

# DID SAINT IGNATIUS OF ANTIOCH KNOW THE FOURTH GOSPEL?

(Continued)

WALTER J. BURGHARDT, S.J.

WOODSTOCK COLLEGE  
Woodstock, Md.

## III. THE PROBLEM TREATED CRITICALLY

### 1. THE AFFINITY IN THOUGHT

That there exists between Ignatius and John a remarkably deep affinity of thought, of ideas—what Dietze<sup>90</sup> labels a *Gedankenverwandtschaft*, von der Goltz<sup>91</sup> and Rackl<sup>92</sup> a *geistige Verwandtschaft*, and the latter also a *Gedankenzusammenhang*<sup>93</sup>—is beyond dispute.<sup>94</sup> Despite Bacon's denial to the Antiochene Bishop in 1910 of aught save "a very few much-disputed echoes . . . of the Gospel,"<sup>95</sup> Rackl could testify four years later to the all but accomplished extinction of the view that in the Ignatian letters are found no Johannine traces whatsoever.<sup>96</sup> And naturally, for already in 1894 von der Goltz, a confirmed *advocatus diaboli* of literary dependence, had found in Ignatius the complete cast of thought and almost all the characteristic features of the Fourth Gospel; Dietze, an equally determined *postulator causae*, regarded the "spiritual relationship" as deeply rooted; and the same affinity of ideas is at the base of Rackl's entire treatment. This striking kinship in the realm of thought has been recognized not only by those who advance the theory of actual acquaintance with the text of the Fourth Gospel,<sup>97</sup> but likewise by scholars who look upon the claim of textual dependence as falling somewhat short of cer-

<sup>90</sup>*Op. cit.*, p. 564.

<sup>91</sup>*Op. cit.*, p. 119.

<sup>92</sup>*Op. cit.*, p. 320.

<sup>93</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 332.

<sup>94</sup>Richardson appears to be the only serious student of the question in the last quarter-century who doubts this.

<sup>95</sup>*Op. cit.*, pp. 32-33.

<sup>96</sup>*Op. cit.*, p. 320.

<sup>97</sup>Of the authors cited in the historical survey of the first part of our article, Lightfoot Zahn, Loofs, Ladeuze, Burney, Streeter, Lagrange.

tainty,<sup>98</sup> by savants who hesitate to throw the weight on either side,<sup>99</sup> and by investigators who refrain from expressing an opinion anent textual acquaintance.<sup>100</sup> Consequently, the parallelisms in thought may be indicated in bare outline, so as to touch on three main points: the Christology in general, the doctrine of the Eucharist, and the doctrine of Christ as "the Life."

The characteristics setting the Fourth Gospel on a plane apart are (1) the *insistence* on the fact of the Trinity, expressed particularly in the doctrine of the consubstantiality of the Son, the mutual indwelling of the Father and the Son, and the procession of the Spirit from the Father; and, in the Prolog, the succinct, cohesive presentation of the dogmas, (2) of the Incarnation, and (3) of the Divine Logos. Or, we may say that the main preoccupation of the Fourth Evangelist is the relationship of the Father and the Son: Jesus Christ, Mediator between God and man, Himself true God and true Man, united to the Father yet distinct from Him, eternal Son of God, eternal Word of God, constituting with the Father and the Holy Spirit a Trinity of Persons in one Divine Nature.

If we turn to Ignatius,<sup>101</sup> we are struck from the very beginning by the constant connection of the Father and the Son, presented as a *single* principle of grace and salvation,<sup>102</sup> union with Whom, begun on earth,<sup>103</sup> is the *single* term of the Christian life.<sup>104</sup> Christians are, indifferently, temples of God, temples of Christ<sup>105</sup>—of Christ, Who is in man not merely as

<sup>98</sup>Camerlynck, Inge, Jacquier, Batiffol, de Grandmaison, Bernard, Schilling.

<sup>99</sup>Westcott, Strachen, Moffatt, Srawley.

<sup>100</sup>Mackintosh, Lebreton, Durand, Lietzmann.

<sup>101</sup>Our summary of the Christological doctrine of Ignatius is based on Lebreton's study, *op. cit.*, pp. 282-331.

<sup>102</sup>*E.g.* the introduction to Eph., Magn., Rom., Philad., Smyrn., Polyc.; also Eph. 9, 2; 21, 2; Magn. 1, 2; Trall. 1, 1; Philad. 1, 1; 3, 2.

<sup>103</sup>*E.g.* Eph. 6, 2 (in God); 8, 2 (in Christ).

<sup>104</sup>*E.g.* Eph. 12, 2; Rom. 5, 3.

<sup>105</sup>*E.g.* Philad. 7, 2; Eph. 15, 3; Eph. 9, 2.

the God Who sanctifies His temple, but as the Spirit that gives life.<sup>106</sup>

Between the Father and the Christian, Christ appears as Mediator, and *His* relation to the Father is the ideal model of the relation which the *Christian* should have towards Him.<sup>107</sup> The doctrine of mediation is beautifully summarized in Philad. 9, 1-2:

Good also were the priests, but better is the High Priest, to Whom has been entrusted the Holy of Holies, for to Him alone have been committed the hidden things of God: He Himself being the door of the Father, through which enter in Abraham and Isaac and Jacob and the prophets and the apostles and the Church. All these things [combine] to the unity of God. But the Gospel has something singular, the advent of the Saviour, our Lord Jesus Christ, His Passion and Resurrection. For the beloved prophets announced unto Him, but the Gospel is the perfection of immortality. . . .

Christ, for Ignatius, is true God.<sup>108</sup> The pre-existent Christ is distinct from the Father,<sup>109</sup> while the subordination implied in certain texts<sup>110</sup> is to be explained, as Rackl notes,<sup>111</sup> not of Christ as God, but of Christ as Man. Modalism has been the critics' cry, yet though the Incarnation is elsewhere described as a manifestation of God in the Flesh, one will but recognize therein Johannine doctrine: the Son of God has appeared, and by His appearance has revealed to us His Father. Many a difficulty will vanish into thin air if we remember that it is in the reality of His human life, "God in the Flesh," that Ignatius embraces the Eternal Word. That real, "historical Christ," the "Christ of earth," though united with the Father, is not identified with Him. Expressions like "united in spirit to the

<sup>106</sup>E.g. Eph. 3, 2; Magn. 1, 2; Smyrn. 4, 1.

<sup>107</sup>Smyrn. 8, 1; Eph. 5, 1; Magn. 13, 2; Eph. 3, 2 (cf. Jo. 15, 9; 20, 21).

<sup>108</sup>E.g. Eph. *mscr.*; 1, 1; 7, 1; 15, 3; 18, 2; 19, 3; Trall. 7, 1; Rom. *mscr.*; 3, 3; 6, 3; Smyrn. 1, 1; 10, 1; Polyc. 8, 3.

<sup>109</sup>E.g. Magn. 6, 1.

<sup>110</sup>E.g. Magn. 13, 2; Philad. 7, 2; Smyrn. 8, 1.

<sup>111</sup>*Op. cit.*, p. 228.

Father"<sup>112</sup> or "the Lord did nothing without the Father, being united [to Him]"<sup>113</sup> are nothing if not pure Johannine doctrine.<sup>114</sup> Eternity, impassibility, invisibility and the rest, what does this mean if not the dogma of consubstantiality? Is there any difference in thought between the Nicene assertion of unity of substance and the Ignatian doctrine of unity "in spirit"?

Christ is Son of God.<sup>115</sup> From all eternity, or merely by His virginal conception? It is true that Christ, as God, is spoken of as ἀγέννητος,<sup>116</sup> but in the time of Ignatius, even in the first flowering of Arianism, we should look in vain for the distinction later drawn so precisely between ἀγέννητος and ἀγέννητος. One follows the rhythm of the thought-movement in Eph. 7, 2:

	There is one Physician	
of flesh		and of spirit
<i>begotten</i>		and <i>unbegotten</i>
come in flesh		God
in death		true Life
from Mary		and from God

Jesus Christ, our Lord,

one will naturally refer the troublesome adjectives, not both to the Incarnation, but the one to the human Sonship, the other to the Divine. In passages, too, where the Divine nature is expressly asserted for various phases of Christ's existence, as "Who was with the Father before the ages and at the end appeared" (Magn. 6, 1), "Who proceeded from one Father, and is with one, and has returned to one" (Magn. 7, 2), "the unerring mouth by which the Father has spoken truly" (Rom. 8, 2), and "after the Resurrection He ate and drank with them as of the flesh, although united in spirit to the Father" (Smyrn. 3, 3): the most natural interpretation is that

<sup>112</sup>Smyrn. 3, 3: of the Risen Christ.

