THE UNIVERSITY of EDINBURGH

IGNATIUS OF ANTIOCH AND THE ARIAN CONTROVERSY

By
Paul R. Gilliam III

Ph.D. Thesis
University of Edinburgh
2011

The research found in the pages of this thesis is my own. This work has not been submitted towards any other degree or professional qualification.

Paul R. Gilliam III

ABSTRACT

The goal of this thesis is to demonstrate the presence of a fourth-century controversy surrounding the second-century Christian martyr Ignatius of Antioch. Scholars are well acquainted with the Ignatian controversy of the seventeenth, eighteenth, and nineteenth centuries. This thesis will show that many years before there existed another controversy over Ignatius of Antioch. During the fourth century, representatives of both Nicene and non-Nicene Christologies sought to conscript Ignatius in order to defend their understanding of orthodox Christianity.

I will expose this nasty fight via the narrative found in the next five chapters. In the opening chapter, I will marshal textual evidence that leads to the conclusion that the Ignatian middle recension is riddled with textual alterations introduced by proponents of Nicene Christology. In chapters two and three, I will argue that the Ignatian long recension represents a response to these Nicene alterations by a Non-Nicene individual or party that possessed a Christology compatible with the *Ekthesis Macrostichos* creed of Antioch 344. I will demonstrate that both the Ignatian long reension and the *Macrostichos* understand Jesus to be equal with God as well as subordinate to God. Chapter four will catalogue the embrace of Ignatius of Antioch by a variety of fourth-century Christian leaders, with a focus on the Nicene Athanasius of Alexandria and the non-Nicene Eusebius of Caesarea. The concluding chapter will direct attention to John Chrysostom's sermon *In sanctum Ignatium martyrem*. The evidence leads me to conclude that by the end of the fourth century Ignatius of Antioch had become such a controversial figure that Chrysostom felt the need to defend Ignatius' character before he could put forth Ignaitus as a model for Antiochene Chrisitans to emulate.

There has been much scholarly work devoted to Ignatius of Antioch and there has been much scholarly work devoted to the Arian controversy. Until now, this personality and this controversy have not been brought together for close inspection.

DEDICATION

Ad memoriam William Whiston
December 9, 1667 – August 22, 1752
Cambridge Univeristy Lucasian Professor of Mathematics 1702-1710

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The road I have traveled in route to the completion of a terminal degree has been arduous but immensely rewarding. I have been enrolled in an institution of higher education, in pursuit of one degree or another, since 1989. As I come to the end of this road, I wish to express my gratitude to numerous people and institutions.

I am grateful to the churches that have supported my academic endeavors. I would be remiss if I did not mention them by name. I completed my Gardner-Webb University Master of Divinity degree while serving as pastor to Henrietta First Baptist Church in Henrietta, North Carolina. I completed my University of North Carolina at Charlotte Master of Arts degree in religious studies while serving as pastor to Caroleen Baptist Church in Caroleen, North Carolina. This Ph.D. thesis was written while serving as interim pastor to Livingston Baptist Church Dedridge in Livingston, Scotland and as pastor to Mulberry Grove Baptist Church in Buckingham, Virginia. These congregations hold some of the finest people I know.

I am grateful for the two and a half years my family lived in Edinburgh. I treasured each opportunity I had to walk the streets and to absorb the atmosphere of this magnificent city. My wife, Lou Ann, our daughter, Matty Grace, and I were pleased to find such a rich community in university family housing on Blacket Avenue. Furthermore, the international community of Preston Street Primary School served as a superb place for Matty Grace to begin her formal education.

I am grateful for the collegial and challenging academic environment I encountered at the University of Edinburgh's School of Divinity – New College. Dr. Sara Parvis and Dr. Paul Parvis provided me with expert and attentive supervision. Their knowledge of Patrisics and care for their students is inspiring. I formed numerous meaningful relationships with fellow post-graduate students while at New College. Amongst those, I would like to acknowledge Karl Shuve and Daniel Johansson. Intellectual exchange with these men was stimulating and meal gatherings with their respective families refreshing.

I am forever grateful for the circle of supportive women in my life. This circle includes Lou Ann, Matty Grace, my mother, Marleen Carroll, my grandmother, Jane Gilliam, and my aunt, Dee Anderson. Their belief in my abilities motivated me during my most fatigued moments.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

The goal of this thesis is to demonstrate the presence of a fourth-century controversy surrounding the second-century Christian martyr Ignatius of Antioch. Scholars, of course, are well acquainted with the Ignatian controversy of the seventeenth, eighteenth, and nineteenth centuries.[1] This thesis will show that many years before there existed another controversy over Ignatius of Antioch. During the fourth century, representatives of both Nicene and non-Nicene Christologies sought to conscript Ignatius in order to defend their understanding of orthodox Christianity.

I will expose this fight over Ignatius via the narrative found in the next five chapters. In the opening chapter, I will marshal textual evidence that leads to the conclusion that the Ignatian middle recension comes to us peppered with textual alterations introduced by proponents of Nicene Christology. In chapter two, I will lay the foundation for the third chapter via a Christological profile of the Ignatian long recension. In chapter three then I will contend that the Ignatian long recension represents a response to the perceived Nicene alterations revealed in the opening chapter by a Non-Nicene individual or party that possessed a Christology compatible with the *Ekthesis Machrostichos* creed of Antioch 344. Chapter four will catalogue the embrace of Ignatius of Antioch by a variety of fourth-century Christian leaders, with a focus on the Nicene Athanasius of Alexandria and the non-Nicene Eusebius of Caesarea. The concluding chapter will argue that by the end of the fourth century Ignatius was still such a controversial figure that John Chrysostom found it necessary to offer a defense of Ignatius in his *In sanctum Ignatium martyrem*.

While I will interact with a broad range of scholarship throughout this thesis, James D. Smith III's ThD dissertation, "The Ignatian Long Recension and Christian Communities in Fourth Century Syrian Antioch," will loom large in the background and, at various points throughout this thesis, it will take center stage (in chapters

---

[1] I will offer a brief discussion of aspects of this controversy below in order to provide a context for my own work. Detailed narratives, however, are found in numerous places. For example, see J.B. Lightfoot, *The Apostolic Fathers* (Part 2, 3 vols.; *Ignatius, St. Polycarp*; 2nd ed.: London and New York: Macmillan and Co., 1889), 2.1.76-86, 280-327, 237-245; Stephen Neil and Tom Wright, *The Interpretation of the New Testament 1861-1986* (New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988), 44-53; Allen Brent, *Ignatius of Antioch: A Martyr Bishop and the Origin of the Episcopasy* (London and New York: T&T Clark, 2009; originally published 2007), 1-13.

three and five).[2] Smith's work is a creative historical reconstruction of the genesis of the Ignatian long recension. Smith concludes that:

> … the Arian party in Antioch located the remains of the venerable martyr-bishop Ignatius in the Christian cemetery ca, AD 364-373 … The 'rediscovery' of the Ignatian relics and the 'redaction' of the Ignatian literary corpus belong together, as products of the same community. This community, in a time of need, sought to appropriate Ignatius as their own saint and advocate. They had this opportunity because of his relative obscurity – his persona was a field not yet cultivated.[3]

As interesting as Smith's thesis is, the results of my research yield opposing conclusions. The evidence examined in the forthcoming chapters make it very difficult to believe that Ignatius was a person of "relative obscurity" or that "his persona was a field not yet cultivated." Rather, this evidence leads to the conclusion that Ignatius of Antioch was one of the battlefields upon which the fourth-century 'Arian' controversy raged.[4] It is hoped that my work will be judged an advance upon Smith's thesis. At the very least the evidence displayed in the forthcoming pages,

---

[2] James David Smith III, "The Ignatian Long Recension and Christian Communities in Fourth Century Syrian Antioch" (Th.D. diss., Harvard University, 1986).

[3] Ibid., 13-14

[4] There is now a solid consensus, with which I agree, that acknowledges the problems with referring to this fourth-century Christological controversy with the rubric 'Arian.' I retain this terminology, nonetheless, for convenience, and because, at the end of the day, Arius himself did have a role in the early phases of the debate. For a discussion see R.P.C. Hanson, *The Search for the Christian Doctrine of God: The Arian Controversy 318-381* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1988; repr. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Baker Academic, 2005), xvii-xxi. Hanson writes in the opening paragraph, "This book is about what is conventionally known as 'The Arian Controversy', but neither the word 'Arian' nor the word 'controversy' appears in the main title. The reason for this is that the author is convinced that the expression 'the Arian Controversy' is a serious misnomer." Building on the work of Hanson, Lewis Ayres writes, "First the controversy is mistakenly called Arian. No clear party sought to preserve Arius' theology. Many who are termed Arian justly protested their ignorance of his teaching or works: their theologies often have significantly different concerns and preoccupations." See Lewis Ayres, *Nicaea and its Legacy: An Approach to Fourth-Century Trinitarian Theology* (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2004; Paperback, 2006), 13. Even Sara Parvis, who maintains some more traditional views in relation to Arius and the controversy that has come to be so closely associated with his name, believes that after Athanasius and Marcellus had spent a year together in Rome "a new animal emerges in the writings of both: the full-blown Arian heresy, modelled on the construct of old heresiologies …" Later she writes, "If Marcellus and Athanasius can be convicted of less than perfect charity and generosity towards those who meant them and their allies harm, it could also be argued that the Eusebian alliance deserved their fifteen hundred years as 'Arian', if not in every case for their theological views, then at least for their political choices." See Sara Parvis, *Marcellus of Ancyra and the Lost Years of the Arian Controversy 325-345* (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2006), 181 and 192. Notice the use of the phrase "Arian Controversy" in the main title of her book and its absence from the main title of Hanson's and Ayres' books.

with the accompanying interpretation, will serve as a fundamentally different historical reconstruction than that offered by Smith.

Before commencing my argument, a few comments are in order as to why this discovery of a fourth-century Ignatian battlefield has not been made before. This is an especially interesting question in light of the abundance of scholarly interest in both Ignatius of Antioch and the Arian controversy. The necessity for my work is better understood within the larger context of Ignatian scholarship.

The Legacy of J.B. Lightfoot and Theodor Zahn

Ignatius of Antioch was the centre of scholarly controversy during the seventeenth through nineteenth centuries. Scholars of these centuries were in search of the historical Ignatius. By the time William Cureton edited and published his *The Ancient Syriac Version of the Epistles of St. Ignatius to St. Polycarp, the Ephesians, and the Romans: Together with Extracts from his Epistles, collected from the Writings of Severus of Antioch, Timotheus of Alexandria, and others, Edited with an English Translation and Notes: also the Greek Text of these Three Epistles, Corrected According to the Authority of the Syriac Version* in 1845, there were three different recensions claiming the name of Ignatius of Antioch.[5] The short recension (now known as the Curetonian letters) contained three letters in Syriac: Ignatius' letter to *Polycarp*, to the *Ephesians*, and to the *Romans*. The middle recension, initially uncovered via two Latin manuscripts (containing *Rom.* but embedded within the *Acts of Martyrdom*) in 1644 by James Usher but later discovered in the famous Greek Medicean manuscript (lost from this manuscript is the *Acts of Martyrdom* and thus *Romans*) of Florence in 1646, contained these three letters in a lengthier form as well as four additional letters: Ignatius' letter to the *Magnesians*, to the *Trallians*, to the *Philadelphians*, and to the *Smyrnaeans*. The long recension, first published from a Latin manuscript in 1498 and then from a Greek manuscript in 1557, contained all of the above seven letters in an even lengthier form plus six additional letters: Ignatius' letter to *Mary of Cassobola* and her reply, to the *Tarsians*, to the *Philippians*, to the *Antiochenes*, and to *Hero*. Interestingly, some or all of these six

[5] William Cureton, *The Ancient Syriac Version of the Epistles of St. Ignatius to St. Polycarp, the Ephesians, and the Romans: Together with Extracts from his Epistles, collected from the Writings of Severus of Antioch, Timotheus of Alexandria, and others, Edited with an English Translation and Notes: also the Greek Text of these Three Epistles, Corrected According to the Authority of the Syriac Version* (London and Berlin: Rivingtons, Asher & Co., 1845).

additional letters were also found attached to most of the manuscripts containing the middle recension of the first seven letters. The question of the day was: will the real Ignatius please stand up?

Cureton thought the three Syriac Ignatian letters, which he himself edited and presented to the scholarly world, represented the authentic Ignatius of Antioch. He defended his views in the above mentioned *The Ancient Syriac Version of the Epistles of St. Ignatius to St. Polycarp, the Ephesians, and the Romans*. His views were met with serious objection by an anonymous author in an article published in the *English Review*. The author was later identified as Dr. Charles Wordsworth, who at the time was a fellow Canon at Westminster with Cureton. Cureton responded to Wordsworth in his 1846 *Vindiciae Ignatianae; or The Genuine Writings of St. Ignatius, As Exhibited in the Ancient Syriac Version, Vindicated From the Charge of Heresy*.[6]

Cureton's arguments were so persuasive that J.B. Lightfoot initially held to the authenticity of the short Syriac recension. What makes Lightfoot's one time belief in the authenticity of the short Syriac recension remarkable is that his own monumental work *The Apostolic Fathers* - part 2 - *S. Ignatius, St. Polycarp* (2nd ed. 1889) has served to cement the current consensus view of the authenticity of the seven letters of the *middle* recension.[7] In the preface to the 1885 first edition of his *The Apostolic Fathers*, Lightfoot describes the process through which his change of mind occurred. He identifies two main factors:[8] 1) his study of the relationship between the Armenian and Syriac convinced him that there had existed a complete Syriac version of the Greek middle recension found in the Medicean manuscript and 2) the publication of Theodor Zahn's *Ignatius von Antiochien* in 1873.[9]

The nineteenth-century works of Theodor Zahn and J.B. Lightfoot have provided the stamina for a nearly 140 year old consensus concerning the authenticity

---

[6] William Cureton, *Vindiciae Ignatianae; or The Genuine Writings of St. Ignatius, As Exhibited in the Ancient Syriac Version, Vindicated From the Charge of Heresy* (London: Rivingtons, 1846).

[7] For an article where he expresses his earlier views see J.B. Lightfoot, "Two Neglected Facts Bearing on the Ignatian Controversy," *Journal of Philology* 1.2 (1868): 47-55. He states in the opening paragraph, "It is not my intention to enter upon the general question of the authenticity of the Ignatian Epistles; though it may be as well to state at the outset that in my opinion the Syriac version, published by Cureton, represents the letters of the father in their genuine form."

[8] Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, 2.1.ix-x.

[9] Theodor Zahn, *Ignatius von Antiochien* (Gotha: Friedrich Andreas Perthes, 1873).

of the middle recension. Today, the Ignatius of the middle recension stands head and shoulders above the Ignatius of the short or the long recension.

Contemporary Ignatian Scholarship

Contemporary scholarship on Ignatius of Antioch continues to be focused on issues surrounding the historical Ignatius. There have been five significant works that have attempted to overthrow the consensus view established by Zahn and Lightfoot. They are: 1) Reinoud Weijenbog's 1969 book, *Les letters d'Ignace*[10], 2) Robert Joly's 1979 book, *Le dossier d'Ignace d'Antioche*[11], 3) Josep Rius-Camps' 1980 book, *The Four Authentic Letters of Ignatius*[12], 4) R.M. Hübner's 1997 *Zeitschrift für antikes Christentum* article, "Thesen zur Echtheit und Datierung der seiben Briefe des Ignatius Antiochen,"[13] and 5) T. Lechner's 1999 book *Ignatius adversus Valentinianos? Chronologische und theologiegeschichtliche Studien zu Briefen des Ignatius von Antiochen*.[14] Because these works have received so much attention from other scholars, they need no further discussion here.[15] Though they have raised the eyebrows of the scholarly community, none of these works have garnered a following. In fact, the major modern work on Ignatius, William Schoedel's 1985 commentary *Ignatius of Antioch*, defends the views of Zahn and Lightfoot concerning the authenticity of the middle recension.[16]

---

[10] Reinoud Weijenbog, *Les letters d'Ignace d'Antioche* (Leiden: Brill, 1969).

[11] Robert Joly, *Le dossier d'Ignace d'Antioche* (Université libre de Bruxelles, Facultéde Philosophie et Lettres 69; Brussles: Editions de l'Université de Bruxelles, 1979).

[12] Josep Rius-Camps, *The Four Authentic Letters of Ignatius* (Rome: Pontificium Institutum Orientalium Studiorum, 1980).

[13] R.M. Hübner, "Thesen zur Echtheit und Daiterung der sieben Briefe des Ignatius Antiochen," *Zeitschrift f*ür *antikes Christentum* 1 (1997): 44-72.

[14] T. Lechner, *Ignatius adversus Valentinianos? Chronologische und theologiegeschichtliche Studien zu Briefen des Ignatius von Antiochen* (Vigiliae Christianae; Supplement Series 47; Leiden: Brill, 1999).

