

*contents pages*  
1

# THEOLOGICAL STUDIES

---

VOLUME 1

FEBRUARY 1940

NUMBER 1

---

## DID SAINT IGNATIUS OF ANTIOCH KNOW THE FOURTH GOSPEL?

WALTER J. BURGHARDT, S. J.

WOODSTOCK COLLEGE

- I. THE PROBLEM POSED
- II. THE PROBLEM SURVEYED HISTORICALLY  
(To Follow)
- III. THE PROBLEM TREATED CRITICALLY
  - 1. THE AFFINITY IN THOUGHT
  - 2. THE AFFINITY IN THOUGHT AND EXPRESSION
- IV. THE PROBLEM RE-POSED

### I. THE PROBLEM POSED

**T**HE seven short letters of Saint Ignatius, Bishop of Antioch, have been the occasion of a vast amount of literary and historical discussion in the last eighty years. A thorough-going discussion of these letters in their relation to the Gospel of Saint John might appear "much ado about nothing" to the lay mind; to the scholar, interested in the problems of primitive Christianity, a review of the question will be of profit and interest.

There are two settings possible, either one of which might set the stage for our discussion. In the first setting, we should presuppose the existence, towards the turn of the first century of our era, of a written document substantially (and, for the most part, in accidentals too) in accord with our Fourth Gospel, whose composition "overwhelming documentary evidence, dating back from the second century, . . . unmistak-

ably assigns . . . to John the Apostle."<sup>1</sup> Passing over from Ephesus to Syrian Antioch, we should fall in with seven short letters,<sup>2</sup> written by her Bishop Ignatius on his way to a martyr's death at Rome<sup>3</sup> no more than a score of years after the composition of John's Gospel.<sup>4</sup>

Heralded as a disciple of the Apostle John,<sup>5</sup> not once does Ignatius mention his "master" by name. And yet, so startling is the echo of the Johannine thought in the Epistles, so redolent of the Johannine are certain Ignatian turns of expression,<sup>6</sup> that the reader with a Fourth Gospel background is brought up short, is compelled to ask himself: Whence this remarkable parallelism? Is it true that we can add the name of Ignatius to the list of those who, by their utilization of the Fourth Gospel in the primitive Church, prove it to have been already in existence as the Christian era was rounding out its initial century?<sup>7</sup> In short, realizing that the Fourth Gospel *already existed* when the Bishop of Antioch wrote, can we affirm that St. Ignatius *knew* that Gospel?

The alternative setting discounts, to some extent, the full force of the evidence we possess for the date of the Fourth

<sup>1</sup>John Donovan, *The Authorship of St. John's Gospel* (London, Burns, Oates & Washbourne, Ltd., 1939. Pp. xxv-280), p. 33. The evidence for the authorship and date of the Fourth Gospel may be found in any reputable Catholic manual of Apologetics (Grandmaison, Felder), or the special treatises (Lepin, Donovan) and commentaries (Lagrange, Durand) on the Gospel in question.

<sup>2</sup>Cf. J. B. Lightfoot, *The Apostolic Fathers. Part II. St. Ignatius. St. Polycarp.* 2nd ed. Vol. I (London, Macmillan and Co., 1889. Pp. xxii-767), pp. 70-134, 233-430. After a masterful investigation that has compelled the assent, ungrudging or otherwise, of Ignatian scholars the world over, the learned Bishop of Durham concludes: "On these grounds we are constrained to accept the Seven Epistles of the Middle Form as the genuine work of Ignatius." (P. 423)

<sup>3</sup>In chronological order, four at Smyrna (Eph., Magn., Trall., Rom.); three at Troas (Philad., Smyrn., Polyc.).

<sup>4</sup>" . . . we shall be doing no injustice to the evidence by setting the probable limits between A.D. 100-118, without attempting to fix the year more precisely." (Lightfoot, *op. cit.*, p. 472) The prevailing tendency is to date the martyrdom, and consequently the Epistles, between 110 and 117, as does Dietze, "Die Briefe des Ignatius und das Johannesevangelium" (*Theologische Studien und Kritiken*, LXXVIII (1905). Pp. 563-603), p. 563.

<sup>5</sup>*Martyrium Colbertinum* I, III. Later the value of this testimony will be considered from a critical point of view.

<sup>6</sup>The truth of this statement will emerge from this study.

<sup>7</sup>Thus, among the Apostolic Fathers, the author of the *Didache*, Polycarp, Hermas; heretics like Marcion; Apocryphal Gospels such as the *Evangelium Duodecim*. A thought-provoking evaluation of the evidence for the acquaintance of individual Apostolic Fathers with the Fourth Gospel will be found in the work of the Committee of the Oxford Society of Historical Theology, *The New Testament in the Apostolic Fathers*, (Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1905. v-144).

Gospel. True, it presupposes, and with perfect justice, the *existence* of that document, but leaves it undated in the discussion. The Fourth Gospel would be an "ancient document" obviously antedating the middle of the second century. And we would ask: From the evidence of the Ignatian Letters *alone*, are we justified—and, if so, with what degree of certainty—in concluding that there existed, at the close of the first century, the written record of the words and deeds of Christ that, under the name of the Beloved Disciple, passed unchallenged the censorship of seventeen centuries?

To sum up. In the first setting the priority of the Fourth Gospel to the Epistles of Ignatius is the *datum* of our discussion; in the second setting it is the *probandum*.

Between the two alternatives there would seem little to choose. By either route can we reach our objective: "Did St. Ignatius of Antioch know the Fourth Gospel?" Nor does the selection of the one in preference to the other necessitate a violent change in the method of investigation. Yet the latter setting has one feature to recommend it that is denied the other, an attraction all its own: it is of incomparable *apologetic* value for the traditional view of the primitive origin of the Fourth Gospel. For, if the evidence of Ignatius is sufficient *of itself* to demonstrate the priority of John's Gospel, then an addition to apologetic history has been made. Further, the attainment of the objective in setting number two guarantees its attainment in setting number one. For then we could obviously add the name of Ignatius to the list of those who, by their utilization of the Fourth Gospel in the primitive Church, prove it to have been already in existence as the Christian era was rounding out its initial century. On the other hand, to *presuppose* the priority of the Gospel as an essential *prerequisite* of our discussion, precludes the possibility of our *concluding* to its priority from the very Letters themselves.

To sum up. A certain answer under cover of the first setting means that the Christian Apologist will be enabled, with perfect security, to class the Letters of Ignatius among

the external evidence for the authenticity of the last Gospel, and shed a ray of light over the background of Ignatius' thought. Just that much and nothing more. A certain answer in the affirmative under the second setting would provide an irresistible weapon in the hands of the orthodox Fourth Gospel critic. Just that and nothing less.

We must, however, hasten to add that the effective utilization of the second and more alluring setting is complicated by a real difficulty. Let us be very concrete. We know that the Letters of Ignatius emanate from a period which begins in the year 107, and ends in the year 117. The supposition of the second setting is that we do *not* know whether the Fourth Gospel was written before or after the Ignatian Epistles. Suppose, for argument's sake, that our comparison of the two authors has already taken place; that the affinity between the two is of such a nature as to postulate for its adequate explanation a relationship of *dependence*, one upon the other. At once the vital question is inevitable: On whom does the debt of dependence lie? Who is the creditor, who the debtor? Simply, *who borrowed from whom?*

Let us check the reply that surges spontaneously to our lips, in deference to a moment's sober reflection. Let us recall that the use of the *explicit* testimony of later writers as a medium of solution is outlawed by the very supposition of our setting. The answer to the question just posed, from the very nature of the case, must come from *purely internal* arguments: a state of affairs rendered more than ever perplexing in view of the fact that the Letters contain not a single demonstrable suggestion of an *explicit* quotation in the passages that serve as the sum and substance of our discussion. But, apart from the fact that internal arguments are seldom sufficient of themselves to solve such problems, those arguments that have been advanced, and others that might be advanced, in support of the priority of the Fourth Gospel on purely internal grounds, seem to the present writer frankly unconvincing.