<sup>113</sup>Magn. 7, 1: of Christ before the Resurrection.

<sup>114</sup>Cf. Jo. 5, 19, 30; 8, 28; 10, 30.

<sup>115</sup>E.g. Eph. 4, 2; 7, 2; 20, 2; Magn. 8, 2; 13, 1; Rom. *inscr.*; Smyrn. 1, 1.

<sup>116</sup>Eph. 7, 2.

of Divine *Sonship*, especially in a writer for whom the name "Father" has not, as often in Clement of Rome, the meaning of Creator or Demiurge, but properly the "Father of Christ."

The Son of God is, for Ignatius, the Word of God. The Word appears here not as the inward concept of God, but as that concept's exterior manifestation, proceeding from the sovereign silence of the Divine Life.<sup>117</sup> Christ is "the unerring mouth by which the Father has spoken truly."<sup>118</sup> This manifestation of God by His Word is the Incarnation, for the Son "went out from Silence" when His Father sent Him here below. Before the Incarnation "He spoke, and it came to pass, and whatsoever He has done [even] in silence, is worthy of the Father."<sup>119</sup> He is the Salvation of the Old Testament,<sup>120</sup> the door of the Father through which all from Abraham to the Apostles and the Church have entered in.<sup>121</sup> All these manifestations, though, have their term in the supreme revelation that is the Incarnation:

But the Gospel has something singular, the advent of the Saviour, our Lord Jesus Christ, His Passion and Resurrection. For the beloved prophets announced unto Him, but the Gospel is the perfection of immortality. . . .<sup>122</sup>

Christ, however, is not only γνώμη Θεοῦ, <sup>123</sup> the practical understanding conceived as a rule of action. He is likewise γνώσις Θεοῦ, <sup>124</sup> the speculative understanding considered in its own proper act.

With the Father and the Son in their inseparable union Ignatius associates the Holy Spirit. Apart from the passages that formally link the three Persons of the Trinity,<sup>125</sup> the Spirit

<sup>117</sup>" . . . Jesus Christ, His Son, Who is His Word, proceeding from silence . . ." (Magn. 8, 2).

<sup>118</sup>Rom. 8, 2.

<sup>119</sup>Eph. 15, 1.

<sup>120</sup>Philad. 5, 2.

<sup>121</sup>Philad. 9, 1.

<sup>122</sup>Philad. 9, 2.

<sup>123</sup>Eph. 3, 2.

<sup>124</sup>Eph. 17, 2.

<sup>125</sup>Magn. 13, 1; 13, 2; Eph. 9, 1.

is the principle of the virginal conception, the soul of the triple hierarchy, the gift which the Lord has truly sent.<sup>126</sup> He cannot be deceived, being "from God," but penetrates and reproves the hidden secrets; He urges union with the Bishop, care of the flesh as of God's temple, imitation of Christ.<sup>127</sup>

The reader familiar with the Eucharistic discourse in Jo. 6 will feel at ease with Ignatius.<sup>128</sup> For the Bishop of Antioch the "Eucharist"<sup>129</sup> is "the bread of God."<sup>130</sup> In sharp contrast to the "food of corruption,"<sup>131</sup> it is the "medicine of immortality, the antidote that we may not die, but have life in Jesus Christ forever."<sup>132</sup> For it is "the flesh of Jesus Christ,"<sup>133</sup> "which suffered for our sins, which the Father in His goodness raised up,"<sup>134</sup> "the gift of God,"<sup>135</sup> the symbol of "faith";<sup>136</sup> and it is "His blood,"<sup>137</sup> the symbol of "love incorruptible."<sup>138</sup>

<sup>126</sup>Eph. 18, 2; Philad. *inscr.*; Eph. 17, 2.

<sup>127</sup>Philad. 7, 1-2. It may be noted here that the above is but one of many approaches (others are those of Rackl, von der Goltz and Dietze) to the problem of the kinship in Christology between Ignatius and the Fourth Gospel. Dietze *e.g.* (*op. cit.*, cf. esp. pp. 564-565) finds most striking in the Letters, as in John, their Christocentric character. The focus of the thought of both authors is the Person of Christ, and, more specifically, the "historical Christ." But, with a flash of insight, Dietze finds two passages especially characteristic for the Christology of Ignatius. The first is Polyc. 3, 2: "Look for Him Who is timeless, the Eternal, the Invisible, Who became visible for our sake, the Impassible, Who for us became subject to suffering, Who endured in every way for us." The second is the passage from Eph. 7, 2 columnized above: "There is one Physician, etc." The former, in Dietze's interesting, well-developed speculation, corresponds to John's prolog, the latter to the remainder of the Fourth Gospel.

<sup>128</sup>In fact, Richardson has asserted that *only* the ideas connected with the Eucharist are unique to Ignatius and John (*op. cit.*, p. 72): a testimony somewhat vitiated by his inability to see in the doctrine of Ignatius, John and Paul any more than "an undefined but close relationship between the body and blood of Christ, and the eucharistic elements" (*ibid.*, p. 71). Lebreton has shown how John and Ignatius alike unite the Christological and Eucharistic dogmas so closely as to make them inseparable; further, that the Eucharistic theology of neither can be reduced to symbolism, for in both the symbol supposes a reality, the flesh of Christ, real and living and vivifying, "d'abord ferment affirmée" (*op. cit.*, p. 288, note 1).

<sup>129</sup>Philad. 4.

<sup>130</sup>Eph. 5, 2; Rom. 7, 3.

<sup>131</sup>Rom. 7, 3.

<sup>132</sup>Eph. 20, 2.

<sup>133</sup>Rom. 7, 3; Philad. 4.

<sup>134</sup>Smyrn. 7, 1.

<sup>135</sup>*Ibid.* Note, however that Lightfoot (*Apostolic Fathers*, Part II, Vol. II, Sect. 1, p. 307) refers this expression to the Redemption.

<sup>136</sup>Trall. 8, 1.

<sup>137</sup>Rom. 7, 3.

<sup>138</sup>Trall. 8, 1; Rom. 7, 3.

The vivifying action of Christ is one of the most cherished of Ignatius' dogmas, one of those that show most clearly the influence of Paul, and especially of John.<sup>139</sup> For "Life" holds the same place of honour in the Fourth Gospel that the "kingdom of God" holds in the Synoptics.<sup>140</sup> While the combined vocabulary of the Synoptics presents the term but sixteen times, it is found in the Gospel of John forty-six times. It is the ultimate explanation of Christ's Person, mission to men and Divine relations with the Father.<sup>141</sup> For John "Life" is a reality both present and future: eternal life is *begun* on earth by the possession of Christ through faith quickened by love, and is *perfected* in heaven by the intuitive vision of God. Death, then, is not annihilation, but a transition to God and eternal happiness.

"Life" to John is a grace offered by God to all men. He merely demands of men that they show good will, hear Christ with a docile heart, believe in Him as the Son of God, in His Divine mission, in the truths He teaches, receive Baptism for spiritual regeneration, receive the Body of Christ to nourish that "life" and have their sins remitted, if necessary, to regain it. The effects of "Life in Christ" are light, satiety, prayer that approaches omnipotence, and resurrection.

For Ignatius Christ is "our Life,"<sup>142</sup> "our true Life,"<sup>143</sup> "true Life in death,"<sup>144</sup> "our inseparable Life,"<sup>145</sup> "our never-failing Life."<sup>146</sup> He appeared in the likeness of man to introduce a new order of things, which is Everlasting Life.<sup>147</sup> As a result, death

<sup>139</sup>Cf. Jo. 6 and 15; Lebreton, *op. cit.*, p. 287.

<sup>140</sup>Cf. Frey, "Le concept de 'vie' dans l'évangile de saint Jean," *Biblica*, I (1920), pp. 37-58, 211-239.

<sup>141</sup>E.g. Jo. 14, 6; 10, 10; 5, 26.