[15] C.P. Hammond Bammel offers a detailed review of Joly's *Le dossier d'Ignace d'Antioche* and Rius-Camps' *The Four Authentic Letters of Ignatius* in his "Ignatian Problems," *Journal of Theological Studies* N.S. 33 (1982): 62-97. William Schoedel too offers an extensive review of Joly's and Rius-Camps' work as well as Reinoud Weijenbog's, *Les letters d'Ignace d'Antioche* in his "Are the Letters of Ignatius of Antioch Authentic?," *Religious Studies Review* 6 (1980): 196-201. Christine Trevett summarizes the work of Weijenborg, Rius-Camps, and Jolly in her often quoted *A Study of Ignatius of Antioch in Syria and Asia* (Studies in the Bible and Early Christianity 29; Lewiston: Edwin Mellen Press, 1992), 11-15. All five of these works are summarized and critiqued in detail in Brent, *Ignatius of Antioch*, 95-143.

[16] William Schoedel, *Ignatius of Antioch* (Hermeneia; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1985). See also Schoedel, "Are the Letters of Ignatius of Antioch Authentic?"

Though the attempted overthrow by a few scholars of the authenticity of the middle recension has not met with any significant approval, scholars are now open to a later dating for the Ignatian letters of the middle recension. In fact, it is becoming fashionable to question the traditional date of Ignatius' martyrdom argued for by Lightfoot - a few years on either side of 110 C.E. The reason for this development is the perceived inconsistencies between the forms of Christianity represented in the middle recension of Ignatius' letters and what scholars think they know of early second-century Christianity. In his contribution to his own edited 2007 book *The Writings of the Apostolic Fathers*, Paul Foster argues for a date of 125-150 CE.[17] In his article, "The Date of Ignatius," Timothy Barnes attempts to narrow the gap even further. He puts forth a date of 140 for the martyrdom of Ignatius.[18]

Continued evidence for the focus upon the historical Ignatius in contemporary scholarship is found in the work of Allen Brent. He argues in his 2006 book, *Ignatius of Antioch and the Second Sophistic: A Study of Early Christian Transformation of Pagan Culture,* that the historical background for understanding the message of the middle recension of Ignatius' letters is the pagan and Hellenistic world of the city states in second-century Asia Minor.[19] In addition, even more recent scholarly works devoted to Ignatius of Antioch demonstrate a continual fascination with the historical Ignatius of the early- to mid second century. John-Paul Lotz seeks to understand Ignatius' use of ὁμόνοια within the time period between the Flavians and the Antonines in his 2007 book, *Ignatius and Concord: The Background and Use of the Language of Concord in the Letters of Ignatius of Antioch*.[20] Thomas A. Robinson is interested in Ignatius' understanding of Christianity's break with Judaism in his 2009 book *Ignatius of Antioch and the Parting of the Ways: Early Jewish-Christian Relations*.[21]

---

[17] Paul Foster, "The Epistles of Ignatius of Antioch," in *The Writings of the Apostolic Fathers* (ed. Paul Foster; London: T&T Clark, 2007), 81-107.

[18] Timothy Barnes, "The Date of Ignatius," *Expository Times* 120/3 (2008): 119-130.

[19] Allen Brent, *Ignatius of Antioch and the Second Sophistic: A Study of an Early Christian Transformation of Pagan Culture* (Studien und Texte zu Antike Christentum; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006.

[20] John-Paul Lotz, *Ignatius and Concord: The Background and Use of the Language of Concord in the Letters of Ignatius of Antioch* (New York: Peter Lang Publishing, 2007).

[21] Thomas A. Robinson, *Ignatius of Antioch and the Parting of the Ways: Early Jewish-Christian Relations* (Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson Publishers, 2009). This is a particularly interesting book. Robinson uses Ignatius to argue against the current trend within the academy to view the parting of the ways between Christians and Jews as a late development. In a telling statement he writes on p.

The Invitation to an Exploration of Ignatius of Antioch and the Fourth Century

Though scholars continue to focus attention on the historical Ignatius of the early- to mid-second century, the Ignatian long recension provides an open invitation to investigate the role that Ignatius of Antioch played in the fourth-century Arian controversy. The reason for this is the commonplace scholarly dating of the Ignatian long recension to the Christological debates of the fourth century, which this thesis affirms.[22] Though this invitation has been ripe since the settling of the question concerning which recension holds the historical Ignatius, the invitation has thus far been largely neglected by the scholarly community. Where it is has been accepted, as we shall see, the exploration has started and ended with the Ignatian long recension itself. In other words, there has been no investigation of the role Ignatius of Antioch played in the Arian controversy as a whole.

Much superb scholarship has been directed towards issues surrounding the second-century martyr from Antioch. With many of those important issues addressed, and in some cases adequately answered, the field is indeed ripe for an exploration into the role Ignatius of Antioch played during the fourth-century Arian controversy. In the forthcoming chapters, I will display the evidence that leads me to conclude that Ignatius was a contentious figure in the Christological controversies of the fourth century. In contrast with the thesis of James D. Smith III that Ignatius was an obscure figure until sometime between 364-373, I will contend that Ignatius was a well-known figure from the beginning of the fourth century and that pro-Nicene and non-Nicene proponents were fighting to claim him as their own as early as 350 or perhaps even a few years before.

240, "The problem with the modern redirection of the target or intensity of anti-Jewish statements in early Christian documents is that it smacks too much of a sanitizing effort … We do not help the struggles of the present by sanitizing the past. We must seek other ways to handle the problems of ancient language and attitude." Along the way, Robinson also provides well informed and up to date discussions of important issues surrounding Ignatius of Antioch.

[22] I will offer a detailed discussion of scholarly opinions regarding the Ignatian long recension and its historical context in chapter three.

CHAPTER ONE

THE ARIAN CONTROVERSY AND THE 'AUTHENTIC' LETTERS OF IGNATIUS OF ANTIOCH

Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to demonstrate significant Christological textual variants within the seven 'authentic' letters of Ignatius of Antioch and, therefore, to reveal that the text tradition of the middle recension, like the long recension (though to a lesser degree), has been affected by the fourth-century Arian controversy. My findings may be surprising to some due to the current concrete consensus concerning the authenticity of the seven Ignatian letters mentioned by Eusebius of Caesarea (*Ecclesiastical History* 3.36). The monumental works, in relatively modern times, of Theodor Zahn and J.B. Lightfoot have served as a mighty bulwark against any who wish to argue for the authenticity of the long recension or for the authenticity of the short recension (otherwise known as the Curetonian letters).[1] It may be, however, that Stephen Neil and Tom Wright are correct when they say:

> In a sense he [Lightfoot] had done it too well. Every elementary text-book of Church history today takes for granted the authenticity of the letters of Clement and of the seven letters of Ignatius, and uses them as primary source material for the history of the sub-apostolic age. As a result the majority of theological students do not even know that their authenticity was even

[1] Theodor Zahn, *Ignatius von Antiochien* (Gotha: Friedrich Andreas Perthes, 1873) and J.B. Lightfoot, *The Apostolic Fathers* (Part 2, 3 vols.; *Ignatius, St. Polycarp*; 2nd ed.: London and New York: Macmillan and Co., 1889). It must be remembered, as stated in the introduction, that at one time Lightfoot himself favored the authenticity of the Curetonian letters over the middle recension. See J.B. Lightfoot, "Two Neglected Facts Bearing on the Ignatian Controversy," *Journal of Philology* 1.2 (1868): 47-55. It must also be stated that Cureton's initial argument for the authenticity of the short recension, as well as his defence against his opponents, is masterful. See, for example, William Cureton, *Vindiciae Ignatianae; or The Genuine Writings of St. Ignatius, As Exhibited in the Ancient Syriac Version, Vindicated From the Charge of Heresy* (London: Rivingtons, 1846) and William Cureton, *Corpus Ignatianum: A Complete Collection of the Ignatian Epistles, Genuine, Interpolated, and Spurious; Together with Numerous Extracts from them as Quoted by Ecclesiastical Writers Down to the Tenth Century; In Syriac, Greek, and Latin: An English Translation of the Syriac Text, Copious Notes, and Introduction* (London: Francis and John Rivington, 1849). In the end, it seems to me, that internal considerations finally win the argument in favor of the Curetonian epistles serving as an abridgment of the more lengthy letters of the middle recension, rather than as the authentic letters themselves. As they stand, the Curetonian letters are not complete.

> seriously questioned, and that one of the greatest critical battles of the century was fought about them.[2]

Likewise, it seems that in the appropriate admiration for the work of Zahn and Lightfoot, there is very little scholarly discussion concerning the reality that there is a complex textual tradition underneath any modern edited eclectic text of the Ignatian corpus. Lightfoot, for example, constructs his Ignatian text from three different recensions (short, middle, and long), six different languages (Greek, Latin, Armenian, Syriac, Coptic, and Arabic), and as many as fifty-one manuscripts.[3]

Many of the differences between these manuscripts and versions are insignificant. They include changes in word order, spellings, the addition and subtraction of the definite article, and omissions due to homoioteleuton. My research, however, yields that within this mass of insignificant textual variants of various types, there are several significant Christological textual variants that can be traced to the Arian controversy.[4] Scholars have made this observation for many years in relation to the long recension of Ignatius' letters, even before the discovery of the middle recension and before the discovery of the short recension. In this chapter, I wish to show the presence of this same dynamic within the middle recension of the Ignatian corpus.[5] The results of my research will in no way challenge the consensus

---

[2] Stephen Neil and Tom Wright, *The Interpretation of the New Testament 1861-1986* (New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988), 61. Though this book represents an excellent piece of New Testament scholarship, the treatment of the past Ignatian controversy is equally superb. See pp. 44-64.

[3] For his discussion of "Manuscripts and Versions" see Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, 2.1.70-134. Lightfoot does conclude that some of these manuscripts are worthless for text critical purposes and thus does not record the readings of them all. Nonetheless, his catalogue gives an impressive inventory of the number of manuscripts known to be in existence containing all or parts of the Ignatian corpus – both spurious and authentic. Since Lightfoot's work in the nineteenth century an additional manuscript – Berlin papyrus 10581 – has been discovered. It is dated to the fifth century and contains *Smyrn.* 3.3-12.1. In addition, it appears that Lightfoot did not know about Codex Taurinensis for the Roman letter. Karl Bihlmeyer states about this codex, "… eine Kollation der bisher unbenützten Taurinerhs., auf die übrigens schon J. Pasini 1749 aufmerksam gemacht hatte (vgl. Funk-Diekamp, Patres Apost. II, LXX f.) stellte mir Prof. Diekamp in Münster gütigst zur Verfügung." See Karl Bihlmeyer, ed., *Die Apostolischen Väter: Neubearbeitung der Funkschen Ausgabe* (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr <Paul Siebeck>, 1956), xxxvi.

[4] I have identified additional Christological textual variants that cannot necessarily be directly connected with fourth-century Christological concerns. Since they are beyond the scope of this thesis, I will not discuss them in this chapter. These highly interesting variants are found in *Rom.* 4.1; *Smyrn.* 2.1, 3.2, 4.2.

[5] My results concur with those of Bart Ehrman in his article, "Textual Traditions Compared: The New Testament and the Apostolic Fathers," in *The Reception of the New Testament in the Apostolic Fathers* (ed. Andrew F. Gregory and Christopher M. Tuckett; New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), 9-27. In this article, Ehrman demonstrates that just as scribes altered New Testament texts both accidentally (e.g., spelling errors and parablepsis brought about by homoioteleuton) and intentionally (e.g., concerns about harmonizing different readings, concerns to

view in regard to the authenticity of the middle recension of the seven Eusebian Ignatian epistles. The results will, however, demonstrate that the actual texts of those seven epistles are not as concretely settled as commonly supposed.[6] The textual tradition of the middle recension contains plentiful evidence that Ignatius' 'authentic' letters were altered by scribes with vested interests in the Christological debates of their day. These significant Christological variants of the middle recension deserve more scholarly attention than they have received in the past.[7]

In the pages to follow, I will offer a discussion of the textual variants that are related to Ignatius' God language. I will propose that the textual tradition provides evidence for a scribal intensification of Ignatius' God language and that this intensification can in all probability be traced to fourth-century concerns. Because of the influence it has exerted on all subsequent studies, I will in each case take Lightfoot's text as a starting point for my discussion. Then, building upon this initial investigation, I will discuss additional variants I am confident can be traced back to fourth-century Christological concerns. I will demonstrate then, with the cumulative evidence of the Ignatian God language variants and the additional fourth-century Ignatian variants, that the middle recension of Ignatius' letters, like the long recension of Ignatius' letters, has been impacted by later Christological concerns associated with the fourth-century Arian controversy.

---

restrict the roles of women in the church, and concerns over doctrinal debates), so did those scribes who copied the collection of documents commonly referred to as the Apostolic Fathers.

[6] Paul Foster writes, "Thus the consensus which has emerged in modern scholarship and is reflected in printed editions is that the seven epistles of the Middle Recension represent the genuine form of the epistles of Ignatius, though perhaps it would be better from a text-critical perspective to say that they represent the earliest recoverable stage of the textual transmission of the Ignatian letters." His comment is helpful in that he does not suggest that scholars are able to know 'the original text' Ignatius penned sometime in the early to mid second century. His comment does, however, unintentionally conceal the complexity of the textual tradition behind the Ignatian epistles. See Paul Foster, "The Epistles of Ignatius of Antioch," in *The Writings of the Apostolic Fathers* (ed. Paul Foster; London: T&T Clark, 2007), 84. As we shall see, in relation to the forthcoming Christological variants, different editors make different textual choices. There are, then, considerable differences in the actual texts that scholars reconstruct.

[7] Readers familiar with scholarship related to New Testament textual criticism will quickly recognize the parallels between my work here with the Ignatian letters and Bart Ehrman's book *The Orthodox Corruption of Scripture: The Effect of Early Christological Controversies on the Text of the New Testament* (New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993). Ehrman writes on page xi, "My thesis can be stated simply: scribes occasionally altered words of their sacred texts to make them more patently orthodox and to prevent their misuse by Christians who espoused aberrant views." There is no evidence that Ignatius' letters were ever considered Scripture on par with, say, Paul's letters or the canonical gospels. My research reveals, however, that it is clear that Ignatius' letters were a battle ground upon which later Christological controversies were fought.

Table of Variants and Text-Critical Methodology

The forthcoming discussion will be complex. As an aid to the reader, I provide the following tables. I list the variants in the order they will be discussed. I also provide a brief discussion of the text-critical methodology I use in dealing with these variants.

God Language Variants

Text	Significant Variants?	Where in the Manuscript Tradition?
1- *Ephesians* 18.2	No	
2- *Romans* Inscription (1)	No	
3- *Polycarp* 8.3	No	
4- *Ephesians* 1.1	Yes	a) Armenian b) Greek of the long recension
5- *Romans* 6.3	Yes	a) Greek of the long recension b) *Acts of the Metaphrast* c) Armenian Martyrology
6- *Ephesians* Inscription	Yes	a) Greek of the long recension b) Armenian
7- *Romans* Inscription (2)	Yes	a) *Acts of the Metaphrast* b) Greek of the long recension c) Syriac of the short recension d) Armenian
8- *Romans* 3.3	Yes	a) Syriac of the short recension b) Greek of the long recension
9- *Romans* 7.3	Yes	a) Greek middle recension of the Colbertine manuscript b) *Acts of the Metaphrast*

		c) Greek of the long recension
10 – *Trallians* 7.1	Yes	a) Armenian
11- *Smyrnaeans* 10.1	Yes	a) Armenian
12- *Smyrnaeans* 6.1	Yes	a) Syriac fragment 1 b) Timothy of Alexandria
13- *Smyrnaeans* 1.1	Yes	a) Armenian b) Coptic
14 – *Romans* 9.1	Yes	a) Codex Hierosolymitanus

Free Standing Arian Controversy Variants

Text	**Significant Variants?**	**Where in the Manuscript Tradition?**
1- *Magnesians* 8.2	Yes	a) Greek of the middle recension b) Latin of the middle recension c) Timothy of Alexandria
2- *Ephesians* 7.2	Yes	a) Armenian b) Greek of the middle recension c) Latin of the middle recension
3- *Magnesians* 7.1	Yes	a) Syriac fragment 1 b) Armenian c) Greek of the long recension d) John of Damascus
4- *Magnesians* 13.2	Yes	a) Armenian b) Greek of the long recension

With characteristically keen insight, Lightfoot says, "The Ignatian Epistles are an exceptionally good training ground for the student of early Christian literature and history. They present in typical and instructive forms the most varied problems, textual, exegetical, doctrinal, and historical."[8] Nowhere has this statement proven truer than in the field of textual criticism. In fact the complexity of the textual tradition behind the Ignatian letters is matched only by that of the New Testament documents themselves. I will, therefore, interact with New Testament text critics as I put forward my own text-critical methodology for the Ignatian letters.

In his article "Reasoned Eclecticism in New Testament Textual Criticism," Michael Holmes, following the lead of Gordon Fee and Eldon Epp, provides terminology for three approaches when dealing with the many New Testament manuscripts and their variants. 1) "Rigorous eclectic" describes methodologies that depend fundamentally on internal concerns (style of the author, surrounding historical context, vocabulary …). 2) "Historical documentary" describes methodologies that depend fundamentally on external evidence (date of manuscripts, genealogical families …). 3) "Reasoned eclectic" describes methodologies that equally combine both internal and external evidence when making decisions about variant readings found in manuscripts.[9] Holmes goes on to state that a clear consensus is present in today's text-critical landscape. The great majority of scholars employ a reasoned eclectic methodology. Yet he acknowledges this paradox: "the time of greatest apparent agreement about method is also marked by substantial disagreement about the lasting status of that method (as well as the results it has produced)."[10]

---

[8] Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, 2.1.xv.