Dr. Rackl, in his splendid work on the Christology of

Ignatius,<sup>8</sup> has proffered two arguments in vindication of Gospel priority that are at first sight impressive. The first resolves itself into this: The author of the Gospel wrote to demonstrate the *divinity* of Christ, Ignatius to demonstrate His true *humanity*. The former, consequently, is the more ancient document, simply because the struggle to vindicate the divinity of Christ is earlier than the struggle to vindicate the true humanity. For "it was only when the belief in the divinity had taken deep root that men began to reflect on the great mystery of God made Man . . ."<sup>9</sup>

All well and good, if it were not also very likely from the contents, that the Fourth Gospel is directed not only against Cerinthus and his ilk, but against Docetists as well.<sup>10</sup> And if it were not also practically certain that the First Epistle of John, composed about the same time, finds its most pernicious adversary in the selfsame "heresy of appearance."<sup>11</sup> Consequently, if, with Dr. Rackl and the host of other orthodox scholars, we date the Gospel and First Epistle somewhere near the turn of the first century, we must concede at least the probability that, not only in the last days of Ignatius, but actually a decade or two before he wrote, the Docetists constituted a force with which to reckon. What warrant have we, therefore, for asserting with any confidence that, had the author of the Gospel written, say in the year 120, he would not have presented to the world substantially the same document that we actually possess here and now? Surely it is rather temerarious, in view of the evidence, to declare that "it was only when the belief in the divinity had taken deep root that men began to reflect on the great mystery of God made Man."

Again, Dr. Rackl asserts Johannine priority on this basis, that the Christology of Ignatius shows *an advance* on that of

<sup>8</sup>Die Christologie des heiligen Ignatius von Antiochien (Freiburg im Breisgau, Herder, 1914. Pp. xxxii-418).

<sup>9</sup>Ibid., p. 342.

<sup>10</sup>Cf. W. S. Reilly, *The Westminster N. T. II. The Gospel according to St. John*, (Longmans Green & Co., London and New York, 1936), p. xxxii.

<sup>11</sup>Cf. 1 Jn. 4, 2; 5, 6.

the Gospel "in der sprachlichen Formulierung."<sup>12</sup> On the human side of Christ he contrasts the Johannine "The word was made flesh" with the Ignatian "having become perfect man",<sup>13</sup> an advance in precision of expression that will scarcely kindle the author's enthusiastic reaction in other scholars. On the Divine side of Christ Rackl admits that John may well be regarded as "more keen than Ignatius,"<sup>14</sup> save for the more copious application of the word "God" to Christ in the Letters: a use surely to be explained by the fact that in Ignatius the Divinity is the *datum*, in John the *probandum*. It must be confessed that Rackl scores a point when he indicates that, on the hypostatic union, the Evangelist has no formulation comparable in precision to Ignatius' words [Eph. 7, 2]: "There is one Physician, of flesh and of spirit; begotten and unbegotten; God, come in flesh, in death, true life; from Mary and from God; first subject to suffering and then incapable of suffering, Jesus Christ our Lord." But to postulate, as the *necessary* explanation of this "advance," a priority in time which may well involve a mere decade or less, and in writers whose purpose is so different, personality so individual and style so personal, is more naïve than convincing.

A stronger case for the priority of the Gospel on purely internal grounds might be constructed if one were to bring out in clear relief how strange it would be for an Evangelist dependent on Ignatius, and certainly writing with a view to the needs of the Church, to neglect what actually is Ignatius' main theme, (insistence on union with, and subordination to, the hierarchy) and focus his attention on that which is rather the foundation and the scaffolding than the superstructure. Or how curious would be such an author's utter omission of an establishment as significant as the triple hierarchy. Yet all this, and very much more in the same vein, has an undoubtedly plausible explanation in the *singleness of purpose* that characterizes the Fourth Evangelist; in the realization that, whether

<sup>12</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 345; cf. p. 347.

<sup>13</sup>Smyrn. iv. 2. Rackl, p. 347.

<sup>14</sup>Pp. 345-346, "schärfer als Ign."

he takes pen in hand to reannounce the "good tidings" in 100 or a score of years later, he will project himself, heart and soul, into the immortal third decade of the first century. This harks back to the core of the difficulty: the insufficiency, in a question of literary dependence, of a purely internal argument from content and style.

To conclude: From the above considerations it appears advisable to discard the more attractive setting in favor of that which accepts at the outset the priority of the Fourth Gospel. To forestall possible misapprehensions, however, on the justification for such a policy, let it be noted that, in studying the question of the literary dependence of one document on another, it is not only legitimate, but also necessary, to give full weight to the historical evidence for the priority of one of the two documents. Now tradition affirms the authenticity of the Fourth Gospel, that is to say, its Johannine authorship towards the close of the first century. In the light of this consideration, do the Letters bear evidence of literary dependence upon the Fourth Evangelist? If the evidence points to literary *affinity* between the two documents, in the light of this consideration it points to *dependence of Ignatius* on the Gospel. Finally, it may be in place to remark here that the reader who sees his way clear to accepting the internal arguments for the priority of the Gospel to the Epistles of Ignatius, need have no hesitation in availing himself of the forthcoming discussion to arrive at a conclusion under cover of the *first* setting.

## II. THE PROBLEM SURVEYED HISTORICALLY

The present study is divided into two main divisions. For, prior to entering upon the critical phase, it aims to present a fairly complete historical survey of the question. Naturally, such a survey will have its quota of limitations. Consequently, the following pages lay no claim to numerical or material perfection. Yet even with quite incidental defects, the value of an historical procedure as an introduction to the critical is hardly problematic. Quite apart from the very natural *interest*

aroused, such a sketch is still a *desideratum* today.<sup>15</sup> For the utility of an outline wherein pass in quick review not only the conclusions that have been reached by scholars of note, but likewise, where possible, the approaches that have led to these conclusions, cannot seriously be doubted. As a result of the historical investigation, the critical inquiry commands respect.

In 1862, while the question of the authenticity of the different Ignatian recensions was still being agitated, Johann Friedrich Bleek claimed that the Letters of Ignatius were probably reminiscent of John's Gospel.<sup>16</sup> Bleek put no emphasis on this, since the question of Ignatian authenticity was in dispute. At the close of the year 1866, Dr. J. J. Van Oosterzee of Utrecht delivered four apologetical lectures in the Odeon at Amsterdam. His cautious comment anent the subject of our discussion was: "It is a fact, that Ignatius, who wrote at the beginning of the second century, made use of such expressions as prove acquaintance with those words of Our Lord which are contained in this Gospel alone . . ." <sup>17</sup>

In 1877 Holtzmann was to mention quite a number of diverse opinions current before his own time, and stated that, while a dependence of Barnabas and Hermas on John could not be thought of, the question of the relation to Ignatius was essentially different.<sup>18</sup> He proceeded to a rather detailed study to substantiate his claim.