<sup>142</sup>Magn. 9, 1.

<sup>143</sup>Smyrn. 4, 1.

<sup>144</sup>Eph. 7, 2.

<sup>145</sup>Eph. 3, 2.

<sup>146</sup>Magn. 1, 2.

<sup>147</sup>Eph. 19, 3.

and Life are set before us,<sup>148</sup> but, unless of our own free will we consent to die unto His Passion, "His Life is not in us."<sup>149</sup> We are to beware lest Satan lead us captive from "the Life set before" us to pursue.<sup>150</sup> No longer are we to live after the manner of Judaism,<sup>151</sup> for, if even the prophets lived after Christ Jesus,<sup>152</sup> "how shall we be able to live apart from Him?"<sup>153</sup> We are now to fashion our lives, not after the Sabbath, but after the Lord's Day, "on which our Life arose."<sup>154</sup> We are to live "after Jesus Christ,"<sup>155</sup> who died for us, that, by believing in His death, we might escape death.<sup>156</sup> For apart from Him we "have not the true Life."<sup>157</sup> And the reason why we break one Bread is "that we may not die but have Life forever in Jesus Christ."<sup>158</sup> For the one thing that matters is that we be "found in Christ Jesus unto the true Life."<sup>159</sup> Perfect faith in Christ and perfect love towards Him: this is "the beginning and the end of Life: faith the beginning, love the end."<sup>160</sup> No wonder, then, that Ignatius, in his plea for martyrdom, urges the Romans not to "hinder" him "from living."<sup>161</sup> It is the Holy Spirit, "living water,"<sup>162</sup> Who speaks to him in the inmost depths of his soul and calls him to the Father.

## 2. THE AFFINITY OF THOUGHT AND EXPRESSION

The foregoing discussion of the affinity in thought between Ignatius and John has plunged us very definitely *in medias res*. It is not our intention, however, to draw any conclusion from

<sup>148</sup>Magn. 5, 1.

<sup>149</sup>Magn. 5, 2.

<sup>150</sup>Eph. 17, 1.

<sup>151</sup>Magn. 8, 1.

<sup>152</sup>Magn. 8, 2.

<sup>153</sup>Magn. 9, 2.

<sup>154</sup>Magn. 9, 1.

<sup>155</sup>Philad. 3, 2.

<sup>156</sup>Trall. 2, 1.

<sup>157</sup>Trall. 9, 2.

<sup>158</sup>Eph. 20, 2.

<sup>159</sup>Eph. 11, 1.

<sup>160</sup>Eph. 14, 1.

<sup>161</sup>Rom. 6, 2.

<sup>162</sup>Rom. 7, 2.



the affinity in *thought* alone: for one thing, the process of argumentation would be too tenuous. We propose rather to apply the touchstone of criticism to those texts that are more commonly adduced to prove dependence, and decide whether the combination of thought and expression justifies us in concluding that Ignatius of Antioch depends upon the Fourth Evangelist.<sup>163</sup>

#### A. THE EUCHARIST

In Eph. 5, 2 Ignatius, speaking of one who is cut off from that unity of Christians which centers about the altar of the Eucharist, says "he is deprived of *the bread of God*." This phrase, with the definite article employed with both nouns, is identical in form with "the bread of God" in Jo. 6, 33.<sup>164</sup> Yet the employment of the expression, considered in isolation, is susceptible to other plausible explanations that render hardly justifiable an assertion of dependence upon the text of the Fourth Gospel, or even upon the Fourth Evangelist, regarded apart from his work. Not that the use of the phrase is to be disregarded entirely as an element of proof, but rather that it would not appear advisable to insist upon it save in a congeries of similar reminiscences.

Again in Rom. 7, 3 we find, with "bread of God," a series of expressions which may be compared with phrases in St. John's sixth chapter. The passage in Ignatius runs: "I delight not in

<sup>163</sup>We say "Fourth Evangelist" advisedly, for the alternatives to a use of the actual text of the Fourth Gospel, namely the existence and influence of a Johannine school or of an oral tradition, are so very easily the predominant objections, and so very much of a *cauda serpentina* in every parallelism we shall have occasion to proffer, that the sensible course is to reserve these alternative hypotheses for separate treatment at the very close of our discussion.

<sup>164</sup>In the evaluation of the Oxford Society Committee, Inge would characterize the phrase as possibly referring to the Gospel, but "in regard to which the evidence" appears "too uncertain to allow any reliance to be placed upon it" (*op. cit.*, pp. iii, iv, 82). Lightfoot (*Apostolic Fathers*, Part II, Vol. II, Sect. 1, p. 45) considers a reference to the Eucharist here as probable, and asserts that "it seems to be inspired by Joh. vi, 31 sq." Bardsley (*op. cit.*, p. 210) reckons the Eucharist as the source of the metaphor, "but there is a larger reference as in John vi 31 f."

<sup>165</sup>References to Jo. are always to Merk's *Novum Testamentum Graece et Latine*, ed. altera, Roma, 1935; verses are numbered according to the Greek, not the Latin.

the food of corruption nor in the pleasures of this life. I desire the bread of God, which is the flesh of Jesus Christ, of Him Who is of the seed of David, and as drink I desire His blood, which is love incorruptible." Here the words "food of corruption" recall John's "meat which perisheth" (6, 27); "the flesh of Jesus Christ" calls to mind "my flesh" (6, 51, 54-56);<sup>165</sup> "as drink . . . His blood" reflects "and drink my blood" (6, 54-56).<sup>166</sup>

There can be no serious doubt but that Jo. 6 (at least from verse 51) and Rom. 7, 3 refer to the Eucharist. Now, just as John opposes to temporary satiety and perishable food the bread of God which remains forever, so too does Ignatius contrast the "food of corruption" with the "bread of God, which

<sup>166</sup>Of the authors cited in Part I, Srawley (p. 29) thinks "bread of God" here one of those expressions that "present striking parallels to the language of the [4th] Gospel, and suggest that either Ignatius was familiar with the Gospel, or that he had lived in surroundings where the ideas and teaching represented in our present Gospel were current." Lightfoot (*Biblical Essays*, pp. 82, 225, 226) finds the contrast in Ignatius "an adaptation" of John's discourse; "bread of God" is "taken from S. John's Gospel, vi. 33;" "food of corruption" is "suggested by" verse 27. Camerlynck (p. 36) sees in Jo. 6 the "fundamentum quod [Ign.] amplificat et excolit," and believes the likeness too great to be explained by oral tradition or intercourse with John. Drummond (p. 258) thinks "bread of God" "may be derived from John vi. 33, 51, 55." Bernard (p. 191; cf. pp. clxviii, 211) is of opinion that "I delight not in the food of corruption" is "perhaps suggested by" verse 27. Belsler (*Das Zeugnis des 4. Evangelisten für die Taufe, Eucharistie und Geistessendung* [Freiburg im Br., Herder, 1912. Pp. xii-293], p. 82; cf. p. 85; cf. *Einleitung*, p. 280) claims the Ignatian passage rests undoubtedly on, and can be regarded as an authentic commentary on verses 32, 33. Knabenbauer (p. 13) refers the passage to utterances in the Fourth Gospel. Westcott (p. 61) thinks it "quite impossible to understand the Ignatian passage without presupposing a knowledge of the discourse recorded by St. John." Dietze (pp. 597-598) notes a plain literary dependence, and Resch (pp. 111-112) holds that the Ignatian expressions on the Eucharist follow the Johannine rather than the Synoptic-Pauline version of Basar. Stahl (pp. 187-188) claims that Jo. 6 does *not* refer to the Eucharist, yet holds Ignatius dependent on Jo., explaining the differences in expression by the desire of Ignatius to avoid arousing in his readers the notions John intended to convey! On the other hand, von der Goltz (pp. 133-134) asserts that the divergence in form is decisive against an hypothesis of dependence, and explains the affinity by a like Christian way of thinking. Carpenter (p. 428, with note 1) claims that this "same conception" as John's is "a sign of the geographical extension of the modes of thought out of which the Gospel emerged." On the "bread of God" here, Inge (pp. iii, iv, 82) maintains the same opinion as above on Eph. 5, 2, though he has admitted (p. 81), in connection with the passage immediately preceding, a probable suggestion by Jo. 6.

is the flesh of Jesus Christ." The divergences from John in Ignatius' mode of expression are obvious: "food of corruption" for "meat which perisheth;" omission of the articles with "bread of God;" slightly different nouns to express "drink." The identity of thought, however, and the striking similarity of expression;<sup>167</sup> the fact that Ignatius compresses into a single sentence ideas and language scattered through one connected discourse in John; the significant observation that, in the sentence immediately preceding, there is, as we shall see, the startling Johannine echo, "living water;" the recollection of the characteristic originality of Ignatius, who grasps the thought of another, only to make it his own; the realization that the Bishop wrote not from the seclusion of an episcopal study, but "in bonds amid ten leopards, that is, a company of soldiers:"<sup>168</sup> all combine to render extremely improbable any explanation save dependence upon the Fourth Evangelist.