[9] Michael W. Holmes, "Reasoned Eclecticism in New Testament Textual Criticism," in *The Text of the New Testament in Contemporary Research: Essays on the Status Quaestionis* (ed. Bart D. Ehrman and Michael W. Holmes; Studies and Documents 46; Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1995), 338. For the work of Fee see G.D. Fee, "Rigorous or Reasoned Eclecticism – Which?" in *Studies in New Testament Language and Text: Essays in Honour of George D. Kilpatrick on the Occasion of His Sixty-fifth Birthday* (ed. J.K. Elliot; NovTSupp 44; Leiden: Brill, 1976), 174-197. The article is reprinted in Eldon J. Epp and Gordon D. Fee, *Studies in the Theory and Method of New Testament Textual Criticism* (SD 45; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993), 124-140. For the work of Epp see Eldon Epp, "Textual Criticism," in *The New Testament and Its Modern Interpreters* (ed. E.J. Epp and George W. MacRae, S.J.; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989), 75-126. This article is reprinted as "Decision Points in Past, Present, and Future New Testament Textual Criticism," in Eldon J. Epp and Gordon D. Fee, *Studies in the Theory and Method of New Testament Textual Criticism* (SD 45; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993), 17-44.

[10] Holmes, "Reasoned Eclecticism in New Testament Textual Criticism," 345.

Perhaps this is why J. Keith Elliott's article "Thoroughgoing Eclecticism in New Testament Textual Criticism" is so persuasive. What Holmes calls "rigorous eclectic," Elliot labels "thoroughgoing eclecticism." Elliot says that thoroughgoing eclecticism "is the method that allows internal considerations for a reading's originality to be given priority over documentary considerations."[11] Furthermore, "This critic is sceptical about the high claims made for the reliability of some MSS or about arguments favoring a particular group of MSS."[12] The most persuasive aspects of Elliot's preferred text-critical methodology are 1) just because a reading appears in an early manuscript and the same reading also has high testimony in other manuscripts, this does not necessarily mean that the reading is authentic, and 2) the basic questions in deciding the authenticity of a reading deal with the style of the author and the author's historical location (especially in relation to doctrinal development).

In the forthcoming discussion of textual variants within the Ignatian corpus, I will not dismiss external considerations all together. I will, however, following the lead of Elliot, rely heavily on internal considerations. In particular, I will seek to resolve textual questions with the ultimate goal of placing Ignatius' Christology within what we know about Christology of the early to mid second century.

Ignatius' God Language

After an examination of the textual evidence, I am in agreement with most scholars that Ignatius of Antioch, the early to mid second-century[13] Christian martyr, does call Jesus "God." In disagreement, however, with many of these same scholars this characteristic does not strike me as novel. John's gospel, which was composed either contemporaneous with Ignatius' letters or a couple of decades before, contains

---

[11] J. Keith Elliot, "Thoroughgoing Eclecticism in New Testament Textual Criticism," in *The Text of the New Testament in Contemporary Research: Essays on the Status Quaestionis* (Studies and Documents 46; ed. Bart D. Ehrman and Michael W. Holmes; Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1995), 321.

[12] Ibid.

[13] For a detailed article that deals, among many other things, with the date of Ignatius' letters see C.P. Hammond Bammel, "Ignatian Problems," *Journal of Theological Studies* N.S. 33 (1982): 62-97. For a more succinct and recent treatment see Paul Foster, "The Epistles of Ignatius of Antioch," 84-89. Foster concludes on pages 88-89, "The majority of scholars retain the traditional dating by Lightfoot of around 110 CE, without showing awareness of its flimsy basis. It remains possible to maintain Ignatian authorship of the seven genuine epistles, but to recognize that the date of their composition could be significantly later than usually assumed …, one may conclude that the letters could have been composed at some stage during the second quarter of the second century, i.e. 125-50 CE, roughly corresponding to Hadrian's reign or the earlier part of Antoninus Pius' period in office."

no hesitation about calling Jesus "God" (John 1.1, 1.14, 20.28; cf. John 5.18, 8.58, 10.30). In addition, the apostle Paul, our earliest Christian writer, clearly equates Jesus with God (Phil 2.6; cf. 1 Cor 8.6; 2 Cor. 8.9; Gal 4.4; Col 1.15-20) and he may even directly call Jesus "God" (Rom 9.5). In his article, "God Language in Ignatius of Antioch," Bishop Demetrios Trakatellis emphasizes the frequency with which Ignatius uses the word θεός – God – or a compound of θεός.[14] But, as I shall soon demonstrate, the textual tradition suggests that Ignatius does not call Jesus "God" with the frequency that is usually assumed. Even, however, if Ignatius does call Jesus "God" with the frequency that some modern critical editions indicate, this does not mean that the eleven occurrences, identified by Trakatellis, where Ignatius labels Jesus θεός somehow represent a unique development within early Christian literature.[15] In fact, Trakatellis appears to contradict the premise of his whole article with his concluding paragraph:

> Ignatius, the bishop of Antioch, evidently did not invent his Christology … What Ignatius did was to interpret the Johannine and Pauline christological traditions or formulas in a way that could serve the immediate and pressing needs of the church and, by extension, his own needs in view of his impending martyrdom. One of the results of his interpretation is his fascinating God language. [16]

I concur with Trakatellis here, with one exception. The God language of John and Paul (and the letter to the Hebrews, Revelation, and, I would argue, even Mark's gospel) is just as fascinating as that of Ignatius of Antioch. When Ignatius calls Jesus "God" he is simply carrying on a very early tradition that he himself inherited. I now turn to the texts themselves.

Ephesians 18.2, *Romans* Inscription (1), and *Polycarp* 8.1

The first observation to make is a simple one: there are three places in the middle recension of the Ignatian letters where Ignatius calls Jesus "God" and there are no major variants. There are eleven other places in the middle recension where significant elements of the textual tradition indicate that Ignatius calls Jesus "God." This calculation includes those places where Ignatius directly calls Jesus "God"

---

[14] Bishop Demetrios Trakatellis, "God Language in Ignatius of Antioch," in *The Future of Early Christianity: Essays in Honor of Helmut Koester* (ed. Birger A. Pearson; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1991), 422-430.

[15] Ibid., 425-426.

[16] Ibid., 430.

(*Trall.* 7.1; *Smyrn.* 1.1, 6.1, 10.1; *Rom.* 9.1). This calculation also includes those places where an accompanying pronoun such as "our" is included along with Ignatius' confession of Jesus as God (*Eph.* inscription, 18.2; *Rom.* inscription [twice], 3.3; *Pol.* 8.3). Finally this calculation includes the places where "God" is linked with "blood" or "suffering" or "bread" when, instead of "God," the term "Christ" might seem more appropriate to the second-century historical context of Ignatius of Antioch (*Eph.* 1.1; *Rom.* 6.3, 7.3).

I quickly list the three occurrences of Ignatian God language where there are no major textual variants. In *Ephesians* 18.2, Lightfoot's text reads, ὁ γὰρ θεός ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦς ὁ Χριστὸς ἐκυοφορήθη ὑπὸ Μαρίας κατ᾽ οἰκονομίαν … "for our God Jesus Christ was conceived by Mary according to the plan …"[17] Lightfoot's text of *Romans* inscription (1) reads, κατὰ πίστιν καὶ ἀγάπην Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν … "according to the faith and love of Jesus Christ our God …" Finally, Lightfoot's text of *Polycarp* 8.3 reads, ἐρρῶσθαι ὑμᾶς διὰ παντὸς ἐν θεῷ ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστῷ εὔχομαι … "I wish that you fare well always in our God Jesus Christ…" Thus, to the extent that the textual evidence allows us to know exactly what the historical Ignatius wrote, we can determine that on at least three occasions Ignatius calls Jesus "God."[18] But, what about the other eleven places where some aspect of the Ignatian textual tradition labels Jesus "God"?

Ephesians 1.1 and *Romans 6.3*

It is, perhaps, ubiquitously assumed that where the middle recension refers to Jesus as "God" and the long recension refers to Jesus in the same place as "Christ" or "Saviour" or "Lord," the middle recension is to be preferred in terms of authenticity. Perhaps this is often the case, but is it always so? I want to query this assumption in relation to *Ephesians* 1.1. *Ephesians* 1.1 of Lightfoot's edition reads, … μιμηταὶ

[17] Each time I quote a Greek text I will introduce the quotation with something like, "Lightfoot's text reads." The reason is that the very variants discussed make it difficult to say something like, "Ignatius says." Even so, I will argue for the likelihood that Ignatius did not call Jesus "God" fourteen times as the textual tradition renders possible. Unless otherwise indicated, all Greek translations are mine. Lightfoot does not break his chapters into sections. Therefore, the section numbers that I use are those found in Bart D. Ehrman, ed. and trans., *The Apostolic Fathers* (Loeb Classical Library; 2 vols.; Cambridge, Mass. and London: Harvard University Press, 2003).

[18] For a detailed discussion of the dates of the various manuscripts and versions containing the Ignatian epistles see again Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, 2.1.70-134. His work is so thorough and detailed (and in most respects has so well survived the test of time) that I feel confident in accepting the dates he gives for the manuscripts and versions in my forthcoming discussions of various texts and issues related to those texts.

ὄντες θεοῦ, ἀναζωπυρήσαντες ἐν αἵματι θεοῦ … "being imitators of God, inflamed in the blood of God." The expression, "inflamed in the blood of God" has variants. θεοῦ is witnessed to by the Geek and Latin of the middle recension as well as the Syriac of the short recension.[19] In addition, Severus of Antioch has this reading in the Syriac translation of his writings. The reading "blood of God," however, has two dissenting voices. The clause is not in the Armenian version. Lightfoot is of the opinion that this is due to homoioteleuton. The other dissenting witness is that of the long recension. The long recension, in Lightfoot's text, reads, … μιμηταὶ ὄντες θεοῦ φιλανθρωπίας, ἀναζωπυρήσαντες ἐν αἵματι Χριστοῦ … "being imitators of God's kindness, inflamed in the blood of Christ."

I ask if it is possible that "blood of Christ" is more likely authentic than "blood of God" for several reasons. First, even though the long recension contains obvious interpolations based on a later fourth-century period and the manuscripts that compose the long recension date from the eleventh century at the earliest, Lightfoot says:

> The Long Recension was constructed, as we have seen, by some unknown author, probably in the later half of the fourth century, from the genuine Ignatian Epistles by interpolation, alteration, and omission. If therefore we can ascertain in any given passage the Greek text of the genuine epistles which this author had before him, we have traced the reading back to an earlier part in the stream than the direct Greek and Latin authorities, probably even than the Syriac version ... , where he [the interpolator] adheres pretty closely to the text of the genuine Ignatius, as for instance through great parts of the Epistles to Polycarp and to the Romans, the readings of this recension deserve every consideration.[20]

---

[19] In order to facilitate easier reading, I will write out in full the names of the various manuscripts. Standard abbreviations, however, are: G = Greek original of the middle recension (Medicean and Colbertine), Ġ = Paris fragment of the Ephesian epistle of the middle recension, P = Berlin Papyrus codex 10581 *(Smyrn.* 3.3-12.1), L = Latin of the middle recension (L1 and L2 are the manuscripts of this version, but L2 is now lost), A = Armenian translation of the middle recension, S = Syriac fragments of the middle recension (S1, S2, S3, and S4 are the collections of fragments belonging to this recension), C = Coptic translation of the middle recension, Arabic = Arabic translation of the middle recension, Σ = Syriac short recension, g = Greek of the long recension, and l = Latin of the long recension. For the *Roman* epistle alone: G = Codex Parisiensis-Colbertinus, H = Codex Hierosolymitanus S. Sabae, K = Codex Sinaiticus, T = Codex Taurinensis, Sm = Syriac version of Ignatius' martyrdom, Am = Armenian version of Ignatius' martyrdom, and M = *Acts of the Metaphrast*. These symbols are taken from a combination of Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, 2.29-10 and Michael W. Holmes, ed. and trans., *The Apostolic Fathers* (3d ed.; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Baker Academic, 2007), 175-176.

[20] Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, 2.2.4.

Though this variant is from a letter that is heavily interpolated, and not *Polycarp* or *Romans*, the long recension here is very close to the middle recension. In other words, this is not a heavily interpolated sentence as is found in many other places of the long recension of *Ephesians*.

Second, there are indeed places where Lightfoot himself favors readings from the Greek long recension instead of readings from the Greek or Latin of the middle recension or readings from the earlier versions (e.g., *Eph.* 5.1; *Trall.* inscription). I ask: if there are other examples where a reading from the Greek of the long recension proves the favourite over other authorities, even when the reading from the Greek of the long recension is in the minority, then why would it not be possible in the case of the "blood of Christ" instead of the "blood of God"? It seems to me that this is an example where the Greek text from which the interpolator built the long recension contains the more likely authentic reading.

I want to continue to push the rationale for asking this question in regards to *Ephesians* 1.1. If the question is valid here, it is also valid in other places where some manuscripts of the textual tradition indicate that Ignatius calls Jesus "God" and other manuscripts of the same text indicate that Ignatius calls Jesus "Christ" or "Lord" or "Saviour," and still other manuscripts may omit the text in question all together. Why should we necessarily favour the God language when there are equally valid variants?

A third reason, then, for my query concerning the possibility of the "blood of Christ" as more authentic than the "blood of God" is simply that this language seems to fit better with the second-century time period. Lightfoot draws attention to Acts 20.28 but, as he himself notes, there is a textual variant here as well. In this text, the apostle Paul is preparing to depart Ephesus for Jerusalem. He informs the Ephesian elders that danger awaits him and that they will not see him again. Paul tells the elders to care for τὴν ἐκκλησίαν τοῦ θεοῦ ἣν περιεποιήσατο διὰ τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ ἰδίου ... "the church of God which he obtained through his own blood." Instead of "church of God," many manuscripts read "church of the Lord." Among the manuscripts that contain "Lord" instead of "God" are P74 and codex Alexandrinus. On the other hand, both codex Sinaiticus and codex Vaticanus contain "God" instead of "Lord." Lightfoot writes, "…θεοῦ is most probably the correct reading." Of

course, P74 was not edited until 1964.[21] Perhaps, knowledge of this papyrus would have changed Lightfoot's decision regarding this reading. Tertullian uses the phrase, "blood of God" in *Ad uxorem* 2.3. Tertullian's voluminous writings, however, post-date Ignatius. In Christian writings before or contemporaneous with Ignatius of Antioch, the phrase "blood of Christ" is frequent (e.g., 1 Cor 10.16; Eph 2.13; Heb 9.14; 1 Pet 1.19; cf. 1 Pet 1.2; Rev 1.5). And, of course, Ignatius himself uses the phrase "blood of Christ" (*Smyrn.* 1.1, 6.1) and "blood of Jesus Christ (*Trall.* 8.1; *Phild.* inscription). As further evidence, there are no significant variants in these places where Ignatius uses the rhetoric "blood of Christ" and "blood of Jesus Christ."

A fourth reason for considering "blood of Christ" as more likely authentic than "blood of God" is that the interpolator of the long recension is not at all shy about calling Jesus "God." One good example is the long recension's version of the famous early Christian confession of *Ephesians* 7. After identifying God the Father as the only true God and physician, the interpolator continues, ἔχομεν ἰατρὸν καὶ τὸν Κύριον ἡμῶν θεὸν Ἰησοῦν τὸν Χριστόν, τὸν πρὸ αἰώνων υἱὸν μονογενῆ καὶ λόγον, … "we have as our physician and Lord God Jesus the Christ, the only begotten Son and Word before the ages." This text is clearly representative of a non-Nicene perspective. There is a distinction between the Father as ὁ μόνος ἀληθινὸς θεός – ''the only true God" and the Son as τὸν Κύριον ἡμῶν θεὸν Ἰησοῦν τὸν Χριστόν – ''the Lord our God Jesus the Christ." Nonetheless, the word θεός is not withheld from Jesus. In fact, elsewhere, in *Polycarp* 8.3 of the long recension, the interpolator leaves the God language just as it is in the middle recension – ἐρρῶσθαι ὑμᾶς διὰ παντὸς ἐν θεῷ ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστῷ εὔχομαι –"I wish that you fare well always in our God Jesus Christ…"[22]

---

[21] For a helpful discussion of the New Testament papyri and New Testament textual criticism as a whole see Bruce Metzger, *The Text of the New Testament: Its Transmission, Corruption, and Restoration* (3d ed.; New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992). For a more basic, yet exceptionally clear, overview of New Testament textual criticism see J. Harold Greenlee, *Introduction to New Testament Textual Criticism* (rev. ed., Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson Publishers, 1995). In relation to P74, Metzger says on p. 41, "Today it is in a poor state of preservation, and contains, with many lacunae, portions of the Book of Acts, James, 1 and 2 Peter, 1, 2, and 3 John, and Jude. The type of text which it preserves agrees frequently with the Alexandrian witness." Greenlee, in contrast, says on p. 27, "P66, P72, P74, and P75 are part of an extensive papyrus collection of the Bodmer Library in Geneva, Switzerland … The biblical texts of this collection rival or exceed the Chester Beatty papyri in importance ... P74 (Papyrus Bodmer XVII) contains Acts virtually complete and the Catholic Epistles in fragmentary form. Dating from the seventh century, it is one of the latest extant Greek NT papyri, but contains a good form of the text."