In 1887 the Rev. A. Plummer was at pains to show that the alleged silence of the Apostolic Fathers apropos of the Fourth Gospel, "if it were a fact, would not be an insuperable difficulty" against its authenticity. After endeavoring to show that this silence "is no more than we might reasonably expect," and "may be considered as telling for, rather than against the authenticity," the author turns on his adversaries with the asser-

<sup>15</sup>Rackl's discussion, *op. cit.*, pp. 320-348, reveals the conclusions of practically every scholar who has even touched on the question down to his time, a quarter of a century ago.

<sup>16</sup>*Einleitung in das Neue Testament* (Berlin, Reimer, 1862. Pp. xiv-799), p. 232, "höchst wahrscheinliche Reminiscenzen."

<sup>17</sup>*John's Gospel: Apologetical Lectures* (Edinburgh, Clark, 1869, Pp. xiv-256), p. 52. This is the translation, from the authorized German edition, by J. F. Hurst.

<sup>18</sup>"Das Verhältniss des Johannes zu Ignatius und Polycarp," *Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie*, XX (1877), pp. 187-214. P. 188, "wesentlich anders."



tion that "the silence of the Apostolic Fathers is by no means certain. . . . The shorter Greek form of the Ignatian Epistles (c. A.D. 150) contains allusions to it, and adaptations of it, which cannot seriously be considered doubtful."<sup>19</sup>

Two years later Lightfoot's incomparable work on Ignatius reflected succinctly his considered opinion: "If Ignatius shows a full knowledge and appreciation of the *teaching* of S. John, his heart clings to the *example* of S. Paul."<sup>20</sup> At its heels came to light the sixth edition of Westcott's labors on the history of the New Testament Canon, wherein this eminent scholar confessed that he could discover barely a handful of "coincidences . . . between the language of St. John and Ignatius." And yet, though "the references to the New Testament are almost exclusively confined" to the writings of Paul, these Letters, "as might be expected, are not without traces of the influence of St. John. The circumstances in which he was placed required a special enunciation of Pauline doctrine; but this is not so expressed as to exclude the parallel lines of Christian thought." After illustrating his contention with a few quotations, he protests:

"These passages, it must be repeated, are not brought forward as proofs of the use of the writings of St. John, but as proofs of the currency of the modes of thought of St. John. They indicate at least that phraseology and lines of reflection which are preserved for us in the characteristic teaching of the fourth Gospel were familiar to the writer of the Ignatian Epistles."<sup>21</sup>

Theodor Zahn wrote much in the same sense in the same year, 1889, emphasizing that both Ignatius and his addressees were familiar with the Johannine mode of thought.<sup>22</sup>

<sup>19</sup>*The Gospel according to S. John* (Cambridge, University Press, 1887. Pp. 388), p. 18-19.

<sup>20</sup>*The Apostolic Fathers. Part II. S. Ignatius. S. Polycarp.* Vol. II. Section I (London, Macmillan & Co., 1889. Pp. vi-619), p. 64. This is the part, volume and section to which we shall make reference hereafter when speaking of *The Apostolic Fathers*.

<sup>21</sup>*A General Survey of the History of the Canon of the New Testament*, ed. 6 (Cambridge, Macmillan & Co., 1889. Pp. lvi-593), p. 33, note 1; 35-36.

<sup>22</sup>*Geschichte des Neutestamentlichen Kanons. Erster Band: Das Neue Testament vor Origenes.* Zweite Hälfte (Erlangen und Leipzig, Deichert, 1889. Pp. 453 to 968), p. 903, "er zeigt . . . selbst mit (Joh.) . . . vertraut . . . (und) die gleiche vertrautheit bei den (Adressaten).

The year 1894 presented devotees of our Evangelist and martyred Bishop with their first complete study of the problem in von der Goltz' detailed work on Ignatius.<sup>23</sup> Taking a different point of departure from his predecessors, von der Goltz aimed first to compare the Ignatian range of ideas in general with the Johannine, and only then to examine literary details by the comparison of texts.<sup>24</sup> Consequently, he set out to consider the "spiritual affinity," (*geistige Verwandtschaft*), taking up in the first place the fundamental Johannine ideas in Ignatius. John and Ignatius are shown to resemble one another most closely in their conception of the person of Christ and their conception of the facts and blessings of salvation, in their views on the Christian life as comprised in faith and love, and in their acquaintance with, and attitude towards, Judaism.

Having discussed the relation of the Ignatian Epistles to the Apocalypse, von der Goltz endeavored to answer a more subtle question. Did Ignatius come to appropriate the rich and developed conception of Christianity that existed "undoubtedly" in Asia Minor and found in the Johannine Gospel and Epistles its classical expression through reading our Gospel, or must he be regarded as an independent witness to this way of thinking. He believed that his investigation has already shown to some extent that the latter is the case.

"... Lässt sich . . . ein solch' eigentümlicher, religiöser Modalismus, eine solche Mystik, eine solche Zusammenfassung und Betonung der gleichen Momente, ein solcher Christusglaube, überhaupt eine so gleiche Art zu denken und zu glauben nicht einfach durch eine Schrift auf jemand übertragen, der nicht Ähnliches und Gleiches auch sonst aufgenommen und zu seinem Eigentum gemacht hat (p. 130).

In the second part of his investigation von der Goltz embarked on an examination of the literary relationship. He considered passages where Ignatius employed the Synoptic in-

<sup>23</sup>*Ignatius von Antiochien als Christ und Theologe. Eine dogmengeschichtliche Untersuchung.* "Texte und Untersuchungen," XII, 3 (Leipzig, Hinrichs, 1894. Pp. 206).

<sup>24</sup>*Ibid.*, pp. 118-143, which merit an extended recapitulation. According to v. d. Goltz, "die ganze Denkart . . . zeigt . . . fast sämtliche eigentümliche Charakterzüge . . . (und) . . . eine ganze Reihe von Ähnlichkeiten . . . der Gedankenwelt," show basic resemblance. (p. 127)

stead of the Johannine narrative, where he showed independence of form and where Ignatius' literary relation to John differed from that of Justin and others, and thus confirmed his belief that there is no literary independence, but there is an emphatic spiritual affinity.<sup>25</sup>

Barely a year was to pass, however, before the Jesuit, Heinrich Boese, concluded from a study of Johannine tone (*Anklänge*) in Ignatius that Ignatius must have known John's written Gospel; again, Ignatius makes it clear that Matthew's Gospel was known in Asia Minor.<sup>26</sup> In the same year Alfred Resch found the use of the Fourth Gospel by Ignatius "indubitable" and "undeniable."<sup>27</sup>

The year 1897 presented the scholarly world with Harnack's conclusion. With von der Goltz Harnack held it improbable, though not impossible, that Ignatius had read the Johannine writings; no certain decision, he feels, can be made. He did, however, protest against the way in which von der Goltz had constructed an "Asia Minor theology," drawn Ignatius into it, and hit upon the hypothesis that the Bishop had previously been in Asia Minor.<sup>28</sup>

The year following, Friedrich Loofs asserted, after a consideration of the "echo" of John's Christology, that Ignatius must have known the Gospel, and more, he must have been familiar with the Johannine milieu in Asia Minor.<sup>29</sup>

In 1899 Camerlynck criticized von der Goltz for an unwarranted insistence on the norm of perfect identity of form. In preference to this he suggested a consideration of the connection of ideas and doctrine, and endeavored to show that even a verbal similarity is not always absent. His conclusion was that, though it seems extremely difficult to obtain complete certitude on such a question, nevertheless, the Gospel of John was probably

<sup>25</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 143, "starker geistiger Verwandtschaft."