Writing to the Smyrnaeans, Ignatius says (7, 1) of certain heretics: "They abstain from the Eucharist and from prayer, because they confess not that the Eucharist is the flesh of our Saviour, Jesus Christ, which suffered for our sins, which the Father in his Goodness raised up. They, therefore, that gainsay *the gift of God*, perish by their disputing. It would be of advantage to them to love, ἀγαπᾶν, that they might also rise."<sup>169</sup> Here, as in Jo. 6, 54, the Eucharist is expressly connected with the Resurrection and Eternal Life. If, however, the Ignatian passage be considered in isolation, this explicit connection in

<sup>167</sup>Note on σάρξ: Richardson (*op. cit.*, p. 71) finds Ignatius just as Pauline as Johannine "in his use of σάρξ to describe the body of Christ and the outer human nature of men generally." True, Paul uses σάρξ of the flesh of Christ (cf. Eph. 2, 14; Col. 1, 22), but it should be observed that Paul never employs it thus *in connection with the Eucharist*. Cf. also Zahn (*Geschichte*, p. 904, note 3) and Rackl (*op. cit.*, p. 336).

<sup>168</sup>Rom. 5, 1.

<sup>169</sup>Among other authors cited in Part I, Belser (*Einleitung*, p. 280), Srawley (p. 96) and Bardsley (p. 211) have recognized the parallelism between the first Ignatian sentence and various expressions in Jo. 6. Bernard (p. clxviii) has inferred from the passage that "the Eucharistic language of Ignatius . . . is clearly influenced by Jo. 6." The affinity of "the gift of God" with Jo. 4, 10 has been indicated by Funk-Bihlmeyer (*Die Apostolischen Väter*, Erster Teil [Tübingen, Mohr, 1924. Pp. 1-163], p. 108).

our author would seem too ordinary an expression of Catholic belief to be traced successfully to John, despite the employment of the Johannine "flesh,"—though a fair case might be fashioned for the view that it is due precisely to John that expressions like the above became ordinary. The manifest marriage of the expression "the gift of God" (whether one refer it to the Eucharist or, with Lightfoot, to the Redemption) with the like phrase in Jo. 4, 10 is vitiated by the obvious divorce in meaning.<sup>170</sup>

Again, Ignatius urges the Philadelphians (4): "Take care, then, to observe one Eucharist: for there is *one flesh* of our Lord Jesus Christ and one cup unto unity in His blood."<sup>171</sup> And he exhorts the Trallians (8, 1) to refresh, recreate, rebuild themselves "in faith, which is the *flesh of the Lord*, and in love, which is the *blood of Jesus Christ*."<sup>172</sup> Though the hypothesis of dependence on John is strengthened by the use of the characteristically Johannine *σάρξ* instead of the *σώματος* of Paul, 1 Cor. 10, 16, and, in the passage from Trallians, by the symbolism (presupposing, of course, the reality: the flesh and blood of Christ) of faith and love, these in isolation will hardly fashion more than a probable argument.

Concluding his letter to the Ephesians (20, 2), Ignatius gives expression to his hope of writing to them again on the

<sup>170</sup>Richardson (*op. cit.*, p. 72) has noted a probable double meaning for ἀγαπᾶν "denoting participation in the Eucharist as well as φιλαδελφία," the former meaning having already been advanced by Cotelier, Pearson, Aldrich, Hefele and Zahn. Lightfoot, however (*Apostolic Fathers*, Part II, Vol. II, Sect. 1, p. 307), thinks this meaning "lexically impossible, nor would the passage be improved by the interpretation, if it could stand."

<sup>171</sup>Bernard (p. clxviii) insists that "the point to be noted is the use of *σάρξ* for the Body of Christ in the Eucharist, as in Jn. 6, a phraseology not found elsewhere in the New Testament." Lightfoot (*Apostolic Fathers*, p. 258) holds the passage "doubtless suggested by" 1 Cor. 10, 16, 17.

<sup>172</sup>"It will be observed," remarks Bernard (p. clxxv), "that Ignatius, at any rate *in loc.*, associates *faith* with the Bread (as in Jn. 6), while he associates ἀγάπη with the wine (as in Jn. 15)." Lightfoot (*Apostolic Fathers*, p. 171) sees here only an indirect reference to the Eucharist: "The eucharistic bread and wine . . . represents also faith and love." Zahn (*Ignatius von Antiochien*, p. 349 sq., in Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, p. 171) believes faith and love are here the *means* whereby we participate in the flesh and blood of Christ, i.e., are united to Him.

subject of the New Dispensation in its relation to Christ, especially if he should learn that, among other things, they come together to "break one bread, which is the *medicine of immortality*, given as the antidote that we may not die, but have life in Jesus Christ forever."<sup>173</sup> True, John had said (6, 58; Douay, 59): "He that eateth this bread, shall live forever." Despite the parallelism in thought, however, the idea itself of life eternal through the Eucharist was certainly too commonplace, while the absence of verbal similarity is too apparent (though *verbal* similarity is a poor criterion when dealing with Ignatius), to suggest the necessity of recourse to the Fourth Evangelist.

To sum up. The Eucharistic passages in Ignatius (save for Rom. 7, 3), if considered each as an isolated unit, need not depend upon the Fourth Evangelist. Such a dependence, however, is postulated by Rom. 7, 3, by reason of the convincing argumentation outlined above. Further, the individual items of reminiscence supplied by Eph. 5, 2, Smyrn. 7, 1, Philad. 4, Trall. 8, 1 and Eph. 20, 2, though insufficient of themselves to fashion a thoroughly cogent argument group themselves together into a congeries that splendidly augments the independent strength of Rom. 7, 3.

#### B. THE LOGOS-CONCEPT

Ignatius tells the Magnesians that God inspired the prophets of old, to the end that disbelievers in later ages, by testing the prophecies, "might be convinced that there is one God, Who revealed Himself through Jesus Christ, His Son, Who is His Word, λόγος, proceeding from silence, Who in all things was well-pleasing to Him Who sent Him" (8, 2). He declares to the Ephesians that Christ is "the mind, γνῶμη, of the Father"

<sup>173</sup>To Zahn's mind (*Geschichte*, p. 904, note 3; cf. also his *Ignatii et Polycarpi Epistulae, Martyria, Fragmenta*, ed. post Dresselianam alteram tertia, fasc. II [Lipsiae, Hinrichs, 1876. Pp. lvi-403, p. 27] this passage and Smyrn. 7, 1 rest upon several verses of Jo. 6. Boese (p. 77) claims that Jn. 6, 58 certainly hovered before the Bishop's mind. The parallelism in thought has been noted likewise by Holtzmann (*Lehrbuch der Neutestamentlichen Theologie*, II [Freiburg im Br. und Leipzig, 1897. Pp. xi-332], p. 502, note 2), Loofs (*Leitfaden*, p. 101) and Rackl (p. 336).