[22] For other examples from the long recension where Jesus is called "God" see *Eph.* 14, 19; *Rom.* 6; *Phld.* 6; *Pol.* 3.

Likewise, the middle recension also distinguishes Jesus from God and identifies Jesus, not only as "God," but also as "Christ" and "Saviour" (e.g., *Eph.* 4.2, 9.1; *Magn.* 5.2, 6.1, 7, 13.2; *Trall.* 1.1, 9.2; *Rom.* inscription [notice here that God is called ὑψίστου – "highest " and Jesus is called μόνου υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ - "his only Son"]; *Phild*. inscription, 1.1, 3.2, 7.2; *Smyrn.* 8.1) Thus, the assumption that the interpolator always changes the authentic "God" to "Christ" or "Saviour" or "Lord" is not a safe assumption.

An argument of a very similar nature to the above can be made in relation to *Romans* 6.3. Instead of "blood of God," *Romans* 6.3 contains the phrase, "suffering of my God." Lightfoot's text is, ἐπιτρέψατέ μοι μιμητὴν εἶναι τοῦ πάθους τοῦ θεοῦ μου – "permit me to be an imitator of the suffering of my God." The reading, τοῦ θεοῦ μου has overwhelming support in the manuscript tradition. It is supported by the Greek of the Colbertine manuscript, the Latin of the middle recension, Syriac collection three, the Armenian version, and the Syriac martyrology. In addition the quotations of several later Christian writers affirm this reading. They include Anastasius of Sinai (cira 680 CE), Timothy of Alexandria, Severus of Antioch, and anonymous Syriac writer two and three. Nonetheless, there are dissenting voices. And this time there are more than two. The Greek of the long recension contains, χριστοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ μου – "of Christ my God." This is an intriguing variant because Christ and God are clearly distinguished from one another in contrast with the majority readings. Yet, here again, Jesus is called God in the long recension. The *Acts of the Metaphrast* simply has, τοῦ χριστοῦ - "of Christ." Significantly, there is no τοῦ θεοῦ μου. The third dissenting voice is from the Armenian martyrology. It contains the reading, *domini mei* – "of my Lord."[23]

I now turn to four additional examples that raise similar questions.

<u>*Ephesians* Inscription; *Romans* Inscription (2), 3.3, and 7.3</u>

In the *Ephesians* inscription we find the following phrase in Lightfoot's text, ἡνωμένη καὶ ἐκλελεγμένη ἐν πάθει ἀληθινῷ ἐν θελήματι τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν – "united and chosen in true suffering in the will of the Father and of Jesus Christ our God." The reading, τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν – "of the Father and of Jesus Christ our God" is witnessed to by the Greek and Latin of the middle recension. The Greek of the long recension

[23] I retain Lightfoot's practice of giving the Armenian text in Latin translation.

expands this reading to, θεοῦ πατρὸς καὶ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν – "of God the Father and our Lord Jesus Christ our Saviour." The Syriac short recension reads (in Lightfoot's Latin rendering of the original), *patris iesu christi dei nostri* – "of the Father Jesus Christ our God*."* The Armenian translation, however, reads in Lightfoot's Latin translation, *dei et domini nostri iesu Christi* – "of God and of our Lord Jesus Christ." According to the Armenian reading as well as the long recension Jesus is not called "God." Rather, Jesus is clearly distinguished from God.

The importance of this variant is that the Armenian translation is dated to the fifth century. After listing six problematic aspects of the Armenian version for constructing the Ignatian text, Lightfoot concedes:

> Yet not withstanding all these vicissitudes, the Armenian version is within certain limits one of the most important aids towards the formation of a correct text. The Greek, from which the Prior Syriac translation was made, must have been much earlier and purer than any existing texts of the epistles, Greek or Latin; and, where this can be discerned through the overlying matter, its authority is highly valuable. Happily this is almost always possible, where the variation of reading is really important.[24]

It is true that Lightfoot puts the Armenian reading, "of God and of our Lord Jesus Christ" in brackets, in his apparatus, indicating that he thinks the reading is "discredited by some special circumstances." [25] In a similar fashion, we saw earlier that Lightfoot believes that the reading "blood of God" was missing from the Armenian translation due to homoioteleuton. Lightfoot, like any editor of an eclectic text, has to make decisions such as these. Nonetheless, his decisions do not rule out the possibilities of other equally defensible decisions.[26] We are, thus, able to see light peering through a widening crack in relation to the text of the middle recension of Ignatius' letters, and in particular to the text of the middle recension in relation to Ignatius' God language.

---

[24] Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, 2.1.90.

[25] Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, 2.2.11. For a key to the symbols and abbreviations of Lightfoot's apparatus see 2.2.1-11.

[26] Bruce Metzger says, "To teach another how to become a textual critic is like teaching another how to become a poet. The fundamental principles and criteria can be set forth and certain processes can be described, but the appropriate application of these in individual cases rests upon the student's own sagacity and insight." See Metzger, *The Text of the New Testament*, 211-212.

In yet another passage the God language of the Armenian translation is significantly different from that found in the text of most modern edited editions. This time, however, Lightfoot does not indicate any problems with the Armenian reading. The last phrase found in Lightfoot's text of *Romans* inscription (2) is, πλεῖστα ἐν Ἰησοῦ Χριστῷ τῷ θεῷ ἡμῶν ἀμώμως χαίρειν – "abundant greeting blamelessly in Jesus Christ our God." The variants here are diverse and intriguing. The reading in Lightfoot's text is supported by the Greek of the Colbertine manuscript and the Latin of the middle recension as well as the Armenian and Syriac martyrologies. The *Acts of the Metaphrast* omits "our." The Greek of the long recension reads, θεῷ καὶ πατρὶ καὶ ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστῷ - "and in God the Father and in our Lord Jesus Christ." The short Syriac recension omits this phrase all together. The Armenian **omits**, τῷ θεῷ ἡμῶν – "in our God." Based on the textual evidence, the seasoned and valuable judgments of Lightfoot aside, we can responsibly ask, "What exactly did Ignatius write?"

Lightfoot reconstructs the following segment of *Romans* 3.3, from the varying manuscripts, as follows, ὁ γὰρ θεὸς ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦς Χριστός, ἐν πατρὶ ὤν, μᾶλλον φαίνεται – "for our God Jesus Christ, being in the Father, is more manifest." The whole phrase is supported by the Greek of the Colbertine manuscript, the Latin of the middle recension, the Armenian version, the Armenian martyrology, the Syrian martyrology, and the Syriac of Timothy of Alexandria. The whole phrase, however, is omitted by the Syriac short recension as well as the Greek of the long recension. Though Lightfoot's reading has the overwhelming support of the majority of manuscripts, including the Armenian, it is worth mentioning that both the Greek of the long recension and the Syriac of the short recension follow the middle recension of *Romans* chapter three closely. In other words, in the Greek long recension *Romans* 3 is not heavily interpolated and in the Syriac short recension *Romans* 3 is not heavily abbreviated. Thus, even in a textual situation such as this one, we can not be absolutely certain that the God language goes back to the historical Ignatius of Antioch.

The textual tradition behind *Romans* 7.3 shows, perhaps, the widest divergence of all the possible places where Ignatius is said to call Jesus "God." Lightfoot's text reads, ἄρτον θεοῦ θέλω, ὅ ἐστιν σὰρζ τοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ ἐκ σπέρματος Δαυείδ, καὶ πόμα θέλω τὸ αἷμα αὐτου, ὅ ἐστιν ἀγάπη ἄφθαρτος – "I desire the bread of God, which is the flesh of Jesus Christ (who is) from the seed

of David, and I desire the drink of his blood, which is love incorruptible." This text is ambiguous because it is not clear that Ignatius, here, clearly calls Jesus "God." Ignatius desires "the bread of God," which is "the flesh of Christ." On the one hand there is a clear distinction between the bread/God and the flesh/Christ. Yet the bread/God is directly called the flesh/Christ. Perhaps this is one reason for the diversity of textual witnesses.

I begin with ἄρτον θεοῦ θέλω – "I desire the bread of God." This phrase, by itself, is affirmed by the Latin of the middle recension, the Syriac of the short recension, the Armenian version, the Armenian martyrology, the Syriac martyrology, and the Coptic version. The following manuscripts, however, recognizing an allusion to John 6.33, add, ἄρτον οὐράνιον, ἄρτον ζωῆς – "heavenly bread, bread of life": the Greek of the Colbertine manuscript, the *Acts of the Metaphrast*, the Greek of the long recension, the Codex Parisiensis, the Codex Hierosolymitanus, the Codex Siniaiticus, and the Codex Taurinensis.

Next, there are some interesting variations in relation to the τοῦ Χριστοῦ. Lightfoot opts for this reading even though it is only contained in the Greek of the long recension and the Syriac of the short recension (recall that in *Rom*. 3.3, Lightfoot rejected a reading found in only these two traditions). It is an insignificant variant but, nonetheless, the Greek of the Colbertine manuscript, the Latin of the middle recension, the Armenian version, the Armenian martyrology, the Syriac martyrology, and the *Acts of the Metaphrast* all contain ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ - "Jesus Christ." Of much greater significance, however, is the addition of τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ – "the Son of God," found in the Greek of the Colbertine manuscript, the *Acts of the Metaphrast*, and the Greek of the long recension. Obviously, τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ serves to clearly distinguish between God/bread and Jesus/flesh. It is noteworthy, in light of the previous discussion concerning *Ephesians* 1.1, that this reading, which clearly distinguishes between God and Jesus, is found in manuscript witnesses in addition to the Greek of the long recension.

Another variant from *Romans* 7.3 is in relation to the τοῦ after Χριστοῦ. Once again, only two witnesses contain the reading Lightfoot adopts for his text. They are the Latin of the middle recension and Syriac martyrology. The Greek of the Colbertine manuscript, the Armenian version, the Armenian martyrology, the *Acts of the Metaphrast*, and the Greek of the long recension all add γενομένου – "having come to be" so that the text reads, "which is the flesh of Christ being from the seed

of David, …" In addition, after τοῦ [γενομένου] the Greek of the Colbertine manuscript, the *Acts of the Metaphrast,* and the Greek of the long recension include, ἐν ὑστέρῳ – "afterwards." Here the text reads then, "which is the flesh of Christ the one having come to be afterwards from the seed of David." As in other cases (e.g., *Smyrn*. 4.2) where γενομένου is inserted into the manuscript tradition, Lightfoot correctly attributes this to a scribal need to affirm the pre-existence and divinity of Christ.[27]

A final variant, found only in the Coptic version of *Romans* 7.3, relates to the concluding and climactic discussion of this chapter. The Coptic adds, κατὰ σαρκὰ – "according to the flesh" after τοῦ ἐκ σπέρματος Δαυείδ – "from the seed of David."

Thus, we see that Lightfoot's textual decisions represent but one possibility. There are a variety of other possibilities, depending upon how one weighs the evidence. And we see that there is much evidence in addition to the Greek of the long recension that brings into question the frequency with which Ignatius calls Jesus "God" in his seven 'authentic' letters.

Lightfoot's Rejection of God Language Variants – *Trallians* 7.1

In light of the above discussion, I contend that the manuscript tradition behind the 'authentic' letters of Ignatius of Antioch reveals the likelihood of a scribal practice of intensifying Ignatius' already high view of Jesus. I also think that this intensification can be traced to fourth-century Christological concerns associated with the Arian controversy. I reach this conclusion because after this intensification is complete, Ignatius sounds more like a fourth-century bishop with subordinationist concerns than he does a second-century bishop following on the heels of Pauline and Johannine Christology. Lightfoot himself certainly does not believe that Ignatius refers to Jesus as "God" every time some part of the manuscript tradition indicates so. There are places in the manuscript tradition where Jesus is called "God" and Lightfoot relegates the designation on these occasions to either brackets in his text or to notes in his critical apparatus. And, as we shall see, other editors make textual decisions that part company with Lightfoot.

Trallians 7.1 is printed in Lightfoot's text as, φυλάττεσθε οὖν τοῦς τοιούτους τοῦτο δὲ ἔσται ὑμῖν μὴ φυσιουμένοις καὶ οὖσιν ἀχωρίστοις [θεοῦ]

[27] Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, 2.2.226-227.

ʾΙησοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ τοῦ ἐπισκόπου καὶ τῶν διαταγμάτων τῶν ἀποστόλων – "therefore guard yourselves against such people and this you will be able to do if you are not puffed up and you are inseparable from [God] Jesus Christ and from the bishop and from the commands of the apostles." As with *Ephesians* inscription and *Romans* inscription (2), the Armenian version of this text serves to tone down the God language of Ignatius. The Armenian omits "God." Lightfoot concludes, "Probably this word should be omitted with the Armenian version." [28] He sides with the Armenian even though both the Greek and Latin of the middle recension contain the word "God." It is not difficult to understand why Lightfoot makes this decision. He is of the opinion that the Greek behind the Syriac, from which the Armenian translation was made, is much superior to the eleventh-century Medicean Greek manuscript of the middle recension. Yet, we saw above that, in relation to *Romans* inscription (2), Lightfoot favours the reading of the Greek and Latin of the middle recension over the Armenian translation. Here, he moves in the reverse direction.

Lightfoot tells us why he decides in favor of the Armenian omission by putting "God" in brackets. He writes, "Though Ignatius frequently speaks of Jesus Christ as God, it may be questioned whether he ever so styles Him without some explanatory or qualifying phrase."[29] When commenting on the previously discussed text from *Ephesians* inscription, ἡνωμένη καὶ ἐκλελεγμένη ἐν πάθει ἀληθινῷ ἐν θελήματι τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ ʾΙησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν, Lightfoot says, "Where the Divine name is assigned to Christ in these epistles, it is generally with the addition of the pronoun, '*our* God,' '*my* God' … or it has some defining words."[30] Lightfoot thinks that Ignatius' rhetoric in other parts of his writings calls for the authenticity of the Armenian translation. Whether he is right or wrong in his judgement, it is to his credit that he puts "God" in brackets in his text and discusses the variants.

In contrast with Lightfoot, Ehrman does not find the Greek θεοῦ ʾΙησοῦ Χριστοῦ awkward in light of Ignatius' rhetoric elsewhere. Ehrman puts "God" in his text of *Trallians* 7.1 without brackets. Furthermore, Ehrman does not even give the variants in his critical apparatus! Ehrman's translation reads, "Guard against such

[28] Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, 2.2.169.

[29] Ibid.

[30] Ibid., 2.2.26

people. You will be able to do this when you are not haughty and are inseparable from God – that is, Jesus Christ – and from the bishop …"[31] Karl Bihlmeyer, like Ehrman, puts "God" in his text without any indication that the reading is questionable. Yet, unlike Ehrman, he does include the variant in his apparatus.[32] Michael Holmes gives the variants, agrees with Lightfoot in choosing the Armenian, but does not put "God" in brackets in his text. His translation reads, "Therefore be on your guard against such people. And you will be, provided that you are not puffed up with pride and that you cling inseparably to Jesus Christ and to the bishop and to the commandments of the apostles."[33]

This comparison of the editions of Lightfoot, Ehrman, Bihlmeyer, and Holmes provides a lucid example of how one encounters a different Ignatius depending upon which eclectic text one is using. This is not the last time we will have occasion to observe differences in the actual texts reconstructed by scholars. In any event, as evidenced by Lightfoot's textual decisions and his discussion of those decisions, Lightfoot himself does not think that Ignatius calls Jesus "God" every time this rhetoric turns up in the manuscript tradition behind the letters of the middle recension.

More Examples – *Smyrnaeans* 10.1, 6.1, 1.1 and *Romans* 9.1

There are several more examples where Lightfoot decides that the God language in some manuscripts is not authentic. My discussion will be less detailed.

The next three examples come from *Smyrnaeans.* In 10.1, Ignatius commends the Smyrnaeans for receiving the deacons Philo and Rheus Agathopous. Lightfoot's text reads in part, καλῶς ἐποιήσατε ὑποδεξάμενοι ὡς διακόνους [Χριστοῦ] θεοῦ - "you did well having received [Philo and Rheus Agathopous] as deacons of [Christ] God." Lightfoot, again, favours the Armenian translation which omits Χριστοῦ against the Greek of the middle recension which reads, Χριστοῦ θεοῦ. Thus, Lightfoot does not think Ignatius identifies Jesus as God here. Ehrman's text, in contrast, reads, καλῶς ἐποιήσατε ὑποδεξάμενοι ὡς διακόνους Χριστοῦ θεοῦ.

---

[31] Ehrman, *The Apostolic Fathers*, 1.263. Ehrman also chooses not to record the critical variant, to be discussed later, related to *Magn*. 13.2.

