," and yet how diametrically opposite is their testimony.

[2] "Vindic. Areop. Clementi XI. P.M. inscriptæ."

much shorter, is not unequal to that of the lamented vindicator of the Ignatian Epistles. But the very dedication of the Dionysian writings to his "fellow-presbyter Timothy" places as great an obstacle in the way of their genuineness as Dr. Baur detected in the inscriptions of the Ignatian letters, while the quotation from Ignatius is reluctantly surrendered as a manifest anachronism, and therefore admitted to be an interpolation. The interpretation of the famous words of Ignatius, *Amor meus crucifixus est*, is alleged by the learned reviewer to allude to the crucifixion of the flesh and earthly affections to the Spirit, and thus to be equivalent to the Pauline idea of a crucifixion to the world: whereas in the Dionysian passage it is alleged in regard to Divine love, and to Christ as its great exemplar. The host of authorities which Cozza—who held the offices of Reader in the Province of Rome, Synodal Examiner of the Diocese of Viterbo, and Consultor of the Congregation of the Index—brings in defence of his position is far greater than any which can be marshalled in defence of the letters of Ignatius. In fact, he is able to appeal to the continuous tradition of many centuries, from St. Maximus to Bellarmine, Baronius, Schelstrate and Natalis Alexander. Yet all their arguments fell pointless and lifeless before the attacks of Luther, Cajetan, Erasmus, Casaubon, Morinus, Usher, Pearson, and the most learned of that critical age. We have already indicated the suggestive affinity between the Ignatian and Dionysian writings. We may observe, hereupon, that the mystical work of Dionysius, "De Cœlesti Hierarchiâ," was most probably founded on the lines of that earthly hierarchy which is planned out in the Ignatian letters.

Before we close these lines we may remind the reader that a comparatively recent forgery was palmed upon the Church with considerable success by Higuera, a Spanish Jesuit, professing to be the Chronicle of Lucius Flavius Dexter, a writer of the end of the fourth century. This was heralded into the world supported by a vast array of learning, which fills a large folio volume of some 500 pages. In this the forger too successfully followed the lead of Annius of Viterbo, who was a *falsarius* of still greater boldness, having produced imaginary works of Manetho, Megasthenes, Fabius Pictor and other ancient authors. The Chronicle of Dexter occasioned a controversy in the Church of Rome, which enlisted many eminent critics on both sides—a proof that such forgeries need only skilful advocates and ingenious theorists to give them a specious appearance of authenticity.[1]

[1] Lucii Flavii Dextri Chronicon, ed. Fr. Bivarius. Lugd., 1627 (fol.).

Inventions of this kind, when they assume the name and authority of mere secular writings, are comparatively harmless. But when they claim a sacred character, and are put forth as the works of the great heroes of Christianity, they cannot be too strictly examined or too severely tested. Especially is this duty incumbent upon us when the claim is in behalf of writings which distort all the proportions of faith, and undermine the first principles of the Gospel—when an institution which was designed to protect the great doctrines of our faith is made destructive of them, and a particular form of government which developed itself naturally, and from the analogy of monarchical institutions, is turned into an article of faith, in some sense *de necessitate salutis*. If the advocates of such a doctrine would but seriously follow it out into its results, they could not but see that instead of "prophesying according to the proportions of faith," they are advocating a system so distorted and deformed as to realize the words which the great Italian poet puts into the mouth of St. Peter:

O buon principio
A che vil fine convien che tu caschi!

In the earlier conflicts of our Church with the Puritans, the watchword of the Episcopal party was "No bishop, no king." It was a foolish saying, as experience has since proved; for bishops flourish as greatly in republics as they do in monarchies. But the Ignatian letters represent the far more serious assertion, "No bishop, no God," for this is the quintessence of the Ignatian teaching.

"We are to follow the bishop as Christ followeth the Father" (Ad Smyrn. c. viii.).

"We cannot be subject to God unless we are subject to the bishop" (Ad Ephes. c. v.).

"We ought to know God and the bishop" (*ibid.*).

"The bishop is to be to us in the place of God, and we ought to regard him as the Lord Himself" (Ad Ephes. c. vi.).

"No baptism or Eucharist is valid unless celebrated by the bishop" (Ad Trall. c. iii.).

"No assembly of the church is legitimate without him" (*ibid.*).

"All who belong to God and Christ are with the bishop" (Ad Philad.).

"We are to concur in the opinion or judgment of the bishop" (Ad Ephes.).

"Whatever the bishop approves of, that is approved by God" (Ad Smyrn.).

"He who honours the bishop is honoured of God" (*ibid.*).

"Attend to the bishop as God attends to you" (Ad Polyc.).

"The bishop presides in the place of God" (Ad Magnes.).

"When you subject yourselves to the bishop as to Jesus Christ, you seem to me to live not after the flesh but after the Spirit" (Ad Trall. c. ii.).

Of such a teacher (and the texture of his teaching is the same throughout) we might well say, "This man seemeth to be a setter forth of strange gods" (Acts xvii. 18). But we at least have a more sure word of prophecy—even that word which saith of all true believers in Christ, whether they be Pontifical, Episcopalian, Presbyterian, Congregational, Baptist—or by whatever name they may be called or miscalled, "I give unto them eternal life, and they shall never perish, neither shall any man pluck them out of My hand" (John x. 28).

R. C. JENKINS.

Notes on Bible Words.

NO. IX.—"DOCTRINE" (TEACHING).

TEACHING, in the N.T. *διδαχή*.

(1) *That which is taught.* Matt. vii. 28, "were astonished at His teaching (*τῇ διδαχῇ αὐτοῦ*) *ἦν γὰρ διδάσκων*"; Mark i. 27, "What new doctrine is this?" John vii. 16, "My doctrine (the teaching *which I give*) is not Mine"; Rom. xvi. 17, "contrary to the doctrine which ye learned." Acts xvii. 19, "this new teaching is, which is spoken by thee?" Acts xiii. 12, "astonished at the teaching (*τοῦ Κυρίου*) of the Lord;" *about*, concerning, as in Heb. vi. 2. But cf. 2 John, verse 9, "teaching which is Christ's"—has Christ for its author (as in Matt. vii. 28).

(2) *Instruction*, the act of *teaching*. Mark iv. 2, "and taught . . . and said (*ἔλεγεν*) unto them in His teaching," *ἐν τῇ διδαχῇ*. Acts ii. 42, "in the Apostles' doctrine," A.V.; "teaching," R.V.

Similarly, *διδασκαλία*. [On the probable distinction between *διδασκαλία* and *διδαχή* see Bishop Ellicott, 2 Tim. iv. 2.]

(1) Ephes. iv. 14, "With every wind of doctrine"; Matt. xv. 9, "teaching for doctrines," *διδάσκοντες διδασκαλίας*. 1 Tim. i. 10.

(2) Rom. xv. 4, *εἰς τὴν ἡμετέραν διδ.*, "for our learning," A.V.; *instruction;* that we may be taught. 2 Tim. iii. (10 and) 16, "profitable for teaching" (Plumptre); *pour enseigner*.

Dean Burgon, in "The Revision Revised" (p. 199), says:

Διδαχή occurs 30, διδασκαλία 21 times, in the N. Test. Etymologically, both words alike mean "teaching," and are therefore indifferently rendered *doctrina* in the