(3, 2), "the knowledge, γνῶσιν, of God" (17, 2). He writes to the Romans that Christ is "the unerring mouth, στόμα, by which the Father has spoken truly" (8, 2).<sup>174</sup>

In John the idea of the Logos dominates the prolog. The Logos is presented in its triple relation: with *God* (the Logos is eternal, distinct from the Father (yet God: 1, 1-2), with the *world* (absolutely nothing that is subject to "becoming" comes into existence independently of the Logos: 1, 3), and with *humanity* (the Logos is the "Christ of *history*," 1, 14). Now, though the *doctrine* of the Logos is found in other writings of the New Testament,<sup>175</sup> the *term* is proper to John.<sup>176</sup> And, if we ask how this "Word" is to be understood, it is evident that, since the Word is said to be eternal, existing "with" God the Father, and Himself God, it is not to be understood as "verbum oris sensibile, sed verbum internum intellectus divini."<sup>177</sup>

The name Logos is applied by Ignatius to Jesus Christ, Who is for him the eternal<sup>178</sup> Son of God,<sup>179</sup> distinct from the

<sup>174</sup>To Reynolds (p. 700) a reference to the Fourth Gospel in Magn. 8, 2 is "obvious," as it is to Knabenbauer (p. 13). Lightfoot, too (*Apostolic Fathers*, p. 128), recognizes the reminiscence, as do Resch (p. 119), Lebreton (pp. 316-317, 320-321) and Jacquier (*Hist.*, p. 55). Höpfl (p. 11) remarks that Ignatius had before his eyes Jo. 8, 29 ("And he that sent me, is with me, and he hath not left me alone: for I do always the things that please him"); and on this verse of Jo., says Bernard (p. 304), "the language of Ignatius seems to rest;" while Dietze (p. 593) avers that an unprejudiced judge cannot fail to see here just such a borrowing. The weight of the *double* parallelism is admitted by Drummond (p. 258), Zahn (*Geschichte*, p. 904) and Gregory (p. 178). Over against such authorities, von der Goltz (p. 131) sees only a similarity in thought, and Schlier (p. 36) characteristically takes both Ignatius and John back to "der mandäische Gnosis."

<sup>175</sup>Cf. Col. 1, 13-20; 2, 9; Phil. 2, 5-11; Heb. 1, 1-4.

<sup>176</sup>1 Pet. 1, 23 and 2 Pet. 3, 5, as well as Heb. 4, 12, cannot be understood of a personal Word. We may note that the doctrine of Philo on the Logos is an amalgam of irreconcilable elements, bearing at most a superficial resemblance to John explicable by a common usage of the Old Testament. The *abstract* Logos that never attains true personality in Philo is countered in John by the *Word made Flesh*; Philo's *Demiurge* falls far short of the Johannine *Creative Word*; and, while the Philonic Logos is *Son of God* no otherwise than is the world, John presents a Divine Sonship infinitely different from the production of the world, and from the participated and analogous sonship of the children of God.

<sup>177</sup>Ceulemans, *Commentarius in Evangelium secundum Joannem* (Mechliniae, H. Dessain, 1929. Pp. 306-(14)], p. 7.

<sup>178</sup>Magn. 6, 1,

<sup>179</sup>Magn. 8, 2.

Father,<sup>180</sup> yet Himself God;<sup>181</sup> the Creative Word Who, before His Incarnation, "spoke, and it came to pass;"<sup>182</sup> true Man in the Incarnation.<sup>183</sup> Thus, the Ignatian Logos, like that of John, unlike that of Philo, is a concrete Being, is Creator, is Son of God with a strictly Divine Sonship. Since, therefore, Ignatius uses the *term* Logos in the sense of St. John, then, inasmuch as in John alone are this doctrine and this term combined, we have a strong argument for dependence on the Fourth Evangelist: an argument confirmed by the highly probable dependence of the relative clause, "Who in all things was well-pleasing etc.," on Jo. 8, 29. What are the principal objections against such dependence?

I. Von der Goltz (p. 131) emphasizes the complete absence of the Johannine forms. We reply that, though we hesitate to affirm with Dietze<sup>184</sup> that the agreement in form is not less exact than in the most sweeping Pauline reminiscences, there are certain considerations that render the accusation quite unjustifiable. Firstly, the relative clause closing Magn. 8, 2 does bear a striking resemblance to Jo. 8, 29, when we realize Ignatius' penchant for borrowing without "giving credit" either by actually citing or exactly quoting the original author: a manifestation of the recognized Ignatian "independence of form." Presupposing this, the use of the third person would then be quite necessary in this particular case if Ignatius is to reproduce the words of Christ. Secondly, the use of πέμπω in relation to Christ is "characteristically and almost exclusively Johannine."<sup>185</sup> Thirdly, the term Logos and its application have a corresponding term and application combined in the

<sup>180</sup>Magn. 6, 1:

<sup>181</sup>Eph. *inscr.*

<sup>182</sup>Lightfoot (*Apostolic Fathers*, p. 69) interprets this expression (Eph. 15, 1) of Christ's work on earth. It may be noted, though, that the expression seems borrowed from Ps. 32, 9 (cf. 148, 5), where it refers to creation.

<sup>183</sup>Magn. 8, 2; Rom. 8, 2; Smyrn. 1-4.

<sup>184</sup>*Op. cit.*, p. 593.

<sup>185</sup>Drummond, *op. cit.*, p. 258. Abbott (*Johannine Vocabulary* [London, Adam & Charles Black, 1905. Pp. xviii-364], p. 226) has the significant summary:

English	Greek	Mk.	Mt.	Lk.	Jn.
Send, including—	πέμπω	1	4	10	32
"He that sent (me, him)"	ὁ πέμψας (με, αὐτόν)	0	0	0	26

Fourth Gospel alone. Finally, the double parallelism (Logos and the relative clause) adds weight to the hypothesis of dependence.<sup>186</sup>

II. Again, von der Goltz (p. 131) does not find the *idea of the Creative Word* in Ignatius. But, apart from the fact that there is solid probability for the opinion that, in Eph. 15, 1, Ignatius does reflect the Creative Word, why should the Bishop on his way to martyrdom be expected to reflect specifically every phase of the Johannine Logos-doctrine?

III. Bauer<sup>187</sup> states that Ignatius identifies God with *συγή* while Abbott<sup>188</sup> deems "from Silence" "a dangerous expression, hardly possible for one who devoutly accepted the Fourth Gospel." In answer, it is not necessary to see with Rackl<sup>189</sup> a silence not of God but, as in Wisd. 18, 14, of "all things." For, as Lebreton (who admits that Ignatius is here, as elsewhere,—Eph. 19 1; Rom. 3, 2-3; 4, 2,—representing the Divine Life as a sovereign silence) has done,<sup>190</sup> we can justly deny that it is possible to find in the text an identification of "Silence" and God or any Gnostic tinge whatsoever. Lightfoot, showing that the Ignatian "procession from Silence" should be referred to the Incarnation,—inasmuch as a reference to the Divine Generation would neither suit the context nor accord with the language of Ignatius elsewhere,—touches our problem as he continues:

As Logos implies the manifestation of Deity whether in His words or in His works, so Sige is the negation of this. Hence the expression 'proceeding from silence' might be used at any point where there is a sudden transition from non-manifestation to manifestation; e.g. Wisd. xviii. 14, 15 . . . where the reference is to the destruction of the first-born in Egypt. To the Incarnation, as the chief manifestation of God through the Word, this language would be especially applicable. . . . Since therefore the

<sup>186</sup>Note that the Synoptic equivalent of our final relative clause is: "This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well-pleased" (Mt. 3, 17; 17, 5; cf. Mc. 1, 11; Lc. 3, 22).

<sup>187</sup>In Lebreton, *op. cit.*, p. 322, note 4.

<sup>188</sup>"Gospels," *op. cit.*, col. 1830.

<sup>189</sup>*Op. cit.*, p. 338.

<sup>190</sup>*Op. cit.*, p. 322, note 4.



whole context here relates to the Incarnation and human life of Christ . . . it is natural to refer ἀπό σιγῆς προελθῶν to the same.<sup>191</sup>

This interpretation of "Silence" is confirmed, as Lightfoot recognizes, by Eph. 19, 1-2, where Ignatius refers to the virginity and child-bearing of Mary and to the death of Christ as "three mysteries of outcry, which were done in the silence of God," and asks "how were they made manifest to the ages?"; also by Rom. 8, 2, where Christ is "the unerring mouth by which the Father has spoken truly." Then, too, προελθεῖν had just before (Magn. 7, 2) been used of the Incarnation. Abbott's objection falls with von der Goltz.

IV. In John, Christ is Logos from all eternity; in Ignatius, by the Incarnation. To this the obvious answer is that, though Ignatius may not assert the pre-existence of the Word here, he does not deny it.<sup>192</sup> And, if we note with Lebreton<sup>193</sup> the close alliance in Magn. 8, 2 of the "Son of God" with the "Word of God," the difficulty becomes even more remote.