<sup>26</sup>*Die Glaubwürdigkeit unserer Evangelien. Ein Beitrag zur Apologetik* (Freiburg im Br., Herder, 1895. Pp. 140), p. 77, 79.

<sup>27</sup>*Aussercanonische Paralleltexte zu den Evangelien: Paralleltexte zu Johannes. "Texte und Untersuchungen,"* X, 4 (Leipzig, Hinrichs, 1896. Pp. 224), p. 166, 173.

<sup>28</sup>*Die Chronologie der altchristlichen Literatur. I.* (Leipzig, Hinrichs, 1897. Pp. xvi-732), p. 397, note; cf. also p. 406, note 2, and p. 397, note.

<sup>29</sup>"Christologie, Kirchenlehre," *Realencyclopädie für protestantische Theologie und Kirche*, IV (1898), pp. 16-56. P. 30.

known and used by Ignatius.<sup>30</sup> More definite was the attitude of H. R. Reynolds in the same year 1899, who concluded to "indubitable traces of the Fourth Gospel having already [prob. 109, not later than 116] found its way from Ephesus to Antioch."<sup>31</sup>

The turn of the century not only furnished fresh impetus for the discussion, it gave rise, in almost equal measure, to contradictory results. Belser, speaking of the Fourth Gospel, stated categorically that Ignatius used John.<sup>32</sup> J. Réville adopted the attitude of von der Goltz.<sup>33</sup> Stahl held that dependence both of ideas and of literary form could be proved.<sup>34</sup>

It was in 1902 that the storm actually broke. Otto Pfeleiderer had, in 1887, regarded the Letters as spurious.<sup>35</sup> Now, however, he confessed himself convinced by Lightfoot of the genuineness.<sup>36</sup> But he exclaimed at the fallacy of arguing from a similarity of ideas to literary relationship. Pfeleiderer asserted that there is not, in the whole collection of genuine letters, "a single sentence" that shows actual dependence on the Gospel or Epistles of John.<sup>37</sup>

Dr. Drummond accused von der Goltz in 1903 of resting his argument on a very questionable critical canon. Yet, after a consideration of texts, he admitted that the writer of the Epistles was familiar with the Gospel; this, to Drummond, pointed to a writer after Ignatius' time.<sup>38</sup>

These coincidences appear to me sufficiently marked and numerous to make it probable that the writer of the Epistles was familiar with the Gospel. But whether the writer was really Ignatius is far

<sup>30</sup>*De Quarti Evangelii Auctore Dissertatio* (Pars prior, Lovanii, Linthout, 1899. Pp. xvi-208. Pars altera, Brugis, Houdmont, 1900. Pp. x-209 to 330), p. 35-36.

<sup>31</sup>"Gospel of John," *Dictionary of the Bible* (Hastings), II (1899), pp. 694-728. P. 699.

<sup>32</sup>*Einleitung in das Neue Testament* (Freiburg im Br., Herder, 1901. Pp. viii-852), p. 280.

<sup>33</sup>*Le quatrième Evangile. Son origine et sa valeur historique* (Paris, Leroux, 1901. Pp. viii-344), p. 325. For this reference I am indebted to Lepin, *L'Origine du quatrième Evangile* (Paris, Letouzey et Ané, 1907. Pp. xi-508), p. 46.

<sup>34</sup>*Patristische Untersuchungen* I (Leipzig, Deichert, 1901. Pp. vi-359), p. 188 and note 1, "dass bei Ign. durchweg mit der Abhängigkeit der Gedanken auch die des Ausdrucks sich verbindet, kann mit Sicherheit erwiesen werden."

<sup>35</sup>*Das Urchristentum, seine Schriften und Lehren, in geschichtlichem Zusammenhang* (Berlin, Reimer, 1887. Pp. viii-891), pp. 825 ff., 832.

<sup>36</sup>*Ibid.*, ed. 2, II (Berlin, Reimer, 1902. Pp. v-714), p. 227.

<sup>37</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 413. He agrees with von der Goltz; cf. note on p. 413.

<sup>38</sup>*An Inquiry into the Character and Authorship of the Fourth Gospel* (London, Williams & Norgate, 1903. Pp. xvi-528), p. 258-260.

too large a question for us to enter upon; and it is the less incumbent upon us to do so because, even if we admit the genuineness of the letters, it may be contended with some show of reason that we have no evidence of the existence of a Johannine document but only of the adoption of phrases which were becoming current in the Church, and preparing the way for the developed doctrine which was afterwards incorporated in the Fourth Gospel.

Yet he can conclude his brief treatment of the question:

I even venture to think that the departure from Johannine language, and the occasional enlargement of Johannine thought, in the exposition of kindred themes, resembling as it does the practice of later writers, points to a time when the Johannine document was already regarded as authoritative, and a proper source for explanation and development.

The selfsame year saw Paul Schmiedel endeavoring to show that "most of the early Christian writings which were held to bear testimony to the Fourth Gospel—and of these precisely the oldest and therefore most important—in reality do not justify the claim made upon them." He remarked, with respect to the Epistles of Ignatius, "The question of the genuineness of these need not be gone into here since even Harnack does not regard it as probable that Ignatius had read the Johannine writings even though, in itself considered, the thing seems to him very easily possible."<sup>39</sup> The same *Encyclopedia Biblica* contains an article on the Gospels, whose descriptive and analytical section comes from the pen of the Rev. E. A. Abbott.<sup>40</sup> He contends that "the Ignatian passages commonly alleged to prove that Ignatius recognized Jn. as a Gospel simply prove that he knew the substance of some traditions incorporated in Jn. . . ." Variations in expression, such as we find in Ignatius, "would be almost impossible, if the Fourth Gospel were familiar to the author as a Gospel, but quite natural if he had a recent acquaintance with the substance of it as a recent doctrine." His conclusion is that Ignatius, despite

<sup>39</sup>"John, Son of Zebedee," *Encyclopedia Biblica* (Cheyne-Black), 1903, coll. 2503-2562. Coll. 2546-47.