[32] Bilhmeyer, *Die Apostolischen Väter*, 94.

[33] Holmes, *The Apostolic Fathers*, 219.

He translates it as, "You did well to receive Philo and Rheus Agathopous as deacons of the Christ of God [*Or: of Christ, who is God*]."[34]

Smyrnaeans 6.1 contains an interesting variant which surfaces in the writings of Timothy of Alexandria in Syriac and in the anonymous Syrian writer of fragment one. Lightfoot's text reads, ἐὰν μὴ πιστεύσωσιν εἰς τὸ αἷμα Χριστοῦ [τοῦ θεοῦ], κἀκείνοις κρίσις ἐστίν – "if they might not believe in the blood of Christ [of God], judgment is to them." Lightfoot's [τοῦ θεοῦ], however, is ambiguous as the two quotations indicate. The anonymous Syrian writer has, *qui est deus* – "who is God," and Timothy has, *qui est dei* – "who is of God." Modern scholars should be grateful to Lightfoot for recording these variants in light of the fact that the Greek and Latin of the middle recension as well as the Armenian and Coptic translation do not contain "who is God" or "who is of God." In fact, Ehrman and Holmes give the variant but, unlike Lightfoot, do not put it or something like [τοῦ θεοῦ] in their text. The weight of evidence against the "who is God" or "who is of God" reading is strong. Thus, this variant indicates that Ignatius' already high Christology was used as a springboard from which to address the Christological concerns of a later generation of believers.

Smyrnaeans 1.1 could be an example of where Ignatius clearly calls Jesus "God" without any qualifying pronouns. And, if Lightfoot's text is correct, there are no awkward grammatical issues. Lightfoot's text reads, Δοξάζω Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν τὸν θεὸν τὸν οὕτως ὑμᾶς σοφίσαντα – "I glorify Jesus Christ the God who thus made you wise." In his notes for this text, Lightfoot repeats what he has said before about Ignatius' God language, "Ignatius does not appear ever to call Jesus Christ God absolutely."[35] Interestingly, even though the Armenian translation and the

---

[34] Ehrman, *The Apostolic Fathers*, 1.304-305

[35] Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, 2.2.289. In contrast with Lightfoot's repeated assertions that Ignatius never calls Jesus "God" absolutely, William Schoedel writes, "It has sometimes been thought that since Ignatius refers to Christ as 'our' God or 'my' God (*Eph.* 15.3; 18.2; *Rom.* inscr; 3.3;6.3; *Pol.* 8.3) or adds some qualifying phrase (*Eph.* 7.2; 19.3; *Sm.* 1.1), and since other more direct references to Christ as God are textually suspect (*Tr.* 7.1; *Sm.* 10.1), he did not view Christ as God in an absolute sense. But such an interpretation seems forced, especially since Ignatius also speaks simply of 'the blood of God' (*Eph.* 1.1) and 'the passion of God' (*Rom.* 6.3). See William R. Schoedel, *Ignatius of Antioch* (Hermeneia; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1985), 39. While I do not question that Ignatius calls Jesus "God" absolutely, I have demonstrated, nonetheless, that the textual tradition in relation to *Eph* 1.1 and *Rom* 6.3 is not unanimous. I have not included *Eph*. 15.3 and 19.3 in my list of fourteen places where the textual tradition indicates that Ignatius calls Jesus "God" because they seem rather ambiguous to me. There is no direct linkage between Jesus and God, though it is implied. I have reserved discussion of *Eph*. 7.2 for variants that I am confident have a direct relationship to the fourth-century Arian controversy.

Coptic translation both omit τὸν θεὸν, Lightfoot opts for the reading of the Greek and Latin of the middle recension. He concludes, "Though the words τὸν θεὸν are wanting in two important authorities, they seem to be genuine, as they are appealed to by two fathers [Severus and Ephraim of Antioch]."[36] Because, however, Lightfoot concludes that Ignatius never calls Jesus "God" absolutely, then "τὸν θεὸν must be closely connected with the words following."[37] Even here, then, Lightfoot softens the interpretation of τὸν θεὸν, even as he decides in favour of the reading. A comparison of Lightfoot's text and translation with that of Ehrman and Holmes reveals that they are all in agreement in relation to this text.

The final example of a place where the textual tradition provides an example of Jesus being called "God" by Ignatius of Antioch, but that is rejected by most editors is found in *Romans* 9.1. Lightfoot's text reads, μόνος αὐτὴν Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς ἐπισκοπήσει καὶ ἡ ὑμῶν ἀγάπη – "Jesus Christ alone will oversee it and your love." Holmes records no variants. Lightfoot and Ehrman, however, inform us that the tenth-century codex Hierosolymitanus contains the reading, Χριστὸς ὁ θεὸς – "Christ the God." This is an intriguing variant because here Jesus is called "God" with the definite article. Lightfoot and Ehrman judge the reading to be inauthentic, however, and relegate it to the critical apparatus.[38]

Summary

Before moving forward with much more evidence demonstrating Christological textual variants, and thus the effects of later fourth-century Christological debates on the text of the middle recension, I want to offer a brief summary of the previous discussion.

First, the textual evidence clearly suggests that at least some places of the textual tradition of the middle recension intensify Ignatius' already high Christology.

Second, I have demonstrated that, while there is no reason to question the consensus of the authenticity of the middle recension of the seven Ignatian letters mentioned by Eusebius of Caesarea, the actual text of those seven letters is not as concrete as one is led to believe based on current scholarly discussions.

---

[36] Lightfoot, *Apostolic* Fathers, 2.2.289.

[37] Ibid.

[38] Lightfoot provides a collation of codex Hierosolymitanus and codex Sinaiticus in his *Apostolic Fathers* 2.2.589-595.

Finally, this initial investigation into Christological textual variants has implicitly demonstrated the need for texts and translations of single manuscripts along with eclectic texts. We must always remember that an eclectic text, for all of its worth, is still a non-existent text.

Free Standing Arian Controversy Variants

I now come to Christological textual variants from the middle recension of Ignatius' letters that can be traced back, on their own and by themselves, to the fourth-century Arian controversy. The results of the research revealed here also serve to confirm my earlier suggestion that the intensification of the Ignatian God language can also be traced to the fourth-century Arian controversy. Without the results of research that follow, it would be more difficult to historically place the God language variants.

Unfortunately scholars have, for the most part, stopped discussing the role of Ignatius of Antioch in the fourth century. The long recension was a matter of much study when the authenticity of the three recensions was under debate. The current consensus concerning the authenticity of the middle recension, brought about largely by the work of Lightfoot and Zahn[39], has relegated the role of Ignatius in the fourth century to scholarly obscurity.[40] Lightfoot himself declares:

> The investigations of the preceding chapters have cleared the ground. All rival claimants have been set aside; so that the Seven Epistles, as known to Eusebius and as preserved to us not only in the original Greek but also in Latin and other translations, alone remain in possession of the field. If there be any genuine remains of Ignatius, these are they. The other recensions, now

---

[39] Schoedel says, "The works of Theodor Zahn and J.B. Lightfoot still represent inescapable points of departure for work on Ignatius (particularly for those who accept the authenticity of the middle recension)." Elsewhere he writes, "The modern consensus concerning the letters of Ignatius may be said to have been established especially by the work of Zahn and Lightfoot." See Schoedel, *Ignatius of Antioch*, xiii and 4.

[40] I have been able to locate a small handful of relatively recent works on the long recension. See, for example, Othmar Perler, "Pseudo-Ignatius und Eusebius von Emesa," *Historisches Jahrbuch* 77 (1958): 73-82; Jack W. Hannah, "The Setting of the Ignatian Long Recension," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 79.3 (1960): 221-238; Harold Ford, "A Comparison of the Recensions of the Ignatian Corpus" (Th.D. diss., Iliff School of Theology, 1961); Reinoud Weijenborg, "Is Evagrius Ponticus the Author of the Long Recension of the Ignatian Letters?," *Antonianum* 44 (1969): 339-347; K.J. Woollcombe, "The Doctrinal Connexions of the Pseudo-Ignatian Letters," in *Studia Patristica* (ed. F.L. Cross; vol. 6; part 4; Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1962); Dieter Hagedorn, *Der Hiobkommentar des Arianers Julian* (Patristische Texte und Studien 14; Berlin and New York: Walter De Gruyter, 1973); James David Smith III, "The Ignatian Long Recension and Christian Communities in Fourth Century Syrian Antioch" (Th.D. diss., Harvard University, 1986). Notice that the most recent of these works is 1986 – over two decades ago – and that it is an unpublished doctoral dissertation. All of these works will be discussed in detail in chapter three.

> shown to be abridgments or expansions, cease to trouble us. They take their place as testimonies to the fame and popularity of the letters on which they are founded.[41]

Lightfoot's declarations went on to have much more authority than he could have imagined. Once the letters of the long recension were determined to be the product of a fourth-century writer – Arian, Neo-Arian, or even orthodox as we shall see in chapter three – and not the writings of an early to mid second-century figure, they were largely cast aside from scholarly examination.

Yet the main goal of this chapter is to demonstrate that the text of the middle recension too has also been corrupted by fourth-century Christological controversies.

I now address four additional variants that I believe clearly entered the textual tradition of the middle recension of Ignatius' letters during the fourth-century Arian controversy. I begin by discussing two variants that Lightfoot himself traces to the fourth century. Then I will discuss two additional variants that I identify with the fourth-century Arian controversy.

Magnesians 8.2

Bart Ehrman is correct when he refers to *Magnesians* 8.2 as "probably the best-known instance of an 'orthodox corruption'" of the Ignatian letters.[42] Lightfoot's text reads, ... ὅτι εἷς θεός ἐστιν ὁ φανερώσας ἑαυτὸν διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ, ὅς ἐστιν αὐτοῦ λόγος ἀπὸ σιγῆς προελθών "… that there is one God, the one who manifested himself through Jesus Christ his Son, who is his Word that came forth from silence." Interestingly, the reading Lightfoot adopts here has minority support. The Greek and Latin of the middle recension, as well as the Syriac of Timothy of Alexandria, add the words ἀΐδιος οὐκ, so that the text states, λόγος ἀΐδιος οὐκ ἀπὸ σιγῆς προελθών – "the eternal Word not coming

---

[41] Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, 2.1.328. In light of its centrality to my study, it is worth quoting the remainder of Lightfoot's paragraph here, "The variations of text again between the Greek original and the various translations of the Seven Letters are immaterial to the question. To allege these as casting suspicion on the genuineness of the letters themselves is to throw dust in the eyes of the enquirer. They are only such in kind, as we might expect to encounter under the circumstances. They are the price paid for ultimate security as regards the author's text. This security, in the case of an ancient writer, will depend mainly on the multiplicity of authorities; and multiplicity of authorities involves multiplicity of readings. The text of the Seven Epistles is assured to us on testimony considerably greater than that of any ancient classical author with one or two exceptions." Lightfoot is overstating his case here. Indeed, the variants might not bring into question the genuineness of the Eusebian seven. Nonetheless, to argue for a secure text is a major stretch.

[42] Ehrman, "Textual Traditions Compared," 23. Ehrman's use of "orthodox corruption" is a reference to his own book, *The Orthodox Corruption of Scripture*.

forth from silence." Only the Armenian translation and a quotation from the Syriac in Severus of Antioch contain the reading that Lightfoot adopts.

Once again, it was the work of Lightfoot and Zahn that brought attention to this variant within the manuscript tradition of the middle recension of Ignatius' letters. Lightfoot first acknowledges that he and Zahn arrived at the same conclusions about this variant independently of one another. He then says, "The wonder is that a reading of such importance should have been so generally overlooked."[43]

More modern commentators have argued, with reference to Zahn and Lightfoot, that ἀΐδιος οὐκ was added by orthodox scribes concerned with the Gnostic connotations of the more authentic reading.[44] Ehrman, for example, concurs with Lightfoot's conclusion in relation to the authenticity of the Armenian translation because scribes concerned to battle Gnostic interpretations of the early Christian movement would have negated the Armenian, "the Word which came forth from silence." Ehrman concedes, "In any event, it would make good sense that this text was changed to avoid its misuse by Gnostics in support of their own doctrines."[45] Likewise, Schoedel writes in a footnote, "But Zahn and Lightfoot were surely right

---

[43] Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, 2.2.127.

[44] Henry Chadwick links *Magn*. 8.2 with his interpretation of Ignatius' emphasis on the silence of the bishop (*Eph*. 6.1; *Phld*. 1.1; cf. *Eph*. 15). In doing so he disagrees with Lightfoot and Bauer. Lightfoot takes *Eph*. 15 to be an indirect defence of the Ephesian bishop Onesimus who has a quiet disposition that others might take advantage of. Bauer understands *Eph*. 6.1 to mean that the bishop is not eloquent. One key to understanding these enigmatic passages, says Chadwick, is in *Magn*. 8.2. Here Ignatius attributes silence to God in a similar fashion to Valentinian gnosticism. In this branch of gnosticism, the main deity is a dyad, *Bythos* and *Sige* (σιγή - silence), who form the first pair of Aeons in the ogdoad (see Irenaeus *Against Heresies* 1.2.1 and 2.12.2). Chadwick argues that since silence is a fundamental characteristic of God for Ignatius, Ignatius also marks the importance of silence in the life of the bishop because "clearly therefore it is necessary to look upon the bishop as the Lord himself" (*Eph*. 6.1). Chadwick writes, "This doctrine that the bishop is the earthly representative of the divine prototype leads Ignatius to attribute to the bishop the characteristics that he predicates to God." See Henry Chadwick, "The Silence of Bishops in Ignatius," *The Harvard Theological Review* 43.2 (1950): 169-172. The quotation is from p. 171. In a much more recent article, Allen Brent deploys a similar, though not identical, manner of argumentation. Chadwick says on the final page of his article, "Ignatius has taken over the familiar Hellenistic conception that things on earth correspond to things in heaven (a notion thoroughly characteristic of gnosticism, at least in its Valentinian form), and has applied it whole-heartedly to his conception of the Church and its ministry." Brent writes, "I have argued in this paper that the clue to this transition [from charismatic community to hierocratic ecclesiastical structure] lies in his [Ignatius'] assimilation of the theology of the Christian church order with the pagan theology implied by the ceremonial and iconography of the mystery cults." See Allen Brent, "Ignatius and Polycarp: The Transformation of New Testament Traditions in the Context of Mystery Cults," in *Trajectories through the New Testament and the Apostolic Fathers* (ed. Andrew F. Gregory and Christopher M. Tuckett; Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2005), 325-349. The quotation is from p. 345.

[45] Ehrman, "Textual Traditions Compared," 24.

in seeing this reading as a correction introduced by later orthodox theologians perplexed by Ignatius' apparent acceptance of a Gnostic title for God."[46]

Lightfoot, however, devotes the vast majority of his discussion to placing this variant, not during the second-century Gnostic movement, but rather during the fourth-century Arian controversy. Lightfoot does say, "A transcriber would be sorely tempted to alter a text which lent itself so readily to Gnostic and other heresies."[47] Yet, the majority of Lightfoot's discussion of this variant centres around the fourth-century Marcellus of Ancyra. Lightfoot goes on to say:

> The interpolation should, I think, be assigned to the fourth or fifth century. About the middle of the fourth century Marcellus propounded his doctrine, which was assailed by Eusebius as Sabellian. The attacks of Eusebius show that Marcellus expressed his views in language almost identical with this statement of Ignatius … It seems probable indeed from this and other coincidences (see *Smyrn.* 3), that Marcellus was acquainted with the Ignatian Epistles.[48]

I find Lightfoot's instincts persuasive. His placement of the ἀΐδιος οὐκ variant in the fourth or fifth century, in response to Marcellus of Ancyra, therefore, deserves further consideration.[49]

---

[46] Schoedel, *Ignatius of Antioch*, 120. It strikes me as significant that Schoedel relegates his discussion of what Ehrman considers "probably the best-known instance of an 'orthodox corruption'" of the Ignatian letters to a footnote. We see again, this time from what is a classic work in Ignatian studies, an over-confidence in the stability of the text of the middle recension. I do not mean to suggest that the ἀΐδιος οὐκ reading is correct. I do not think it is. I simply contend that the textual issues of the middle recension should have a more prominent place in Ignatian studies than they do. For an argument, nonetheless, that the ἀΐδιος οὐκ reading is authentic see Robert Joly, *Le dossier d'Ignace d'Antioche* (Université libre de Bruxelles, Faculté de Philosophie et Lettres 69; Brussles: Éditions de l'Université de Bruxelles, 1979). Bammel, "Ignatian Problems," offers an extensive critique of this book as well as J. Rius-Camps, *The Four Authentic Letters of Ignatius, the Martyr* (Christianismos 2; Rome: Pontificium Institutum Orientalium Studiorum, 1979).

[47] Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, 2.2126.

[48] Ibid., 126-127.