We may sum up the differences between John and Ignatius under two points. Firstly, while John presents the Logos specifically, not only in His historical existence, but also in His eternal pre-existence, Ignatius refers expressly only to the Logos Who is the "Christ of history." Let us reflect, though, that the Gospel prolog is a deliberate condensation, in a few lines, of the very essence of the Gospel itself, and let us contrast with this the circumstances under which our Bishop wrote, his purpose in writing, and the absence of any intention of presenting a complete summary of the Logos-doctrine. Secondly, John's Logos is "verbum internum intellectus," Ignatius' Logos is "verbum oris sensibile;" a divergence which, together with its explanation, is reducible to the former. Finally, we cannot insist too much on the rugged strength of mind that almost compels Ignatius, not only so to digest another's thought as to express it in his own language, but actually to envelop it

<sup>191</sup>*Apostolic Fathers*, p. 127.

<sup>192</sup>Cf. Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, pp. 127-128.

<sup>193</sup>*Op. cit.*, pp. 320-321.

within the framework of his own original ideas.<sup>194</sup> To explain Magn. 8, 2 adequately, a recourse to the Fourth Evangelist seems necessary.

### C. THE HOLY SPIRIT

In Jo. 3, 8 we read: "The Spirit breatheth where he will; and thou hearest his voice, but thou knowest not whence he cometh, and whither he goeth: so is every one that is born of the Spirit." Christ, having told Nicodemus that he ought not marvel at the necessity of a rebirth, implies that, just as a thing is not to be denied because the manner in which it is done is obscure, so neither is the difficulty of knowing the way in which regeneration takes place a proof of its impossibility. This He illustrates by an example. The wind, here personified, blows wherever it pleases, without hindrance. One hears its whistling, but knows not from what determined place it begins to blow, nor where it will finally go. So, too, one can recognize the regenerated man from certain effects, but the process of that regeneration and its blessed term one cannot plainly comprehend.<sup>195</sup>

In Jo. 8, 14 we read: "Jesus answered and said to them: Although I give testimony of myself, my testimony is true: for I know whence I came, and whither I go: but you know not whence I come, or whither I go." Christ says in effect to the Pharisees: I know that I was begotten Son of God from the bosom of God, that I came visibly into this world by the Incarnation, that I will return into heaven by the Ascension. Therefore My testimony is true, for I am God, and God can neither be deceived nor deceive. But you, through your own fault, do not know My Divinity, you do not know that I am come from heaven and will return to heaven.<sup>196</sup>

Ignatius writes to the Philadelphians (7, 1): "For even

<sup>194</sup>Evidence Eph. 3, 2; 17, 2; Rom. 8, 2; quoted at the beginning of this section on the Logos-doctrine. Note that Zahn (*Geschichte*, p. 904) would explain Ignatius' application of "Logos" to the *Incarnate* Christ by having us see here "how the oldest readers of the Johannine writings understood the Logos-name."

<sup>195</sup>Cf. Ceulemans, *op. cit.*, p. 47.

<sup>196</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 120.

though some have desired to deceive me according to the flesh, yet the Spirit is not deceived, being from God. For He knoweth whence He cometh and whither He goeth, and reproveth that which is hidden."<sup>197</sup> The circumstance to which Ignatius alludes in the context is admittedly obscure. It seems best to hold with Lightfoot<sup>198</sup> that the phrase "according to the flesh" "points to some deceit practiced upon him (and perhaps successfully) in the common affairs of life. . . . In this province they might deceive him, but in the sphere of the Spirit no deception was possible." For the Spirit is from God, and, though no one else can trace His movements, He Himself knows them. Rackl, however,<sup>199</sup> interprets the context thus: Some persons wanted to lead me into error, but did not succeed. "According to the flesh" a deception was possible, for man, the flesh, does not know everything, does not know whence the Spirit comes and whither He goes. But "according to the Spirit" a deception is impossible: the Spirit, Who is from God, cannot be led astray, for He knows everything, even the hidden. He, Who is Himself Spirit, knows what no man knows: whence He comes and whither He goes.<sup>200</sup>

Concentrating on Jo. 3, 8, it is true that the Ignatian and Johannine contexts differ: that is but natural. The texts in question are identical, save for the person of the verb "to know." The thought, directly, is divergent. In John the par-

<sup>197</sup>A certain borrowing from Jo. 3, 8 is asserted by Pope (p. 276), de Grandmaison (p. 131), Reynolds (p. 700), Höpfl (p. 11), Knabenbauer (p. 13), Bernard (p. 108), Lightfoot (*Apostolic Fathers*, p. 266; *Biblical Essays*, p. 82), Bardsley (p. 211), Zahn (*Geschichte*, pp. 903-904), Rackl (pp. 331-333), Resch (p. 80) and Dietze (pp. 598-599); and at least implied by Boese (p. 77), Strachan (p. 875), Lagrange (p. xxvi), Jacquier (*Hist.*, p. 56), Drummond (p. 257) and Stanton (pp. 19-20). A highly probable dependence is the tenet of Camerlynck (pp. 35-36) and Inge (p. 82), while Srawley (p. 29) hovers between a dependence on the Gospel and a Johannine atmosphere. Abbott ("Gospels," col. 1830) believes Ignatius closer to Philo, Schlier (p. 142) closer to Gnosticism. Von der Goltz (pp. 135-136) holds the explanation of textual dependence no more probable than several others, and Richardson (p. 74) appears to incline to a theory of coincidence, due to "general currency."

<sup>198</sup>*Apostolic Fathers*, p. 266.

<sup>199</sup>*Op. cit.*, p. 332.

<sup>200</sup>Gregory (*Canon*, p. 178) refers *pneuma* to "Ignatius' own spirit." Highly improbable, at best.

ticular expression is the first member of a comparison with the Spirit, and, since a comparison is instituted not with itself but with something analogous, it is logical to interpret John's *pneuma* in the first member as referring directly to the wind.<sup>201</sup> The *pneuma* of the Ignatian text refers *only* to the *Holy Spirit*.

What, then, are the arguments for dependence on the Fourth Evangelist? Firstly, the literal repetition of the Johannine phraseology in Ignatius, who could not have come closer to a citation without expressly quoting the passage. Secondly, the thought-relation is not lacking. For it is certainly true that the concept of the movements of the Holy Spirit, invisible to men but none the less efficacious for all that, is at least the necessary basis or complement of the phrase in John, just as it is the very essence of the phrase in Ignatius. Thirdly, as Lightfoot remarks, the application in the Gospel is natural. The application in Ignatius is strained and secondary, nor is his language at all explicable, except as an adaptation of a familiar passage.<sup>202</sup>

Finally, Dietze's argument<sup>203</sup> deserves a hearing. Ignatius, he says, is defending himself against the reproach of uncovering factions by "gadding about the community fishing for news." He protests: "It is not flesh and blood that have revealed this to me, but the Spirit, and He cannot err, *because* He is from God. *For* the Spirit knoweth, etc." Now, for Ignatius' conclusion to be valid, he must argue to the inerrancy of the Spirit either because He is from God or because He knows whence He comes and whither He goes: "beides nebeneinander

<sup>201</sup>True, Rackl holds (*op. cit.*, p. 332) that "in John too, at least indirectly, the question is of the Holy Spirit," so as to conclude that the knowledge which John denies of men, Ignatius asserts affirmatively of the Spirit of God. If by "indirectly" Rackl means that the second member of the comparison is implied in the first, it appears more logical to hold that the reference to the incomprehensible movements of the Spirit in the process of regeneration is rather implied in the succeeding "so too is every one that is born of the Spirit." At any rate, it is certain that, in the *context* at least, it is *implied* that the Spirit "knows whence He cometh and whither He goeth."

<sup>202</sup>*Apostolic Fathers*, p. 226. Cf. Drummond (*op. cit.*, p. 257): "It can hardly be questioned that in John the connection is more appropriate and original." Here is grist to the mill that would seek to establish Johannine priority on purely internal grounds.