<sup>40</sup>"Gospels," coll. 1761-1898. Abbott's account runs from coll. 1761-1840; Schmiedel's historical and synthetical section from coll. 1839-1898.

an acquaintance (but not a familiarity) with John's work, did not recognize John as a written Gospel.<sup>41</sup>

Dr. Stanton summed up the evidence for an acquaintance with the Fourth Gospel on the part of Ignatius and Polycarp as inconclusive. He stated that "the Johannine expressions might possibly have been derived from the phraseology of a school . . . the phenomena that we have noted point to acquaintance with it [John], but we cannot feel confident that they may not be due to some other cause, so long at least as we confine our attention to the Subapostolic Age . . ." <sup>42</sup>

In 1904 Père Calmes, in the commentary of his work on the Fourth Gospel, not only noted several reminiscent parallels, but actually thought that in one passage (Ign. Rom. 3, 3::Jo. 15, 18-21) a relation of dependence is discoverable.<sup>43</sup> Bishop Lightfoot returned to the fray to remark that, since " . . . the letters contain only two direct quotations, as such, from Holy Scripture, under these circumstances it is sufficient if we are able to trace the influence of the Fourth Gospel in individual thoughts and phrases. Nor are such traces wanting . . ." <sup>44</sup>

In the course of a series of lectures delivered in the Union Seminary, New York, in the Fall of 1904,<sup>45</sup> Dr. Sanday stated it as his belief that it is not "so much a question of close coincidence in expression," for if Ignatius' "rugged strength of mind" . . . reproduces the thoughts of others, it "does so in a form of its own." Agreeing in the main, as he admits, with von der Goltz, he continues: "I can quite allow that Ignatius has so absorbed the teaching that we call St. John's as it were *in succum et sanguinem* that the relation cannot be adequately explained by the mere perusal of a book late on in life. There is something more in it than this." He claims that the Epistles do not bear out von der Goltz' hypothesis of a lengthy residence

<sup>41</sup>Col. 1830.

<sup>42</sup>*The Gospels as Historical Documents. Part I. The Early Use of the Gospels* (Cambridge, University Press, 1903. Pp. xv-288), pp. 20-21.

<sup>43</sup>*L'évangile selon saint Jean* (Paris, Lecoffre, 1904. Pp. xvi-485), p. 315, note 1; p. 355, note 1; p. 401, note 1.

<sup>44</sup>*Biblical Essays*, 2nd ed. (London, Macmillan Co., 1904. Pp. xiv-459), p. 81.

<sup>45</sup>I quote from the work *The Criticism of the Fourth Gospel* (Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1912. Pp. xiv-268), p. 241-245.

by Ignatius in a Johannine community, and believes "it would be more natural to fall back on the tradition that Ignatius was an actual disciple of St. John," were it not for the lack of early evidence (66). He does, nevertheless, put the alternatives between "some more or less intimate connexion" in the "dark spaces" of their lives, and the careful study of the Johannine writings "years before the date of his journey to Rome."

The following year, 1905, is memorable for two highly important contributions to our discussion. The Committee, appointed by the Society of Historical Theology in Oxford, gave to the world the result of its efforts in a volume exhibiting those passages of early Christian writers which, in the opinion of the Committee, indicate acquaintance with any of the books of the New Testament. Dean Inge, to whose hands Ignatius was commended, thus summed up what a discussion of a number of texts had revealed to him:

Ignatius's use of the Fourth Gospel is highly probable, but falls some way short of certainty. The objections to accepting it are mainly (1) our ignorance how far some of the Logia of Christ recorded by John may have been current in Asia Minor before the publication of the Gospel. If they formed part of the Apostle's oral teaching, they must have been familiar to his disciples, and may have been collected and written down long before our Gospel was composed. (2) The paucity of phrases which recall the language of the Gospel, and the absence of direct appeals to it; phenomena which are certainly remarkable when we consider the close resemblance between the theology of Ignatius and that of the Fourth Gospel. . . .<sup>46</sup>

The second memorable contribution was Paul Dietze's article dealing expressly with the subject<sup>47</sup>. He begins with a rather lengthy, penetrating study of "the profound affinity" of thought in John and Ignatius. He then discusses their Christologies, their evaluation of the pre-Christian revelation of God, and their conception of the Christian life. How ex-

<sup>46</sup>*The New Testament in the Apostolic Fathers* (Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1905. Pp. v-144), pp. 81-83.

<sup>47</sup>"Die Briefe des Ignatius und das Johannesevangelium," *Theologische Studien und Kritiken*, LXXVIII (1905), pp. 563-603. Dietze speaks of a "tiefgreifende Gedankenverwandschaft."

plain this relationship? This much the author concedes to von der Goltz, that a literary dependence alone is not a sufficient explanation. Von der Goltz' dilemma: either Ignatius received this world of ideas through reading our Fourth Gospel, or he must be reckoned an independent witness of this world, was answered by von der Goltz in favor of the second alternative. Dietz says that the dilemma does not exist. He shows that one of von der Goltz' principal arguments against literary dependence, namely independence of form, is extremely untenable as a principle, illustrating Ignatius' method of using Apostolic Literature by the way in which he employs Pauline thoughts. Further, even in Ignatius' sweeping originality of turn, repeatedly the very Johannine form echoes. This fact he proceeded to demonstrate in detail, and concluded: If one can deny that Ignatius knew the Fourth Gospel, one can deny with as much right that he knew any New Testament writing.

In 1906 the Jesuit Knabenbauer entered the lists, in his commentary on John, with the succinct declaration of a literary dependence of Ignatius on John.<sup>48</sup> And Loofs reentered the same lists, reiterating his opinion that Ignatius was familiar with John's Asia Minor milieu.<sup>49</sup>

The succeeding year showed itself extremely favorable to an affirmative answer to our question. Caspar René Gregory noted that Ignatius was running over with John's Gospel and that Matthew and John appear to have been either his favorites or the ones better known to him.<sup>50</sup> M. Lepin, after mentioning von der Goltz' conclusion on the question, and citing Harnack, Abbott, Schmiedel and J. Réville as favoring this view, declared that other critics found so many and such remarkable points of contact that they deduced a real dependence of Ignatius on John.<sup>51</sup> Mgr. Ladeuze, in the early part of his

<sup>48</sup>*Evangelium secundum Ioannem*, "Cursus S.S.," Cornely, Knabenbauer, Hummelauer (Parisii, Lethielleux, 1906. Pp. 606), p. 13.

<sup>49</sup>*Leitfaden zum Studium der Dogmengeschichte*. 4th ed. (Halle a. S., Niemeyer, 1906. Pp. xxiii-1002), p. 102.

<sup>50</sup>*Canon and Text of the New Testament* (New York, Scribner, 1907. Pp. 539). Note that Gregory does not seem absolutely certain of the genuineness of the Ignatian Epistles, cf. pp. 72, 178-179.

<sup>51</sup>*Op. cit.* (in note 33), p. 46.



thorough discussion of Lepin's work, asserted that very probably Ignatius read and used John's Gospel. He added that the affinity is too close to be explained adequately by this literary dependence. He believes that we must admit the existence in Syria, at the end of the first century, of a Christian teaching very similar to that of the Fourth Gospel, and in which Ignatius was raised even before he could read that Gospel.<sup>52</sup>

In 1908 Jacquier raised the question of the relationship by quoting, apparently with approval, the remark of Mgr. Ladeuze on the seeming certainty of Ignatius' frequent utilization of the very text of the Fourth Gospel. But, besides this parallel in "linguistic peculiarities," Ignatius teaches in his Epistles a Christology resembling very closely that of John. After a consideration of texts the author concluded that Ignatius' intimacy with the Fourth Gospel on the one hand, and his failure to cite it textually on the other, would be explicable on the theory that oral tradition was the source of his knowledge.<sup>53</sup>

As may be seen, Jacquier closed with a doubt about the certainty of Ignatius' acquaintance with the actual text of the Gospel. To disturb the chronological order, for the nonce, in the interests of the logical, let us hurry on to the year 1911. Now we find him quoting expressions that he terms identical or almost so, with those of the Gospel. He believes he has found texts "inspired by texts of the Fourth Gospel, though not totally concordant." He expresses, in almost identical language, the doubt which was the concluding note of his remarks three years before, but this time he *concludes* with Ladeuze's unhesitating affirmation of an acquaintance with the actual text.<sup>54</sup>

In 1908 MacRory summed up the conclusions of the Oxford Society Committee [Sanday, Zahn, Wernle, Loisy] on the

<sup>52</sup>"L'origine du quatrième évangile, à propos du livre de M. Lepin" (*Rev. Bibl. N.S.* 4 [1907], cf. 559-561).