[49] For a helpful and extremely clear presentation of the life of Marcellus as well as a history of scholarship on Marcellus up to 1982, see Joseph T. Lienhard, "Marcellus of Ancyra in Modern Research," *Theological Studies* 43.3 (1982): 486-503. Lienhard's greatest contribution to Marcellan scholarship, however, is *Contra Marcellum: Marcellus of Ancyra and Fourth-Century Theology* (Washington: Catholic University of America Press, 1999). For a recent substantial study of Marcellus see Sara Parvis, *Marcellus of Ancyra and the Lost Years of the Arian Controversy 325-345* (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2006). She argues, building on the works of Theodor Zahn, Friedrich Loofs, Wolfgang Gericke, Martin Tetz, Klaus Seibt, and Joseph Lienhard, that, though in the later years of the fourth century, after his death, Marcellus' theology would be deemed heretical, Marcellus' theology was "perfectly mainstream" in his day (see pp. 2 and 3). In contrast with Parvis, Michel R. Barnes argues that after Nicaea the problem was not the subordination of Arius but rather the apparent modalism of the Nicene Creed. Barnes goes on to say, "After Nicaea the object of concern and condemnation is Marcellus, not Arius." See Michel René Barnes, "The Fourth Century

To begin with, an awareness of the manner in which *Magnesians* 8.2 becomes expanded in the long recension is important for comprehending how this text could have been perceived in the heat of the battle that was the Arian controversy. Lightfoot, I think correctly, decides that the text of the middle recension which the interpolator of the long recension had before him, was without ἀΐδιος οὐκ.[50] Lightfoot's text of the long recension of *Magnesians* 8.2 is, ... ὅτι εἷς θεός ἐστιν ὁ παντοκράτωρ ὁ φανερώσας ἑαυτὸν διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτου, ὅς ἐστιν αὐτοῦ λόγος οὐ ῥητὸς ἀλλ᾽ οὐσιώδης οὐ γάρ ἐστιν λαλιᾶς ἐνάρθρου φώνημα, ἀλλ᾽ ἐνεργείας θεϊκῆς οὐσία γεννητή ὃς κατὰ πάντα εὐαρέστησεν τῷ πέμψαντι αὐτόν – "that there is one God the Almighty who manifested himself through Jesus Christ his Son, who is his Word not spoken but essential. For he is not the pronouncement of articulate speech but a begotten substance of divine energy who pleased the one who sent him in all things." I will return to this text in a moment. First, however, I need to say a few brief words about Marcellus of Ancyra.

There is scholarly division concerning Marcellus. Some argue that Marcellus was willing to give up some of the more idiosyncratic Christological views of which he was accused; such as the belief that Christ's kingdom will come to an end, that there was no Son of God until the incarnation, and that God as a trinity will in the future, once again, recede into God as a monad.[51] Others argue that Marcellus was misrepresented by Eusebius of Caesarea in his works *Contra Marcellum* and *Ecclesiastica Theologia*. In other words, Marcellus successfully defended himself against the charges of heretical teaching in his letter to Bishop Julius of Rome.[52]

---

as Trinitarian Canon," in *Christian Origins: Theology, Rhetoric and Community* (ed. Lewis Ayres and Gareth Jones; New York and London: Routledge, 1998), 47-67. The quotation is taken from p. 51.

[50] Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, 2.2.126.

[51] For example Lienhard writes, "The Eusebians refined their terms considerably after Nicaea, and Marcellus undoubtedly did the same. If the development from the *Contra Asterium* through Marcellus' letter to Julius and Eugenius's *Expositio fidei* to the Marcellians' confession of 375 is considered, then it is clear that Marcellus and his followers gradually gave up most of the distinctive doctrines of the *Contra Asterium* in order to retain one: to the end, the Marcellians did not use the phrase 'three *hypostaseis*' of God, the phrase that is practically shorthand for the 'Cappadocian settlement.'" See Joseph T. Lienhard, "Basil of Caesarea, Marcellus of Ancyra, and 'Sabellius,'" *Church History* 58 (1989): 157-167. The quotation is from p. 159.

[52] Sara Parvis concurs with Theodor Zahn's belief that Marcellus is representative of a major early church tradition that goes back to Ignatius of Antioch and beyond (the Revelation of John) identified as "Asia Minor theology." She then says about this theology, "It was clearly loathed by Eusebius of Caesarea, among others, who systematically wrote it out of early church history." She later writes, "Marcellus had been condemned for allegedly teaching that the Son first came into existence through

There is clearly a scholarly movement afoot to rehabilitate Marcellus in much the same way there has been a scholarly rehabilitation of Arius over the past forty-five years or so.[53] Whatever the particular manner of scholarly rehabilitation employed, I think there would be general agreement with Michel Barnes' statement, "Marcellus' trinitarian theology is wholly centred in a Logos theology, in which divine unity is described by analogy to the unity between a speaker and a speaker's word: the word exists 'within' and then it 'goes out' – it is uttered."[54]

It is not difficult, then, to see the coherence between a Marcellan theological stance and the *Magnesians* 8.2 reading which Zahn, Lightfoot, and the great majority of scholars since have deemed authentic, ὅς ἐστιν αὐτοῦ λόγος ἀπὸ σιγῆς προελθών. In his article, "The 'Arian' Controversy: Some Categories Reconsidered," Joseph T. Lienhard suggests the categories "miahypostatic" and "dyohypostatic" for labelling the two theological traditions that opposed one another during the fourth century.[55] As the titles suggest, representatives of miahypostatic tradition prefer to speak of one *hypostasis* in God and representatives of the "dyohypostatic" tradition prefer to speak of two or three *hypostaseis* in God. *Magnesians* 8.2 sounds much too "miahypostatic" for the interpolator of the middle recension of Ignatius' letters.

We thus see that the interpolator clearly converts a miahypostatic sounding reading into a dyohypostatic reading. Michel Barnes does not use the same rubrics as Lienhard, but he does have a similar understanding. Barnes calls attention to two insights about God in early Christianity. The first is the singularity or unity of God

---

the Virgin, and that the kingdom of the eternal Son and Word would have an end … These are the charges, therefore, on which the *Letter to Julius* concentrates, and what Marcellus says in response to them has demonstrably not changed from what he says in *Against Asterius*. Marcellus was always prepared to call the pre-incarnate Word 'Son', and to state unequivocally that the Son is eternal and is the one through whom all created things are made, not merely a title accorded to the Word after the Incarnation." See Parvis, *Marcellus of Ancyra*, 2 and 182.

[53] See Maurice Wiles, "In Defense of Arius," *Journal of Theological Studies* 13 (1962): 339-347; Rowan Williams, *Arius: Heresy and Tradition* (rev. ed.; Grand Rapids, Mich. and Cambridge, U.K.: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2001); Robert C. Gregg and Dennis E. Groh, *Early Arianism: A View of Salvation* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1981); Robert C. Gregg, ed., *Arianism: Historical and Theological Reassessments: Papers from the Ninth International Conference on Patristic Studies* (Patristic Monograph Series 11; Philadelphia: The Philadelphia Patristic; repr., Eugene, Ore.: Wipf and Stock Publishers, 2006).

[54] Barnes, "The Fourth Century as Trinitarian Canon," 52.

[55] Joseph T. Lienhard, "The 'Arian' Controversy: Some Categories Reconsidered," *Theological Studies* 48.3 (1987): 415-437.

and the second is the diversity of God. He writes, "Each insight, with its associated language, is not always valued equally with the other, and too emphatic use of one language triggers concern among those whose sympathy lies with the other insight and the other language."[56] *Magnesians* 8.2 serves, then, as the trigger that produces the interpolator's expansion.

The interpolator clearly distinguishes between the "one God Almighty" and "Jesus Christ his Son." In contrast with the Marcellan tradition with the Word/Son understood as so unified with the Father that the Son is as speech that is released from a person's mouth, the interpolator argues that Jesus Christ is God's "Word not spoken but essential." The interpolator goes on to say that as the Word, Jesus Christ is "not the pronouncement of articulate speech but a begotten substance of divine energy." Thus, for the interpolator as a representative of what Lienhard refers to as the "dyohypostatic" and Barnes refers to as "diversity of God" insight, the Word / Son is an independent entity distinct from and subordinate to the Father.[57]

I conclude, then, building upon the initial discussion of Lightfoot, that the variant ἀΐδιος οὐκ represents another and much more discrete manner of accomplishing the same goal as the interpolator's expansion. Interestingly, though, in this instance, both the emerging orthodox party and the anti-Nicene parties are in agreement in condemning the Christological understanding associated with Marcellus of Ancyra. In other words, the credit for the interpolation of the middle recension goes to the emerging orthodox party; and the credit for the interpolation of the long recension goes to the group later declared heterodox.

Ephesians 7.2

Ephesians 7.2 is one of the most well-known passages from the middle recension of Ignatius' letters. I quote it in full from Lightfoot's text, εἷς ἰατρός ἐστιν, σαρκικὸς καὶ πνευματικός, γεννητὸς καὶ ἀγέννητος, ἐν ἀνθρώπῳ θεός,

---

[56] Barnes, "The Fourth Century as Trinitarian Canon," 50.

[57] For a nice discussion of the debate within the fourth-century church concerning the relationship of the Word/Son to the Father see Maurice Wiles, "Person or Personification? A Patristic Debate about Logos," in *The Glory of Christ in the New Testament: Studies in Christology in Memory of George Bradford Caird* (ed. L.D. Hurst and N.T. Wright; New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1987; repr., Eugene, Oreg.: Wipf and Stock Publishers, 2006), 281-289. He writes on p. 282, "For Marcellus, Logos is the dominant image and this means that for him the affirmation of any pre-existent personal entity distinct from the Father is not called for. For Eusebius [of Caesarea], Son is the dominant image, and Logos must be understood in terms of it; for him therefore the distinct hypostatic existence of the Son before the Incarnation is of the essence of the faith."

ἐν θανάτῳ ζωὴ ἀληθινή, καὶ ἐκ Μαρίας καὶ ἐκ θεοῦ, πρῶτον παθητὸς καὶ τότε ἀπαθής, Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς ὁ Κύριος ἡμῶν – "there is one physician fleshly and spiritual, begotten and unbegotten, God in man, in death true life, both from Mary and from God, first subject to suffering and then incapable of suffering, Jesus Christ our Lord." But there are in fact significant variants in this "semi-credal" passage.[58] I draw attention to the phrase, ἐν ἀνθρώπῳ θεός – "God in man." This reading is supported by Athanasius, Theodoret, Gelasius of Rome (fifth century), the Syriac of Severus, and Syriac fragment one. The Armenian translation, however, reads *deus et filius hominis* – "God and Son of Man." Yet a third reading is witnessed by the Greek and Latin of the middle recension, ἐν σαρκὶ γενόμενος θεός – "God having come to be in flesh." Observe once again how diverse the textual tradition can be, a diversity often ignored in scholarly discussion.

Different scholars give different reasons for the different choices they make in a reconstruction of *Ephesians* 7.2. Ehrman, for example, chooses, ἐν σαρκὶ γενόμενος θεός apparently because ἐν ἀνθρώπῳ θεός appears only in Patristic sources and in one Syriac fragment. Lightfoot, on the other hand, chooses ἐν ἀνθρώπῳ θεός because he thinks that ἐν σαρκὶ γενόμενος θεός was created by scribes concerned about the Apollinarian doctrine "that the Logos took the place of the human νοῦς in Christ."[59] Schoedel follows Lightfoot's reasoning but chooses the opposite reading! Schoedel says:

> As to the third antithesis, the reading "come in flesh, God" (cf. John 1:14) is to be preferred to the reading from Patristic quotations "in man, God." The change can be ascribed to the desire of later theologians to avoid any suggestion of an Arian or Apollinarian Christology which denied a human soul to Christ (hence "man" instead of merely "flesh" was required.)[60]

Even though Schoedel disagrees with Lightfoot on the reading, they agree that the change of the text can be traced back to fourth-century concerns.

At first glance, the contradictory textual decisions of Lightfoot and Schoedel accompanied by the same fundamental reasoning – concerns about Apollinarian theology – can add even more confusion. I submit, however, that it is not difficult to discern how both readings ἐν σαρκὶ γενόμενος θεός – "God having come to be in

---

[58] Schoedel, *Ignatius of Antioch*, 60-62.

[59] Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, 2.2.49.

[60] Schoedel, *Ignatius of Antioch*, 61.

flesh" and ἐν ἀνθρώπῳ θεός – "God in man" could cause scribes with fourth-century Christological concerns headaches. Thus although, as indicated by the different textual decisions of different editors, we cannot be certain whether the second-century martyr Ignatius of Antioch wrote ἐν σαρκὶ γενόμενος θεός or ἐν ἀνθρώπῳ θεός or even the *deus et filius hominis* of the Armenian, the contention of both Lightfoot and Schoedel that fourth-century Apollinarian concerns inspired a scribal change to the manuscript tradition is cogent.[61]

Preparatory Remarks to Magnesians 7.1 and Magnesians 13.2

In a moment, I will turn to two additional variants that I believe emerge in the wake of the fourth-century Arian controversy. They are *Magnesians* 7.1 and *Magnesians* 13.2. First, however, I want to prepare the soil for these fascinating textual variants of the middle recension of Ignatius' letters.

One of the major debating points of the Arian controversy was the subordination of the Son to the Father. Embedded deep within earliest Christian writings is the conviction that Jesus is subordinate to God.[62] For all of the diversity of thought found within the New Testament writings, there is a clear and consistent Christological pattern. Jesus is understood to be, on the one hand, equal with God and, on the other hand, subordinate to God. This paradoxical pattern is found in such diverse writings as the Gospel of Mark (e.g., Mark 2.5-7 / Mark 10.17-18) and the Gospel of John (e.g., John 1.1,14 / John 14.28), the letter to the Hebrews (e.g., Heb 1.1-4 / Heb 10.11-13) and the Revelation of John (e.g., Rev 4 and 5), the letters to the Corinthians (e.g., 1 Cor 1.24, 8.6 / 1 Cor 15.24-28) and the letter to the Colossians (e.g., Col 1.15-20), and the letter to the Philippians (e.g., Phil 2.5-11) and the letters to Timothy (e.g., 1 Tim 1.17 / 1 Tim 2.5). We find this same pattern, though with different degrees of accentuation, maintained in many of the earliest Christian writers that lived either contemporaneous with some of the authors of the later writings of the New Testament or that lived just after the authors of the New Testament

[61] For scholarly contributions that attempt to clarify issues of Apollinarian Christology see Kelley McCarthy Spoerl, "Apollinarian Christology and the Anti-Marcellan Tradition," *Journal of Theological Studies* 45.2 (1994): 545-568; Kelly McCarthy Spoerl, "The Liturgical Argument in Apollinarius: Help and Hindrance on the Way to Orthodoxy," *The Harvard Theological Review* 91.2 (1998): 127-152; and Brian E. Daley, "'Heavenly Man' and 'Eternal Christ': Apollinarius and Gregory of Nyssa on the Personal Identity of the Savior," *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 10.4 (2002): 469-488.

[62] I use the term "subordination" to indicate the earliest Christian belief that Jesus holds a secondary and inferior place to God the Father.

documents. Though the subordination of Jesus differs in degree, examples include the writings of Irenaeus (e.g., *Adversus haereses* 3.10.3-4, 4.7.4, 4.10.1), Justin Martyr (e.g., *Apologia i* 6, 13, 32; *Apologia ii* 13), Theophilus (e.g., *Ad Autolycum* 2.10, 2.22), Athenagoras (e.g., *Legatio pro Christianis* 10), Tertullian (e.g., *Adversus Hermogenem* 18; *Adversus Praxean* 2,8,9, 12), and, of course, Origen (e.g, *Contra Celsum* 8.14-15, 57).[63]

During the fourth-century this paradoxical pattern of the Son's equality and subordination to God would fall apart. Some personalities such as Arius, Eusebius of Nicomedia, and then the long string of Neo-Arians such as Aetius and his student Eunomius would continue to play the subordination card at the expense of the equality card.[64] Other participants in this debate such as Alexander of Alexandria, his successor Athanasius, Marcellus, and a long list of pro-Nicenes would continue to play the equality card, but they would find it necessary to put a significant qualification around the subordination card. This is an important point. Due to prominent biblical texts, from both the Old Testament and the New Testament, pro-Nicenes could not do away with the subordination of the Son to the Father all together. Rather, as I will discuss in more detail later, Nicenes and pro-Nicenes limited the subordination of Jesus to the incarnation only. This is a novel occurrence within early Christian doctrinal development. Unless, that is, we find these fourth-century ideas, that would later become 'orthodox,' already present in the writings of the second-century figure Ignatius of Antioch.

Scholars are divided on the question of Jesus' subordination to God in the 'authentic' writings of Ignatius. Some argue that Ignatius does subordinate Jesus to God. Others argue that he does not. I will interact with some of these scholars in the discussions to follow, especially the discussion of *Magnesians* 13.2. Here, I simply want to provide a sample of scholarly disagreement about subordination in Ignatius of Antioch.

---

[63] While all of these early Christian authors affirm the divinity of Jesus, they do differ in the manner in which they subordinate Jesus to God. For example, the "second God" language of Origen and the "second place" language of Justin Martyr is absent from Irenaeus, Theophilus, Athenagoras, and Tertullian. Nonetheless, all these authors understand the role of Logos/Son to be present in creation and in those places from the Old Testament where God speaks to humans. Thus, as the texts referenced above demonstrate, these authors maintain the common idea of a lofty and exalted God that needs a mediator to interact with creation and humanity.