<sup>203</sup>*Op. cit.*, pp. 598-599.

ist zu viel." And, because the second phrase merely repeats the first, the "for" cannot be intended as proof. Hence the sentence that it introduces is intended precisely as a citation; "for" is equivalent to the German "nämlich." This "citation" would then rest upon a combination of Jo. 8, 14 and 3, 8. In 8, 14 Christ makes use of this expression in the same way and for the same end as Ignatius. This testimony of Christ in the same situation would then be the occasion of the "citation," and, seeing that the subject was the Spirit, Jo. 3, 8 would come to mind with the form of the expression there found. Thus the "citation" would have received the form we actually find in Ignatius.<sup>204</sup> Dietze may not have written *finis* to the controversy, but his thoughtful study has surely presented us with a confirmatory argument.

After the above presentation it would seem that the only objection of import is the claim of a dependence of Philad. 7, 1 on Philo.<sup>205</sup> But, as Bernard has pointed out,<sup>206</sup> Philo's "conviction speaking to the soul says to her: Whence comest thou and whither goest thou?", is not verbally akin to Ignatius as is Jo. 3, 8, and bears no resemblance in thought. Schlier's case for a debt to Gnosticism is patently unconvincing, and there is little reason for questioning a dependence on the Fourth Evangelist, and specifically on the expression as it appears in Jo. 3, 8 alone, or in 8, 14 alone, or as a combination of the two.

In His conversation with the Samaritan woman, Christ exclaims that, if she only knew the tremendous favor granted her by God, that is, of speaking with *Him*, if she knew Who it was Who spoke to her and asked her for drink, she would undoubtedly have asked of Him, and He would have given her "living water": water, that is, gushing forth ceaselessly from a fountain (Jo. 4, 10). This "living water" is grace,

<sup>204</sup>Somewhat in the same vein, Bardsley (p. 211) and Zahn (*Geschichte*, p. 903).

<sup>205</sup>Thus Abbott ("Gospels," col. 1830) holds that the expression is "a tradition from Gen. 16, 8, quoted by Philo." . . . "Ignatius is closer to Philo than to John."

<sup>206</sup>*Op. cit.*, p. 108, note 2. Note that Dr. Bernard errs in attributing this part of the article on the "Gospels" to Schmiedel. The actual author is Abbott.

which quenches the thirst of the soul and becomes in it the source of eternal life. This grace exists in the soul as a perennial fountain (V. 14), ever gushing, "springing up into life everlasting," that is, leading the soul by a series of graces and by meritorious works to eternal blessedness.<sup>207</sup> And, if we turn to Jo. 7, 38, we hear from the lips of Christ that He will pour out upon the believer the gifts of the Holy Ghost (cf. v. 39), not only to revivify the soul, but that, like "rivers of living water," they may overflow into every good work.<sup>208</sup>

Ignatius, on the road to martyrdom, deliberately seeking death in the midst of life and its attractions, writes to the Romans (7, 2): "My lust has been crucified, and there is not in me the fire of love for material things: but there is water living and speaking in me, saying within me: Come to the Father." There is little doubt but that Ignatius' "living water" is the Holy Spirit.<sup>209</sup>

The employment of the identical phrase, "living water" ὕδωρ ζῶν, in a metaphorical sense, of the same object, the Spirit, is a telling stroke for the hypothesis of a "borrowing" from John. Secondly, the fact that the sentence immediately following, "I delight not in the food of corruption, etc.," has proved a strong argument for dependence, lends added strength to our already powerful case. Bardsley's "Mosaic of Johannisms" is no mere play of fancy. Thirdly, if, instead of "and speaking" (καὶ λαλοῦν), "springing up" (ἀλλόμενον) be the correct reading,<sup>210</sup> the parallel with Jo. 4, 14 is likewise strik-

<sup>207</sup>Cf. Ceulemans, *op. cit.*, pp. 59, 60.

<sup>208</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 112.

<sup>209</sup>Plummer (p. 108; cf. p. 149) holds the Ignatian "living water" "a scarcely doubtful reference" to Jo. 4, 10. Lightfoot (*Apostolic Fathers*, p. 224) considers the reference "doubtless." Reynolds (p. 700) refers it to 4, 14, and Bardsley (p. 210) is enthusiastic about a use of c. 4. High probability is again Inge's verdict (pp. 81-82). Stanton (p. 19) sees here "an interpretation and application of the saying to the woman of Samaria," effected through combining it with Christ's teaching elsewhere in Jo. The hypothesis of dependence on Jo. 4, 10 ff. and 7, 39 is "thoroughly cogent" to Dietze (p. 597). Von der Goltz (p. 132), Richardson and Schilling (p. 50, note 86) deny the possibility of proving such a dependence.

<sup>210</sup>As Lightfoot (*Apostolic Fathers*, p. 224) and Bardsley (p. 210) are disposed to believe.

ing, especially as only in John is ἄλλομαι applied to water.<sup>211</sup> Fourthly, the words "Come to the Father" suggest the thought of Jo. 4, 23: "The Father seeketh such, etc." Finally, the obscurity of the expression is inexplicable unless we hold that Ignatius could presuppose in his readers the knowledge of the metaphor *and* its application to the Holy Spirit. But where, save in John, do the metaphor and application appear simultaneously?

Against a dependence on John it has been urged by Richardson<sup>212</sup> that the phrase "living water" is such a common Greek metaphor that no argument can be drawn from its use. *But* our argument for dependence is based not on the use of the metaphor *as such*, but on the *application* of the metaphor to the Holy Spirit. More elusive is Schilling's theory<sup>213</sup> that "the living water speaking within" is an image borrowed from the 'speaking fountains' at Daphne . . . The popular view was that he who drank this 'talking water' would receive prophetic inspiration." This is more than doubtful when we try to conceive how Ignatius, after having personally applied the phrase to the Holy Spirit, could rely on his Roman readers to make the application themselves.

#### IV. THE PROBLEM RE-POSED

The foregoing discussion has shown that we can postulate for Ignatius a dependence upon the *author* of the Fourth Gospel.<sup>214</sup> The problem of passing beyond this conclusion and

<sup>211</sup>Abbott, *Johannine Grammar* (London, Adam & Charles Black, 1906. Pp. xxvii-687), p. 243.

<sup>212</sup>*Op. cit.*, p. 74.

<sup>213</sup>*Op. cit.*, p. 50, note 86. A theory propounded before Schilling by Jortin among others.

<sup>214</sup>Many more Ignatian texts might have been developed to the same degree. Thus, Philad. 9, 1, where Ignatius calls Christ the "door of the Father," and where the affinity of thought and expression is so great that no reasonable doubt can be urged against dependence. On the other hand, the expression "the prince of this world" (Eph. 17, 1; 19, 1; Magn. 1, 2; Trall. 4, 2; Rom. 7, 1; Philad. 6, 2) appears to the present writer more akin to Pauline thought and phraseology than to Johannine. The reference to the anointing of Christ in Eph. 17, 1 depends rather on Mt. 26, 7 than on Jo. 12, 3. This von der Goltz (p. 136) has shown very shrewdly, and Dietze (pp. 596-597) is in perfect accord with his "adversary" on this text.

maintaining that Ignatius depended upon the actual *text* of the Gospel, would be simplified if the Fourth Gospel, as we have it, never constituted the subject-matter of its author's public discourses or intimate conferences, but saw the light of day only as a written document. In this case, since it appears that in the first half of the second century the Fourth Gospel was actually circulating in Middle Egypt,<sup>215</sup> there would be little difficulty in its transmission from Ephesus<sup>216</sup> to Antioch in time for Ignatius to steep himself in its doctrine and spirit.

Our problem, however, is so elusive precisely because the substance of the Gospel was included within the apparently larger compass of John's oral subject-matter, even if it did not issue from his lips under the precise form, division, unity and reflective character of the written record. For the primary office of the Apostle was to teach, and, since the Fourth Gospel deals with important phases of the life and personality of the Master, it is inconceivable that John would have neglected the substance of these events in his oral teaching. Further, the Gospel itself furnishes intrinsic evidence of long-continued repetition with the help of memory.<sup>217</sup> Finally, New Testament scholars appear to take such oral preaching for granted.<sup>218</sup> Which leaves the question wide-open. For then the oral trans-

<sup>215</sup>This on the basis of the discovery of a fragment of a leaf of a papyrus codex, containing on the recto part of Jo. 18, 31-33 and on the verso part of Jo. 18, 37-38. Cf. C. H. Roberts, ed., *An Unpublished Fragment of the Fourth Gospel in the John Rylands Library* (Manchester, Manchester U. Press, 1935. Pp. 35), p. 25.