<sup>53</sup>*Histoire des livres du Nouveau Testament. IV. Les écrits johanniques* (Paris, Lecoffre, 1908. Pp. 422), p. 55-56.

<sup>54</sup>*Le Nouveau Testament dans l'église chrétienne. I.* (Paris, Lecoffre, 1911. Pp. 450), p. 48-50.

subject, and claimed that "Dietze has almost established it as certain" that Ignatius knew the Gospel of John itself.<sup>55</sup> In 1909 Davidson's mind was: "The Epistles of Ignatius . . . apparently show traces of the Fourth Gospel . . . , but these are not conclusive."<sup>56</sup> Peake contented himself with setting the opinions of Wernle and Loisy over against that of Pflleiderer.<sup>56a</sup> And Strachan, admitting an "undoubted affinity" between the two authors "both in expression and in doctrine," remarked:

"It cannot be regarded as certain that Ignatius used the Gospel. His evidence is on the border-line between evidence for the existence of the Gospel and proof of the influence of a *milieu* of Johannine teaching and thought. It is probable that Ignatius had access to some document containing Johannine teaching (cf. *e.g.* his reference to the narrative of the woman of Samaria); on the other hand, that might easily have been a story told orally by the Apostle in the course of his preaching and embedded in the hearts and minds of those who heard him."<sup>57</sup>

We are provided in 1910 with two succinct and quite contradictory estimates. B. W. Bacon claimed for Ignatius "a very few much disputed echoes and a diffused and equally disputed influence of the Gospel";<sup>58</sup> while the then President of the Biblical Institute at Rome, Leopold Fonck, declared that Ignatius ". . . reveals in the quotations, allusions, and theological views found in his Epistles an intimate acquaintance with the Fourth Gospel."<sup>59</sup>

The year following, Moffatt discussed the parallelisms in rather minute detail, decided that "the influence of Paulinism . . . does not explain satisfactorily the resemblance between our documents, and stated:

<sup>55</sup>"Recent Criticism and the Authorship of the Fourth Gospel," *Irish Theological Quarterly*, III (1908), pp. 51-77. Pp. 56-57.

<sup>56</sup>"Gospel of John," *Dictionary of the Bible* (Hastings; complete in one vol.), 1909, pp. 477-484. P. 478.

<sup>56a</sup>*A Critical Introduction to the New Testament* (London, Duckworth, 1909. Pp. xii-242), p. 183.

<sup>57</sup>"Gospel of John. I: Critical Article," *Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels* (Hastings), I (1909), pp. 869-885. P. 875.

<sup>58</sup>*The Fourth Gospel in Research and Debate* (London and Leipsic, Unwin, 1910. Pp. xii-544), pp. 32-33.

<sup>59</sup>"Gospel of Saint John," *Catholic Encyclopedia*, VIII (1910), pp. 438-443. P. 439.

As Ignatius uses, but inexactly cites, the epistles of Paul without any formal citation or reproduction of their contents in any given passage . . . , why may not he have dealt with the text of the Fourth Gospel similarly? May not the sovereign freedom of a writer who uses earlier writings to help out his characteristic ideas, neglecting the form but conserving so much of the spirit as he found congenial, be held to explain the one problem as well as the other? (p. 579)

He believed that the "echoes" of the Fourth Gospel in Papias, Ignatius, Justin and others "are sufficient to prove its diffusion as early as the first quarter of the second century."<sup>60</sup> Dr. Mackintosh, concentrating on the doctrine of Christ's Person, was cautious enough to declare in 1912 that Ignatius' "ideas are Johannine in the main," and endeavored to prove his contention from a study of the Christology of the Bishop of Antioch.<sup>61</sup>

The Ignatian scholar may not subscribe to every one of Bardsley's arguments, nor to his conclusions, but he cannot afford to ignore the study itself, made in 1913.<sup>62</sup> Bardsley writes:

Our argument rests not only upon specific parallels but upon the general similarity of the two writers. We must admit items of evidence which though of little significance when considered in isolation indicate when taken together that, to use Dr. Sanday's phrase, Ignatius had absorbed St. John's teaching *in succum et sanguinem*. If he had not long meditated on the documents, he had passed much of his life in a church permeated by St. John's influence, and the negative evidence of his letters makes strongly against his residence in Asia. Moreover, as we shall see, this argument does not take account of all the evidence (p. 207).

The author then proceeds to show in minute detail the influence of John on Ignatius in the doctrine of the pre-existence of Christ, in the use of the term Logos applied to Our Lord, in emphasis on the subordination of the Son, in the terminology

<sup>60</sup>*An Introduction to the Literature of the New Testament* (New York, Scribner, 1911. Pp. xli-630), pp. 578-580.

<sup>61</sup>*The Doctrine of the Person of Jesus Christ* (New York, Scribner, 1912. Pp. xiv-540), p. 130, 129-134.

<sup>62</sup>"The Testimony of Ignatius and Polycarp to the Writings of St. John," *Journal of Theological Studies*, XIV (1913), pp. 207-220.

wherewith the Incarnation is described, in the Ignatian doctrine of the Christian ministry, in the insistence on unity, in the eucharistic phraseology, in the Ignatian doctrine of the Spirit, in the importance Ignatius attaches to knowledge and in his fondness for abstract or summarizing nouns, in the doctrine of the Cross, in the doctrine of the subjects of Redemption and in the antithesis of love and hate, in the presentation of the Resurrection, in the doctrine of glory and of the power of the ascended Christ, and in the doctrine of Christ as the door of salvation. The author likewise reflects upon certain evangelical "incidents" with their parallels in Ignatius. His conclusions are:

. . . The Johannine theology is no recent acquisition of Ignatius. It is at the basis of his thinking, the *datum* and not the *probandum*. St. John's thought and methods of expression have become part of the furniture of his mind. When the Epistles were written he must have been familiar with it for many years (p. 219).

And further still:

. . . Our study of the letters has proved, not only the influence of St. John, but also that his Epistles and Gospel were already written. The hypothesis of oral influence does not account for the parallelisms. They presuppose the existence of St. John's teaching in its present form, and in the instance of the parallels with Jn. x in its present order and arrangement, and in one place Ignatius assumes that a distinctively Johannine logion was known to his readers (p. 219).