[64] The theology of Eusebius of Caesarea will occupy our attention in ch. 4.

Virginia Corwin states, "If one term must be chosen to indicate the tendency of his thought, Ignatius must be said to be monarchian, though he is very close to the point later described to be orthodox."[65] In contrast with this statement, Cyril Richardson writes, "If Ignatius be culpable of heresy it certainly verges more on subordination than on modalism or patripassianism."[66]

The views of Martin Hengel and Robert Grant are similar to Corwin. Hengel's opinion is that "Although not intended by Ignatius and John, they are not far from a monarchianistic misinterpretation." [67] Grant contrasts Ignatius with the early Christian apologists. In relation to the apologists, Grant says "…, the Christology of the apologies, like that of the New Testament, is essentially subordinationist. The Son is always subordinate to the Father, who is the one God of the Old Testament."[68] Ignatius, however, according to Grant contains, "The most 'advanced' Christology of the early second century." He adds: "Especially important in Ignatius' doctrine was his insistence that Jesus Christ was God, a view emphasized in his letters to the Christians of Rome, Ephesus, and Smyrna. It may be significant that at the end of the second century these churches produced or tolerated theologians called Patripassianists, those who held the Father suffered or even died."[69]

Larry Hurtado, in contrast with Hengel and Grant, reads Ignatius' Christology is a similar fashion to Richardson. Hurtado says, "Yet Ignatius refers to Jesus as *theos* while still portraying him as subordinate to 'the Father.' Jesus is 'the mind of the Father' (Ign. *Eph.* 3.2) and 'God's knowledge [*theou gnosin*]' (17.2), and, as we noted earlier, Christians sing 'through Jesus Christ to the Father' (4.2)."[70] Later Hurtado strongly asserts:

> In the first two centuries, all texts from, and affirmed in, the developing proto-orthodox tradition, from the New Testament writings onward, reflect subordination Christology, the Son understood as the unique agent of the

---

[65] Virginia Corwin, *St. Ignatius and Christianity in Antioch* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1960), 140-141.

[66] Cyril Charles Richardson, *The Christianity of Ignatius of Antioch* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1935), 42.

[67] Martin Hengel, *Studies in Early Christology* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1995), 129.

[68] Robert Grant, *Gods and the One God: Christian Theology in the Graeco-Roman World* (London: SPCK, 1986), 109.

[69] Ibid., 105.

[70] Larry W. Hurtado, *Lord Jesus Christ: Devotion to Jesus in Earliest Christianity* (Grand Rapids and Cambridge: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2003), 638.

> Father, serving the will of the Father, and leading the redeemed to the Father … If, in the light of Arius, fourth-century Christians became jittery with anything that smacked of subordinationism, that is irrelevant for understanding Christian thought of the first two centuries.[71]

From this sampling, we see a disagreement on a fundamental aspect of Ignatius' Christology - did Ignatius subordinate Jesus to God? In other words, is Ignatius' Christology in this regard part and parcel of his day, or, as Thomas G. Weinandy argues, is Ignatius' Christology on "the road to Chalcedon"? [72]

I conclude that the textual evidence suggests that Ignatius did subordinate Jesus to God and that later pro-Nicene scribes, finding what they saw advantageous to their Christological beliefs in some Ignatian passages, changed other Ignatian passages that did not conform readily to their convictions. We have already seen that Ignatius' God language becomes intensified based on the variant readings and that no editor, that I am aware of, accepts as authentic every place within the textual tradition of the middle recension where Ignatius calls Jesus "God." We have also observed variants that Lightfoot himself considers to have entered the textual tradition as a result of fourth-century Christological conflicts. I now bring to the surface two variants that arise in places where Ignatius, in step with the Christology of his neighbours, indicates Jesus' subordination to God. These variants, as well, should be ascribed to debates surrounding the Arian controversy.

Magnesians 7.1

One prominent theme of the Ignatian letters is Ignatius' call for the people to subordinate themselves to the bishop, presbyters, and deacons as a means of obtaining unity (e.g., *Magn*. 7, 13; *Trall*. 2, 7; *Phld*. 7; *Smyrn*. 8). It makes perfect sense, within Ignatius' historical location of the early- to mid-second century, that he sometimes specifically calls upon the subordination of Jesus to God in order to model the importance of the people submitting to the church leadership, and in particular to the bishop (*Magn*. 7, 13; *Phld*. 7; *Smyrn*. 8).

The textual tradition behind *Magnesians* 7.1 illustrates a place within the middle recension of the Ignatian corpus where a fourth-century (or possibly later)

---

[71] Ibid., 647-648.

[72] Thomas G. Weinandy, "The Apostolic Christology of Ignatius of Antioch: The Road to Chalcedon," in *Trajectories through the New Testament and the Apostolic Fathers* (ed. Andrew F. Gregory and Christopher M. Tuckett; New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), 71-84.

scribe became anxious about Ignatius' habit of subordinating Jesus to God. Lightfoot's text reads, ὥσπερ οὖν ὁ Κύριος ἄνευ τοῦ πατρὸς οὐδὲν ἐποίησεν [ἡνωμένος ὤν], οὔτε δι᾽ ἑαυτοῦ οὔτε διὰ τῶν ἀποστόλων, οὕτως μηδὲ ὑμεῖς ἄνευ τοῦ ἐπισκόπου καὶ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων μηδὲν πράσσετε – "Therefore just as the Lord did nothing without the Father [being united], neither by himself nor through the apostles, in this manner do nothing without the bishop and without the presbyters." Lightfoot puts ἡνωμένος ὤν– "being united" in brackets as doubtfully authentic because the reading is supported by the Greek and Latin of the middle recension. Syriac fragment one, the Armenian translation, the Greek of the long recension, and John of Damascus, however, omit the phrase. Ehrman includes the reading in his text and Holmes puts it in brackets.

We have already observed the value that Lightfoot ascribes to the Armenian translation. We have also noticed that on numerous occasions the God language is not present in the Armenian translation as it is in other textual witnesses (*Eph*. inscription, 1.1; *Rom*. inscription (2), 6.3; *Trall*. 7.1; *Smyrn*. 1.1, 10.1). I concur with Lightfoot that this is a questionable reading. Furthermore, I think the fourfold witness of the Armenian, Syriac, Greek of the long recension, and John of Damascus contains the more authentic reading.[73]

In light of previous textual evidence adduced and the forthcoming discussion of *Magnesians* 13.2, I contend that the likelihood of a scribe adding ἡνωμένος ὤν in order to soften the subordinationist tone of the text is highly probable.

Magnesians 13.2

I now come to what I consider to be the strongest and most interesting aspect of my argument that the middle recension of Ignatius' letters too is affected by fourth-century Arian debates. In many ways, all the preceding arguments have been leading to this text. With the cumulative evidence of the preceding pages, I am

[73] Observe here that, even though Lightfoot indicates that the reading of the Greek of the long recension is discredited, he includes it with other readings that omit ἡνωμένος ὤν. As is characteristic of the long recension, the author elaborates the middle recension by adding a direct quotation from Scripture – in this case John 5.30. Lightfoot's text of the long recension records it as, οὐ δύναμαι γάρ, φησίν, ποιεῖν ἀφ᾽ ἑαυτοῦ οὐδέν – "for I am unable, he says, to do anything of myself." Thus, the interpolator, as expected, strengthens the subordinationist tone of the passage. In light of the other witnesses, I see no reason to think that ἡνωμένος ὤν was a part of the Greek text of the middle recension that the interpolator had before him. If this is correct, we see once again the value of the Greek text behind the long recension. And we observe this even in a heavily interpolated place. Textual witnesses such as this add strength to my earlier textual argument in relation to *Eph.* 1.1.

confident that the κατὰ σάρκα – "according to the flesh" of *Magnesians* 13.2 was added by a scribe in light of novel fourth-century understandings of the subordination of Jesus to God.

Lightfoot's text reads, ὑποτάγητε τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ καὶ ἀλλήλοις, ὡς Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς τῷ πατρὶ [κατὰ σάρκα] καὶ οἱ ἀπόστολοι τῷ Χριστῷ καὶ τῷ πατρί, ἵνα ἕνωσις ᾖ σαρκική τε καὶ πνευματική - "Be submissive to the bishop and to one another as Jesus Christ (was) to the Father [according to the flesh] and the apostles to Christ and to the Father, in order that there might be unity both fleshly and spiritual." The reading, κατὰ σάρκα – "according to the flesh," is supported by the Greek and Latin of the middle recension. It is, however, as with *Magnesians* 7.1, omitted by the Armenian translation and the Greek of the long recension.[74] Lightfoot makes an acute observation, "These words, if genuine, would expressly limit the subordination of the Son to the His human nature …"[75] He goes on to comment, correctly in my opinion, "But their absence in some authorities seems to show that they are no part of the original text."[76] Lightfoot does not elaborate. I agree with his judgment, however, because the practice of limiting the Son's subordination to the Father to his human nature does not develop until the fourth century. This development in early Christian theological thinking occurs due to needed defensive strategies against the manner in which Arius, his followers, other non-Nicenes, and later Neo-Arians interpret key scriptural texts.

It is interesting to observe how other scholars deal with *Magnesians* 13.2 in light of whether or not they think Ignatius subordinates Jesus to God. In a classic study of Ignatius' Christology, Michael Rackl writes:

---

[74] Here again Lightfoot indicates in his apparatus that the Greek of the long recension is discredited. He is of this opinion because he says that the Greek of the long recension also omits several words which follow apparently because of homoioteleuton. See Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, 2.2.138. Lightfoot's text of *Magn*. 13.2 in the long recension is, ὑποτάγητε τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ καὶ ἀλλήλοις, ὡς ὁ Χριστὸς τῷ πατρί , ἵνα ἕνωσις ᾖ κατὰ θεὸν ἐν ὑμῖν – "Be submissive to the bishop and to one another as the Christ (was) to the Father, in order that there might be unity according to God in you." Lightfoot may be correct concerning the slip of the interpolator's eye. Equally possible, however, is that the Greek text the interpolator has before him - extremely valuable for text critical purposes - only contains these words. The additional words, καὶ οἱ ἀπόστολοι τῷ Χριστῷ καὶ τῷ πατρί - "and the apostles to Christ and to the Father" render the sentence slightly awkward. Perhaps, then, the interpolator simply chooses to omit them. Whatever the scenario, it appears most likely to me that κατὰ σάρκα is not a part of the interpolator's Greek text.

[75] Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, 2.2.138.

[76] Ibid.

> Indes ist diese Unterordnung nicht von dem Gotte Christus, sondern von dem Menschen Christus ausgesagt. Ignatius macht überraschenderweise bereits – nicht bloß sachlich, sondern auch formell – diese Unterscheidung. M. 13,2: ... Dieses *κατὰ σάρκα* ist frappierend bei einem Autor, der zu Beginn des zweiten christlichen Jahrhunderts schreibt. Es setz dieser Ausdruck eine reife Erkenntnis und eine klare Reflexion voraus. Dieses *κατὰ σάρκα* zeigt, wie stark Ignatius über die Dinge nachgedacht, von denen seine Breife handeln. Christus war also seinem Vater gehorsam „ dem Fleische nach“ , d.h. seiner menschlichen Natur nach. Nur diese Bedeutung (von „ menschlicher Natur“) kann *σάρξ* hier haben ; ...[77]

Indeed, if the κατὰ σάρκα of *Magnesians* 13.2 is penned by an early second-century Christian, Ignatius or otherwise, it would be *frappierend* – “astonishing.”

In contrast with Rackl, William Schoedel acknowledges that the κατὰ σάρκα is an interpolation. He writes, “The phrase ‘according to the flesh’ looks suspiciously like an addition made by an interpolator bent on eliminating any suggestion of subordinationism in the text.” Yet, Schoedel does not think that Ignatius, like the vast majority of his Christian predecessors and contemporaries, clearly subordinates Jesus to God. Schoedel contends that what we have here is an over anxious scribe. He goes on to write concerning the scribe’s concern to remove implications that Ignatius subordinates Jesus to God, “Such fears were groundless, as we have seen (see on *Eph.* 3.2), but in the age of trinitarian disputes there would have been great sensitivity on these points.”[78] For reasons that will become apparent, I suggest that Rackl is wrong and Schoedel is only half right.

The phrase κατὰ σάρκα in various senses is by no means unusual in Christian writings of the first and second centuries. It is a common phase found in the Pauline letters (Rom 1.3, 4.1, 8.4-5, 8.12-13, 9.3, 9.5; 1 Cor 1.26, 10.18; 2 Cor 1.17, 5.16, 10.2-3, 11.18; Gal 4.23, 4.29; Eph 6.5). An investigation of these Pauline texts reveals that they can generally be classified under three rubrics. On some occasions Paul uses κατὰ σάρκα to refer to Jesus’ human ancestry in contrast with Jesus’ status as Son of God (Rom 1.3; 2 Cor 5.16). On other occasions Paul uses κατὰ σάρκα when referring to individuals other than Jesus (Rom 4.1, 9.3, 9.5; 1 Cor 1.26, 10.18; Gal 4.23, 4.29; Eph 6.5). Paul also uses κατὰ σάρκα in reference to the morally upright life of the believer in contrast with the immoral lifestyle a believer

---

[77] Michael Rackl, *Die Christologie des Heiligen Ignatius von Antiochien* (Freiburger Theologische Studien 14; Freiburg: Herder, 1914), 228.

[78] Schoedel, *Ignatius of Antioch*, 131.

sometimes slips into, or the general condition of a nonbeliever (Rom 8.4-5, 8.12-13; 2 Cor 1.17, 10.2-3, 11.18). Nowhere, however, does Paul use κατὰ σάρκα to limit Jesus' subordination to God to Jesus' incarnated state. In fact, Paul maintains the remarkably consistent Christological pattern of pre-Nicene Christianity. Paul understands Jesus to be equal with as well as subordinate to God, and Paul puts no limitations around Jesus' subordination to God (e.g., Rom 1.4, 9.5; 1 Cor 8.5-6. 15.24-28; Phil 2.5-11; Col 1.15-20; 1 Tim 2.5).[79]

The phrase κατὰ σάρκα also occurs elsewhere in the Ignatian corpus of the middle recension, but not as a means of limiting Jesus' subordination to God to the incarnation (*Phld.* 7 - used of Ignatius' opponents; *Smyrn*. 1.1 - used of Jesus' human ancestry in a very similar fashion to Paul in Romans).[80] In fact, a multitude of other texts clearly demonstrate that Ignatius subordinates Jesus to God in a similar fashion to Paul and John (*Eph.* 3.2, 4.2, 9.1; *Magn.* 5.2, 7.1, 8.2, 13.2; *Trall.* 3.1; *Rom.* inscription, 8.2; *Phld.* 7.2; *Smyrn.* 8.1) In other words, Ignatius, like Paul and John, equates Jesus with God and subordinates Jesus to God. In support of this observation, I draw attention especially to the *Romans* inscription combination of πατρὸς ὑψίστου καὶ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ μόνου υἱοῦ αυτοῦ - "of the Father Most High and of Jesus Christ his only son" with κατὰ πίστιν καὶ ἀγάπην Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν – "according to the faith and love of Jesus Christ our God."

It was roughly two hundred years after Ignatius' martyrdom that some Christians, in opposition to other Christians, became adamant about limiting Jesus' subordination to God to the incarnation. Marcellus, Eustathius of Antioch, Athanasius, and later pro-Nicenes think that by subordinating Jesus to God, there are

---

[79] It is also worth making the basic point that Paul clearly distinguishes between God and Jesus. There is no foreshadowing of modalism in Paul's letters. See, for example, the greetings from Paul's letters (Rom 1.7; 1 Cor 1.3; 2 Cor 1.2; Gal 1.3; Phil 1.2; 1 Thess 1.1; Phlm 3). Even those letters considered pseudonymous by some scholars maintain the strong distinction between God and Jesus (Eph 1.2; Col 1.3; 2 Thess 1.2; 1 Tim 1.2; 2 Tim 1.2; Titus 1.4).