<sup>216</sup>On Antioch as an improbable cradle of the Fourth Gospel, cf. Durand, *op. cit.*, pp. xix-xx; cf. also Lagrange, *op. cit.*, p. lxvi.

<sup>217</sup>Cf. P. Gaechter, S.J., *Summa Introductionis in Novum Testamentum* (Oeniponte Lipsiae, Rauch, 1938. Pp. x-252-11), p. 173; specifically his "Der formale Aufbau der Abschiedsrede Jesu," *Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie*, LVIII (1934), pp. 155-207. Note that the *Verbum Domini* review of Fr. Gaechter's *Summa* (XVIII, 1938, p. 288\*\*) claims that the strophic constructions proposed by the author, especially in Jo., have not yet been proved by convincing arguments. Note, too, that Gaechter holds for textual acquaintance on the part of Ignatius (*Summa*, pp. 169-170).

<sup>218</sup>Cf. Gaechter (*Summa*, p. 173), Huby (*L'Évangile et les Évangiles* [Paris, Grasset, 1939. Pp. 306], p. 242), Grandmaison (*op. cit.*, I, p. 183), Lightfoot (*Biblical Essays*, p. 197), Stanton (*The Gospels as Historical Documents, Part III. The Fourth Gospel* [Cambridge, University Press, 1920. Pp. x-293], pp. 178-179), Donovan (*op. cit.*, pp. 31-32), MacRory (*The Gospel of St. John*, ed. 4 [St. Louis, Herder, 1916. Pp. lviii-378], p. xlvii). For other arguments, see Donovan, pp. 47, 206.



mission of the substance of the Gospel would account for the striking affinity in thought, while the employment by Ignatius of such isolated Johannine phrases as we have studied would hardly postulate the precise form, division, unity and reflective character of our actual text.<sup>219</sup>

If, then, Ignatius never made the acquaintance of the written Gospel, he must have absorbed its substance either through the medium of personal discipleship, or through contact with a Johannine School, or by way of oral tradition. The earliest direct statement that Ignatius was a disciple of John occurs in the *Martyrium Colbertinum*, in itself a "legendary forgery of the fourth or fifth century."<sup>220</sup> Neither Irenaeus nor Eusebius nor Chrysostom mentions such a relationship. Jerome, in *Eusebii Chronicon* II (PL 27, 461), adds Ignatius to Eusebius' Papias and Polycarp as "auditores insignes" of John, but in his later notice of Ignatius and Polycarp in *De Viris Illustribus*, cc. 16, 17 (PL 23, 665-668), he twice mentions Polycarp as a disciple, but not Ignatius, "notwithstanding the temptation."<sup>221</sup> Consequently, as also because of Jerome's own admission of the hurried composition of a book dictated with great rapidity to a secretary (Preface to *Chronicon*, Bk. II, PL 27, 223-224), Lightfoot concludes that more probably the author did not intend to class Ignatius as "auditor" but only as "insignis." If he actually intended the former, he was simply mistaken. Such is the fragile foundation of the later tradition concerning Ignatius' discipleship.

<sup>219</sup>If, however, it is true, as Huby (*op. cit.*, pp. 244-245) and Stanton (*Gospels*, III, pp. 178-179) hold, that John's Logos-doctrine was not the seed from which the remainder of the Fourth Gospel developed, but rather the "open blossom," the harmonious synthesis acquired only after the body of the Gospel had "accumulated during years of meditation and teaching;" if it is true that "in the Prologue and the remainder of the Gospel we have the history of the Evangelist's thought in inverse order," we may find difficulty in explaining Ignatius' Logos save by recourse to the written document. Yet, though I grant that *the Prolog as we have it* was more probably never preached anterior to its composition as a Gospel summary, I am loath to admit that John never used or strove to expound *the term Logos* till he came to pen his recollections and reflections.

<sup>220</sup>Funk-Bihlmeyer, p. xxxiii, note 1.

<sup>221</sup>Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, II, II, 1, p. 477.

Lightfoot has remarked that "we may, without any great impropriety, speak of the 'school of St. John'."<sup>222</sup> The Muratorian Fragment mentions "his fellow-disciples" and "his bishops" as importuning John for a written Gospel. Clement of Alexandria tells of John appointing bishops round about Ephesus and seeing in other ways to the formation of individual Churches.<sup>223</sup> Irenaeus often appeals to such a body as preserving and transmitting Apostolic tradition.<sup>224</sup> More eminent in the School would be Polycarp,<sup>225</sup> Papias,<sup>226</sup> Pothinus<sup>227</sup> and Irenaeus<sup>228</sup>.

The hypothesis of oral tradition, advancing a step, would have the preaching of John directed to a still wider audience than his immediate disciples; would have that preaching repeated, often *verbatim*, by auditors conscious of a precious spiritual treasure in these reflections of the Beloved Disciple; would thus have the doctrine of John propagated far and wide until there actually existed a living, fluid Johannine tradition, a prolonged contact with which would have made possible a very definite, rather complete knowledge of the doctrine and phraseology later incorporated into the Fourth Gospel.

The possibility, even the probability, of a well-formed oral tradition, wherein the words of John would often have been repeated *verbatim*, is clear if we consider the capacity of many peoples, particularly of the East, for verbal repetition. This is especially true when the language is naturally rhythmical, when the art of printing is unknown, and when writing itself is subsidiary to speech. With the spoken word the principal medium of tradition in the primitive Church, the language used for the Johannine oral tradition would be one of the

<sup>222</sup>*Essays on the Work Entitled Supernatural Religion* (London & N. Y., Macmillan, 1889. Pp. ix-324), p. 217. Cf. Pope's table of "The School of St. John in Asia Minor" in *Aids*, IV (ed. 2), p. 273; he includes Ignatius.

<sup>223</sup>*Quis dives salvetur*, 42.

<sup>224</sup>Cf. *Adv. Haer.* 2, 22, 5; 3, 3, 4; 5, 33, 3; Eus., *Hist. Eccl.* 5, 20.

<sup>225</sup>Eus., *Hist. Eccl.* 5, 20.

<sup>226</sup>Irenaeus, *Adv. Haer.* 5, 33, 4.

<sup>227</sup>Eus., *Hist. Eccl.* 5, 5.

<sup>228</sup>*Ibid.*, 5, 20.

ancient languages of the East, or possibly Greek,<sup>229</sup> any one of which would have lent itself with ease to the art of oral tradition. And, as Grandmaison has pointed out,<sup>230</sup> the exact transmission of compositions of the oral style occurs with a surety and facility which surprise us. Very often the people of the East were able to repeat, word for word, whole and entire, speeches heard but once. We are, therefore, justified in concluding that there existed at the turn of the first century a rather exact and widespread oral Johannine tradition.

Did Ignatius of Antioch come in contact with the Johannine School or oral tradition? We cannot affirm with certainty that he did: it is foolhardy to assert with von der Goltz that acquaintance with the text of the Gospel alone is insufficient to account for the close affinity. Since however, we are ignorant, on the one hand, of the extent to which the Johannine oral tradition penetrated during those latter decades of the first century, and, on the other, the antecedents of Ignatius—his early life, education, ministry, travels—are shrouded in complete darkness, we cannot affirm with certainty that this contact did not take place, that it was not so prolonged that Johannine thought and phraseology became part and parcel of his mental equipment and public exposition of doctrine.

As a result of the present investigation, it is the personal conviction of the author that the hypothesis of a textual dependence on the Fourth Gospel is by far the most satisfying. But, since our quest has been, and is, for scientific certitude, we must admit that we cannot at present see our way clear to a flat rejection of the hypothesis of oral tradition or (less likely) a Johannine School. For him who is convinced that these hypotheses are unjustifiable conjectures, the problem is solved. For our own part, however, the treatment of this serious difficulty remains the Ignatian problem of the future.

<sup>229</sup>Cf. Gaechter's thesis (*Summa*, p. 175): ". . . adhibito interprete, qui alta voce graece repeteret, quae apostolus ei aramaice submisce dicebat."

<sup>230</sup>*Op. cit.*, I, pp. 201-209.