After this, the statement of Dr. Holland must sound tame when he wrote in the same year that, in his Epistle to the Smyrnaeans, Ignatius poured out "his love and hope and joy and fear, in words in which mingle the spirits of the Apostle of Love and the Apostle of the Gentiles, while they enforce that ideal of order and system which traditionally belongs to the great Apostle to whom the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven were first committed."<sup>68</sup>

Essential as is the contribution of Bardsley, it is the present writer's opinion that that article met its match in the space

<sup>68</sup>*The Apostolic Fathers* (London. S.P.C.K., 1913. Pp. 223), p. 174.

devoted to the subject by Dr. Rackl in his afore-mentioned work on the Christology of Ignatius,<sup>64</sup> which, appearing in 1913, interrupted the quasi-monopoly enjoyed by English-speaking investigators of the years immediately preceding. Dr. Rackl recognizes the insufficiency of the evidence supplied by the *Martyrium Colbertinum* on the personal relation of Ignatius to John, but believes that, though, absolutely speaking, Ignatius' manner of writing may possibly be perfectly original or inspired by Paul, yet the Letters impress a reader as so characteristically Johannine as almost to postulate even an extended personal intimacy between Ignatius and John. Rackl attacks Lützelberger's "argument from silence," and accuses von der Goltz of a theory that "floats completely in the air, bereft of any positive halting-place,"<sup>65</sup> but does not consider it necessary (apparently in view of Dietze's work) to refute the latter in particulars. He takes one example<sup>66</sup> to show a literary dependence, and agrees entirely with the conclusion of Zahn.<sup>67</sup> He points out very clearly how Ignatius is dependent on John in his Christology, taking up specifically the ideas of unity, the Eucharist and the Logos-concept.

Dr. Rackl explains the difference between Ignatius and John by the difference in standpoint. For, though both see in Jesus the Messiah and Son of God, John sets out specifically to prove these claims, while Ignatius, accepting both as well-established facts, writes to prove that Christ, *who is* the Messiah and Son of God, is really and truly "Jesus," that it was not merely in appearance but in truth and reality that Jesus lived on earth as man. This likewise, in his opinion, demonstrates the priority of the Gospel of John, for the attack on Christ's Messiahship and Sonship was earlier than the denial of His true Humanity. Further, the Letters show an advance over John "in der sprachlichen Formulierung."<sup>68</sup> Rackl's conclusion is:

<sup>64</sup>See note 8. On Ignatius and John, see Rackl, pp. 320-348.

<sup>65</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 329. On von der Goltz, cf. pp. 327-329.

<sup>66</sup>Philad. vii. i (cf. Jn. iii. 8).

<sup>67</sup>*Ibid.*, pp. 333-334. On Zahn, cf. note 22, *supra*.

<sup>68</sup>*Ibid.*, pp. 345-348.

Wenn wir uns schliesslich noch fragen, ob die Christologie des Ignatius synoptisch, johanneisch oder paulinisch ist, so kann darauf geantwortet werden: Für Ignatius und für die Gestaltung seines Christusbildes sind die synoptischen Evangelien in gleicher Weise massgebend gewesen wie das Johannesevangelium und die Paulusbriefe. Ignatius kennt keinen Unterschied zwischen synoptischem, johanneischem und paulinischem Christusbild; für ihn bilden die Aussagen der heiligen Schriften über Christus eine harmonische Einheit (p. 348).

Writing on Ignatius in 1916, Batiffol admitted that "among the sources of Ignatius' teaching, first place must be given to St. Paul," but believed that "more probable" than von der Goltz' conclusion of the relationship with John's Gospel is the tenet that "Ignatius used the Fourth Gospel, without quoting it."<sup>69</sup> Three years later Dr. Srawley conceded that "the cast of thought shows strong affinities with the ideas of the Johannine writings . . .," but averred that "it is difficult to prove that Ignatius is in any passage quoting from the Fourth Gospel."<sup>70</sup> Loisy, writing in 1921, still doubted, in spite of the Logos doctrine and anti-Docetic passages, that Ignatius knew John.<sup>71</sup>

Burney treated the subject somewhat thoroughly in 1922, and concluded that Ignatius was thoroughly familiar with the Johannine Theology, and "therefore with the documents themselves" . . . Ignatius's knowledge of the Fourth Gospel . . . seems to be proved to demonstration. The manner in which he utilizes its teaching shows further that his acquaintance with it was not merely superficial, but that he had assimilated it through a familiarity extending over many years.<sup>72</sup>

According to Streeter, writing in 1925, Ignatius' "whole outlook and his theology have been profoundly influenced by the study of this Gospel; but his use of it suggests that it is not yet recognized in his own Church as on the same level of

<sup>69</sup>"Ignatius," *Dictionary of the Apostolic Church* (Hastings), I (1916), pp. 594-605. P. 601.

<sup>70</sup>*The Epistles of St. Ignatius Bishop of Antioch*. 3rd ed. (London, S.P.C.K., and New York, Macmillan & Co., 1919. Pp. vii-132), p. 29. (First ed., 1900.)

<sup>71</sup>*Le quatrième évangile. Les épîtres dites de Jean* (Paris, Nourry, 1921. Pp. 602), pp. 7-8.

<sup>72</sup>*The Aramaic Origin of the Fourth Gospel* (Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1922. Pp. 176), p. 170-171.

authority as Matthew." More apropos of our question, Streeter admits some rather remarkable points of contact with John. But "even if these are quotations," they are so few that the Fourth Gospel cannot have been regarded as authoritative.<sup>73</sup>

In 1926 Hugh Pope, O. P., found in Ignatius "reminiscence" rather than "direct quotation." However, "we can demand for Ignatius an acquaintance with . . . John . . .," and in fact discovered "an unquestionable quotation."<sup>74</sup> Dr. Carpenter's brief concern with the parallels in 1927 urged him to conclude to a type of thought kindred with the Johannine. But there is no trace of a Gospel.<sup>75</sup> In the same year Père Lagrange's splendid commentary on John had this to say respecting the relations between Ignatius and the Gospel: Ignatius does not cite John, but he is imbued with John's doctrine.<sup>76</sup>

De Grandmaison's life-work on Christ in 1928 contained scant reference to the matter in hand, and may leave room for doubt as to the mind of the author. He stated that Ignatius was filled with Johannine thought and spirit and found one certain allusion to a text, which may be a citation. He quoted Burney's conclusion, apparently with approval.<sup>77</sup> About the same time, Lebreton, in an epoch-making work, declared that Ignatius was the heir of Saint Paul and Saint John.<sup>78</sup>

In 1929, Doctor Bernard, in his commentary on the Fourth Gospel, wrote:

He (Ignatius) moved in circles where the Johannine presentation of Christianity first found explicit expression, and this may account, in part, for the remarkable likeness of his thought and religious diction to the writings of Jn. It does not follow that in the Ignatian Epistles there is any conscious literary obligation to the Fourth Gospel, although this is possible. But it is in accordance

<sup>73</sup>*The Four Gospels. A Study of Origins, Treating of the Manuscript Tradition, Sources, Authorship, & Dates.* (New York, Macmillan & Co., 1925. Pp. xiv-622), p. 455, 505.

<sup>74</sup>*The Catholic Student's "Aids" to the Study of the Bible. IV. The New Testament (The Gospels).* 2nd ed. (London, Burns, Oates & Washbourne, 1926. Pp. xvi-408), p. 79. The "quotation" is Philad. vii. 1 (cf. Jn. iii. 8), p. 276.

<sup>75</sup>*The Johannine Writings. A Study of the Apocalypse and the Fourth Gospel* (Boston & New York, Houghton Mifflin, 1927. Pp. xii-493), p. 206.

<sup>76</sup>*Évangile selon saint Jean.* 3rd ed. (Paris, Lecoffre, 1927. Pp. cxcix-554), Intr., p. xxv.

<sup>77</sup>*Jésus Christ. Sa Personne, son message, ses preuves.* I (Paris, Beauchesne, 1928. Pp. xxxviii-412), p. 131. The "citation" is Philad. vii. 1 (cf. Jn. iii. 8). On Burney, cf. pp. 36-37.

<sup>78</sup>*Histoire du Dogme de la Trinité des Origines au Concile de Nicée.* II. 3rd ed. (Paris, Beauchesne, 1928. Pp. xxii-701), p. 283. (1st ed., 1910.)

with all probabilities, that Ignatius had read this famous book which had been produced with the imprimatur of the Church at Ephesus a quarter of a century before he wrote to the Christians of that place. He uses several Johannine phrases after a fashion which is difficult to explain if they are no more than reflections of current Christian teaching (p. lxxi).

And, in summing up his discussion:

Ignatius does not name John, nor does he mention his writings; but his circumstances could not have left him ignorant of the personality of the man, while the phraseology of the Ignatian Epistles betrays acquaintance with the teaching and probably with the text of the Fourth Gospel (p. lxxii).

The author has found the writings of Ignatius, together with those of Justin and Ireneaus, "more valuable than any of the set commentaries by the Fathers: Ignatius for his theological presuppositions, which are markedly like those of the Fourth Evangelist. . . ." <sup>79</sup>

Heinrich Schlier found in Ignatius a strain of localized Syrian Christianity, colored by Gnosticism. Even admittedly minute parallels did not indicate to Schlier either conceptual or literary contact. <sup>80</sup>

Père Durand, in his volume on the Fourth Gospel in the *Verbum Salutis* collection, opened our discussion in 1930 with the remark that the Epistles of Ignatius and the Odes of Solomon are impregnated with Johannine ideas. <sup>81</sup> Returning to the scene, if only in an incidental way, Moffatt noted of Ignatius: "Even when he is echoing Pauline phrases or Johannine ideas, he does it in his own way." <sup>82</sup>

In 1931 Howard offered Eucharistic parallels between Ignatius and Jn. vi, and, though not commenting on our precise question, was of opinion that Ignatius, like Justin Martyr, seems "to represent the type of eucharistic doctrine most conspicu-

<sup>79</sup>A *Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel according to St. John*. I (New York, Scribner, 1929. Pp. clxxxviii-290), p. lxxi-lxxii; also, pp. clxxxvi-vii.

<sup>80</sup>*Religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zu den Ignatiusbriefen* (Giessen, Töpelmann, 1929. Pp. iv-188), p. 175-177.

<sup>81</sup>*Évangile selon saint Jean*. 21st ed. (Paris, Beauchesne, 1930. P. liii-591), Intr., p. xvii.

<sup>82</sup>"Ignatius of Antioch—A Study in Personal Religion," *Journal of Religion*, X (1930), pp. 169-186. P. 176.



ously in the thought of the Fourth Evangelist."<sup>83</sup> In the same year Tillmann stated that the Letters have the first traces of the Gospel, without affording certain proof that Ignatius knew a written form of it. Place for admitting Ignatius' personal contact with John or John's group must be kept open.<sup>84</sup>

The year 1932 gave us the first volume of Lietzmann's history of the ancient Church, wherein the author remarked that Ignatius was influenced both by Paul and John both in respect of ideas as well as in the very ring of numerous expressions.

In 1929 Dr. Bernard, in his commentary on the Fourth Gospel, wrote:

. . . Seine Briefe tragen sehr im Gegensatz zum Brief des römischen Clemens durchweg den Stempel seiner geistigen Eigenart, die aufs stärkste durch Paulus, nicht wenig auch durch Johannes beeinflusst ist und diese Abhängigkeit unbeschadet aller sonstigen Originalität auch dauernd in der Formung der Gedanken wie in zahlreichen zitartigen Anklängen zum Ausdruck bringt.<sup>85</sup>

And yet, before the year drew to its close, Friedrich Augustus Schilling was to express his belief that "literary relationships with the Fourth Gospel are doubtful, though parallelisms in thought and expression are prominent."<sup>86</sup>

Three years later a doctorate dissertation in the Union Theological Seminary, New York, concerned with the Christianity of Ignatius, appeared in print from the pen of Cyril Charles Richardson.<sup>87</sup> As far as the present writer is aware, this volume, which has for its aim to examine the Christianity of Ignatius and its relationship to the religious ideas of his predecessors, especially Paul and John, is the latest attempt to deal with our subject in any detail. Richardson believes that a great many of the likenesses in ideas, brought up by Dietze and others, "have parallels in Paul, to whom Ignatius's indebtedness can hardly be denied." He continues:

<sup>83</sup>*The Fourth Gospel in Recent Criticism and Interpretation* (London, Epworth, 1931. Pp. 292), pp. 265-266, and 213.

<sup>84</sup>*Das Johannesevangelium*. 4th ed. (Bonn, Hanstein, 1931. Pp. xii-364), p. 12. Jo. 6 shows its influence on the Eucharistic phraseology of Ignatius, p. 146.

<sup>85</sup>*Geschichte der alten Kirche*. I. *Die Anfänge* (Berlin und Leipzig, de Gruyter, 1932. Pp. vii-323), p. 253.

<sup>86</sup>*The Mysticism of Ignatius of Antioch* (Philadelphia, U. of P., 1932. Pp. 75), pp. 6-7.

The important question, therefore, it seems to me, is whether Ignatius incorporates in his letters ideas that are unique to John. If this is the case and it can be assumed that Ignatius lived in a "Johannine atmosphere," we have an antecedent probability that the Fourth Gospel is the source of the three possible literary reminiscences which alone are far from conclusive proof of Ignatius's acquaintance with Johannine literature (p. 68).

Richardson goes on to reject a great number of alleged parallels as proof, either because of lack of agreement with John, or else because of simultaneous agreement with Paul, claims that "actually the only ideas that can be considered unique to Ignatius and John are those connected with the Eucharist," and feels himself compelled to assert that these parallels "are not overwhelming proof of the dependence of Ignatius upon John." After discussing three allegedly parallel passages, the writer concludes:

None of these passages is in itself convincing proof of the literary dependence of Ignatius upon John, but when one recognizes the free and independent way in which Ignatius makes use of Pauline language and phrases, it does not seem impossible that he has here Johannine passages in mind. However, the question of his indebtedness to John has not yet been indubitably established, nor on the other hand is there sufficient justification for denying it altogether. Perhaps the evidence at our command is not sufficient to enable us to give a final and conclusive judgment (p. 74-75).

In 1937 Ludwig Kösters, S. J., in his splendid work, *Unser Christusglaube*, observed: "We find definite literary traces of the Fourth Gospel in the letters of St. Ignatius of Antioch (d. 107)."<sup>87</sup> We close this review of the history of criticism of Ignatius' letters with the view of Höpfl, O. S. B., who finds in the Bishop of Antioch a familiarity with the Gospels of Matthew and John, and a doctrinal viewpoint nearest John's.<sup>88</sup>

<sup>87</sup>*The Christianity of Ignatius of Antioch* (New York, Columbia U., 1935. Pp. x-120). Cf. pp. 68-75. The texts with possible Johannine allusions are Rom. 7, 2; Magn. 7, 1; 8, 2; Philad. 7, 1.

<sup>88</sup>I quote from the translation by Joseph W. Grundner, under the title, *The Believer's Christ* (St. Louis, Herder, 1939. Pp. 416), p. 238.

<sup>89</sup>*Introductio Specialis in Novum Testamentum*. 4th ed. (Roma, Anonima Libreria Cattolica Italiana, 1938. Pp. xxii-569), p. 11.

(To be continued)