[80] Both Ehrman and Paul Foster see in *Smyrn*. 1.1 a reference to Matt 3.15. I agree but I would also add that *Smyrn* 1.1 is reminiscent of Rom 1.3-4. See Ehrman, *The Apostolic Fathers*, 297 and Paul Foster, "The Epistles of Ignatius of Antioch and the Writings that later formed the New Testament," in *The Reception of the New Testament in the Apostolic Fathers* (ed. Andrew F. Gregory and Christopher M. Tuckett; New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), 159-186. Foster concludes in this article that, of the documents that would later comprise the New Testament, Ignatius knows 1 Cor, Eph, 1 Tim, 2 Tim, and Matt. One of the reasons Foster decides on Ignatian knowledge of these four Pauline letters is because of Ignatius' comment in his Ephesian letter that Paul remembers the Ephesians in his every letter. As it turns out, Paul does mention the Ephesians in these four letters. Foster's argument is cogent, but my impression, based on texts such as *Smyrn*. 1.1, is that Ignatius is acquainted with more Pauline letters such as Romans and, possibly, with John's gospel.

two gods and monotheism is compromised. Similarly, Arius, Eusebius of Nicomedia, and later non-Nicenes conclude that to equate Jesus with God is to worship two gods and monotheism is compromised. Indeed, we find the two parties gravitating to one side of the dominant Christological paradox (equality and subordination) at the expense of the other. Though both sides advocate a significant shift away from the Christological understanding of their predecessors, Marcellus, Alexander, Athanasius, and later pro-Nicenes would triumph. In the words of R.P.C. Hanson, the Arian controversy, which continues for many years after 325 CE, is "the story of how orthodoxy was reached, found, not of how it was maintained."[81]

There is another variant in *Magnesians* 13.2 that indicates a fourth-century interpolation. For convenience sake, I quote the text again, ὑποτάγητε τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ καὶ ἀλλήλοις, ὡς Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς τῷ πατρὶ [κατὰ σάρκα] καὶ οἱ ἀπόστολοι τῷ Χριστῷ καὶ τῷ πατρί, ἵνα ἕνωσις ᾖ σαρκική τε καὶ πνευματική - "Be submissive to the bishop and to one another as Jesus Christ (was) to the Father [according to the flesh] and the apostles to Christ and to the Father, in order that there might be unity both fleshly and spiritual." The Greek and Latin of the middle recension add καὶ τῷ πνεύματι – "and to the spirit" after καὶ οἱ ἀπόστολοι τῷ Χριστῷ καὶ τῷ πατρί - "and the apostles to Christ and to the Father and to the Spirit." Once again, we see with Lightfoot the value of the Armenian version in providing us with more authentic readings than the Greek or the Latin of the middle recension. The Armenian does not contain καὶ τῷ πνεύματι.

I do not suggest that trinitarian rhetoric is absent before the fourth-century. Quite the contrary, trinitarian rhetoric is present within the earliest Christian writings we possess (e.g., 2 Cor 13.14; Matt 28.19). The fact remains, however, that the role and function of the Spirit to the Father and to the Son is given more attention by the developing church with the passing of time. Even though the fourth-century debates are largely about the Father and the Son, the Spirit begins to have increasing significance as the Creed of Constantinople indicates. The absence of καὶ τῷ πνεύματι as well as the absence of κατὰ σάρκα from the Armenian translation together lead me to believe that *Magnesians* 13.2 was of significant concern for orthodox scribes of the fourth or, perhaps, fifth century.

---

[81] R.P.C. Hanson, *The Search for the Christian Doctrine of God: The Arian Controversy 318-381* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1988; repr. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Baker Academic, 2005), 870.

Conclusion

In this chapter, I have demonstrated that there are, within the middle recension of the seven 'authentic' Ignatian letters, significant fourth-century Christological variants. Along the way, this chapter has also demonstrated the instability of the textual tradition behind the middle recension of the Ignatian letters.

I have drawn attention to fourteen places where the textual tradition indicates that Ignatius calls Jesus "God." Of these fourteen, only three are without significant variants (*Eph.* 18.2; *Rom.* inscription; and *Poly.* 8.3). My discussion of the remaining eleven was intended to demonstrate that, while we can be confident that Ignatius of Antioch of the early- to mid-second century does call Jesus God, we cannot with any degree of confidence determine the frequency with which he does so (*Eph.* inscription, 1.1; *Trall.* 7.1; *Rom.* inscription, 3.3, 6.3, 7.3, 9.1; *Smyrn.* 1.1, 6.1, 10.1). I illustrated this by showing that different editors make different choices in relation to these variants. I also brought to the surface of this discussion those places where Lightfoot himself rejects some of the God language attested by the textual tradition of the middle recension. In addition, I proposed that in some places, for example *Ephesians* 1.1 and *Romans* 6.3, where most modern editors accept that Ignatius calls Jesus "God," an argument can be made in favour of the minority reading that presents Ignatius as calling Jesus something other than "God."

The lack of consistent manuscript attestation in relation to Ignatius' God language led me to conclude that scribes that later copied Ignatius' letters intensified the God language that Ignatius addresses to Jesus. I suggested that this intensification is brought about by the concerns of the orthodox party that emerges from the fourth-century Arian controversy.

I could not, however, have made this inference without the further evidence of additional textual variants that demonstrate fourth-century Christological concerns. Thus, I moved forward to defend Lightfoot's brief comments about the Arian controversy concerns surrounding the variants of *Magnesians* 8.2 and *Ephesians* 7.2. After this affirmation of Lightfoot's initial remarks concerning the provenance of *Magnesians* 8.2 and *Ephesians* 7.2, I gave evidence for why I believe *Magnesians* 7.1 and *Magnesians* 13.2 can be added to the list of Ignatian variants that developed in the manuscript tradition due to the Arian controversy.

I now wish to state further conclusions that emerge from this chapter. This chapter has shown that the Armenian version of the middle recension of the Ignatian letters contains significantly less God language directed to Jesus than do other members of the manuscript tradition. From the variants discussed, *Ephesians* inscription, *Romans* inscription, *Trallians* 7.1, *Smyrnaeans* 1.1, *Smyrnaeans* 6.1, and *Smyrnaeans* 10.1 all contain variants without the God language attributed to Ignatius by other manuscripts. Even *Ephesians* 1.1, "the blood of God," is omitted from the Armenian translation. Recall that Lightfoot attributes this to homoioteleuton. Based on the overall tendency of the Armenian version to contain less God language directed at Jesus, however, perhaps Lightfoot is wrong in this judgment. If the Armenian version of the middle recension were all we had, Ignatius' God language would, indeed, be present, but it would be much less pronounced.

This is a crucial point to my argument. All of the Ignatian texts listed in the above paragraph do not refer to Jesus as "God" in the Armenian version. Of the eleven texts considered where the manuscript tradition behind the middle recension possesses variants in relation to the Ignatian God language, only three of them from the *Armenian* version witness to Ignatius calling Jesus "God" (*Rom*. 3.3, 6.3, 7.3). Thus, of the fourteen total possibilities of Ignatian God language directed to Jesus, only six (counting the three without variants) can be found in the Armenian version. In addition, of the four texts considered with variants that I traced directly to the Arian controversy (*Magn*. 7.1, 8.2, 13.2; *Eph*. 7.2), three of the readings, judged by most scholars to be authentic, were found in the Armenian version (*Magn*. 7.1, 8.2, 13.2). Thus, it is possible that, on the whole, the Armenian version provides us with the most authentic Ignatius of Antioch.

This study has also shown that *Romans* contains the greatest number of Christological variants. *Romans* has five variants in relation to Ignatius' God language. Due to the propensity of Ignatius to call Jesus "God" in the Roman letter, this total of five variant passages is not surprising. Coming in just behind *Romans* is *Smyrnaeans* with three God language variants. *Ephesians* contains two God language variants. *Trallians* has one God language variant. The manuscript tradition attests that Ignatius calls Jesus God once in his letter to Polycarp, but this is one of the three places where there is no significant variant. According to the manuscript evidence,

Ignatius does not call Jesus God in *Philadelphians* and *Magnesians*.[82] We also discovered that *Magnesians* contains three of the four variants that I placed under the category of "Free Standing Arian Controversy Variants." Thus, it would appear that, without any God language directed to Jesus and with a clear subordinationist theme, *Magnesians* served as the greatest headache for orthodox scribes of the fourth century or later.

I draw attention to the fact that all of the discussion of the Arian controversy in this chapter has centred on the first phase of the controversy. In particular, we spent considerable time connecting the variants of *Magnesians* 8.2 to the Christological understanding of Marcellus of Ancyra. It is also in the writings of Marcellus of Ancyra and Athanasius of Alexandria that we begin to see the understanding of Jesus' subordinate status limited to his incarnation take centre stage. Therefore, I see no reason why these Nicene and pro-Nicene textual variants could not have begun to enter the manuscript tradition of the Ignatian middle recension sometime during the first half of the fourth century. This observation will become more important in future chapters as I continue to defend my argument that Ignatius of Antioch was a battle ground upon which the Arian controversy was fought and as I offer an alternative historical interpretation, concerning the role of Ignatius of Antioch in the fourth century, to that of James D. Smith III in his ThD dissertation, "The Ignatian Long Recension and the Christian Communities in Fourth Century Syrian Antioch."

The foundational goal of this chapter has been to demonstrate that the middle recension of Ignatius' letters, like the long recension of Ignatius letters, reflects the concerns of fourth-century Christological controversy. It has been long known that the long recension is the product of a fourth-century interpolator of the middle recension. I have shown that the middle recension, though not to as great an extent, also reflects scribal concerns with issues related to the Arian controversy. The difference is that the variants that emerge from the middle recension reflect the

---

[82] This is true, but there is an interesting variant in *Phld*. 8.1. Lightfoot's text reads, πᾶσιν οὖν μετανοοῦσιν ἀφίει ὁ Κύριος, ἐὰν μετανοήσωσιν εἰς ἑνότητα θεοῦ καὶ συνέδριον τοῦ ἐπισκόπου – "Therefore the Lord forgives everyone who repents, if they repent into the unity of God and the council of the bishop." Κύριος is supported by the Greek and Latin of the middle recension as well as the Armenian version. The only dissenting voice is the Greek of the long recension. In place of Κύριος it has, unsurprisingly, ὁ θεός. The long recension thus makes clear that ultimately it is God who forgives. I have not included this variant in the main discussion because it seems clear that the interpolator changed Κύριος to ὁ θεός.

concerns of orthodox scribes. The long recension reflects the concerns of a non-Nicene interpolator. Thus, this chapter has suggested an unexpected conclusion. I propose that the non-Nicene long recension of Ignatius' letters arises in the fourth century as a response to the tampering of the middle recension of Ignatius' letters by scribes of the emerging orthodox party. The defense of this surprising find will be one of the goals of the next chapter.

CHAPTER TWO

GOD LANGUAGE IN THE IGNATIAN LONG RECENSION: A CHRISTOLOGICAL PROFILE

Introduction

Much of the opening chapter was devoted to an examination of the God language found in the Ignatian middle recension. In this chapter, I move forward to examine the God language found in the Ignatian long recension. The results of this examination will provide a Christological profile of the Ignatian long recension from which I will be able to construct the argument of the next chapter. In the next chapter, I will contend that the Christology of the Ignatian long recension is most similar to the Christology found in the *Ekthesis Macrostichos* Creed of Antioch 344.

In the pages to follow, I will offer a detailed textual study of the Ignatian long recension in two stages. I will discuss the manner in which the author/interpolator/forger alters the God/Christ language of the Ignatian middle recension. The data revealed in this discussion is brought forward in answer to another question about the Ignatian long recension: why would someone set out to interpolate the seven authentic letters of Ignatius of Antioch and then forge six additional letters in the martyr's name? After this demonstration, I will then provide a discussion of the God language as found in the interpolations to the middle recension and the additional forgeries that complete the Ignatian long recension. In other words, I will examine the interpolations and the forgeries in distinction from changes made to the middle recension proper.

While the primary goal of this chapter is to lay the foundation for the next, there will be other no less tangible results. First, the forthcoming data and accompanying interpretation will confirm Lightfoot's contention (to be discussed in the next chapter) that the same hand is responsible for both the interpolations and the forgeries. We will see that the Christology of both sets of documents is the same. Next, the research presented in this chapter leads me to conclude that the Ignatian long recension was composed in the following manner: the person responsible for the interpolations and the forgeries (again to be discussed in the next chapter) carried out his work by first cleaning up and clarifying the text of the middle recension and next adding the interpolations and the forgeries.

The Alteration of the God/Christ Language Found in the Middle Recension

As this investigation into the God/Christ language of the Ignatian long recension gets underway, we give attention to the interesting yet unasked question: why did someone during the first half of the fourth century find it necessary to interpolate the seven authentic letters of Ignatius and then forge six additional letters?

Why Forgeries?

It is a scholarly consensus that early Christians frequently wrote literary works and put the name of some other, usually well known, Christian to those works. While no one questions this view, little consideration is given to the fundamental question: why would early Christians, of all people, circulate forgeries?

Paul Achtemeier reminds us that, among all the possibilities for ancient pseudonymity, deceit itself was one of them.[1] He draws attention to Tertullian's well-known account of the presbyter in Asia who confessed to writing the *Acts of Paul* because of his "love of Paul" (*De baptismo* 17).[2] Also, Eusebius writes of the Bishop Serapion's condemnation of the *Gospel of Peter* due to its inclusion of docetic teachings (*Historia ecclesiastica* 6.12).

What makes the issue of ancient Christian forgeries more complicated, however, is that there is plentiful evidence that Christians also wrote in someone else's name for commendable reasons. Achtemeier speaks of 1) the student's obligation to his master and 2) the "therapeutic lie." External evidence for students writing in the name of their established teacher consists of students of the Pythagorean School, such as Iamblichos, who credit their work to Pythagoras. Tertullian, once again, serves as internal evidence. In *Against Marcion* 4.5, Tertullian states that most people ascribe the form of Luke's gospel to Paul. He then says, "And it may well seem that the works which disciples publish belong to their masters."[3] It

---

[1] Paul J. Achtemeier, *1 Peter: A Commentary on First Peter* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1996), 39-40. Achtemeier's treatment of pseudonymity is helpful and clear, but also concise due to the nature of its appearance in the introduction to a commentary. Perhaps, the best detailed study of the issue, as acknowledged by Achtemeier, is Norbert Brox, *Falsche Verfasserangaben: Zur Erklärung der frühchristlichen Pseudepigraphia* (Stuttgarter Bibelstudien 79; Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1975).

[2] Tertullian quotes 1 Cor 14.34-35 as evidence that Paul could never have allowed a woman, such as Thecla, to teach and to baptize.

[3] Translation taken from *ANF* 3.

does not appear that Luke actually sent out his text under Paul's name. However, it seems clear that Tertullian thinks that when you read what Luke wrote, you are reading what Paul taught. We find here, again, the principle in place that a disciple was expected to carry on his master's teaching.

This is true even when something other than respect for the teacher is the major concern. The "therapeutic lie" is acceptable if the end result is for the good. Norbert Brox highlights Plato in this regard. Plato allows for the physician to lie to the patient, if the lie is for the betterment of the patient (*Republic* 389b-c). Cicero regards the embellishment of a story, if it enables the speaker to make his/her point more clearly, as acceptable behavior (*Brutus* 11.42). In a similar vein, John Chrysostom rejoices over the good fortune of the Israelites due to Rahab's lie (*On Repentance* 49.331).[4]

In addition to deceit, respect for one's teacher, and the "therapeutic lie," I would like to contribute an additional reason for pseudonymity amongst early Christian writers. The discussion of the textual corruption of the middle recension of the Ignatian letters, found in the first chapter, serves as the foundation for my contention that early Christians also interpolated and forged literature in the name of other Christians when they thought the writings of their esteemed figure had become corrupted by others, either intentionally or accidentally. While a single reason for forgery suggested above cannot account for all incidents of early Christian forgeries, I contend that the process of textual corruption is a cogent reason for understanding why someone would interpolate the seven authentic letters of Ignatius of Antioch and then forge six additional letters.

Evidence from Other Early Christian Literature

Building on the evidence presented in the first chapter, I call attention to examples from antiquity that indicate early Christians were much aware that the writings of their key leaders were sometimes changed in the interest of contemporary theological debates.[5]

---

[4] Brox, *Falsche Verfasserangaben*, 84-85. In addition to these texts brought forward by Brox, I would add the account of Cato's acceptance of bribery when it was, in his opinion, for the good of the commonwealth. See Suetonius' *The Deified Julius*, 19.

[5] Kim Haines-Eitzen says, "Early Christian literature, like ancient literature more generally, was subject to unavoidable scribal errors and blunders. Authors, readers, and scribes share the awareness that scribes were bound to make mistakes, but also testify to the potential for deliberate tampering of

Rufinus, the fourth-century historian also known for translating Greek patristic writings into Latin, states in the prologue to his Latin translation of Origen's *De principiis* that he follows Jerome's example for translating Origen's writings. According to Rufinus, when Jerome translated more than seventy of Origen's *Homilies* into Latin, he removed "stumbling blocks" found in the Greek so that "a Latin reader would find in them nothing out of harmony with our faith" (2).[6] Rufinus goes on to state that the cause of the many contradictions in Origen's writings is due to corruptions brought about by heretics and other evil persons, and that these corruptions are especially present in *De principiis*. In those places where Origen appears to have heretical views regarding the Trinity, Rufinus has "either omitted it as a corrupt and interpolated passage" (3) or he has changed the reading in such a way as to make it agree with Origen's more orthodox statements concerning the Trinity found elsewhere. In those places where Origen might be understood by more educated persons but misunderstood by the less educated, Rufinus has added what Origen says about the subject in other writings in order to bring about clarity. Rufinus assures us that he is adding nothing of his own in these cases, but that he is "simply giving back to him his own statements found in other places" (3). Rufinus gives a reason as to why he has confessed to making changes from the Greek text of Origen's *De principiis*, "to prevent slanderers from supposing that they have once again discovered some matter of accusation against me" (4). Finally, he exhorts everyone who may read or transcribe Origen's *De principiis* to "compare his copy with the originals from which it was made, and … emend it and make it distinct to the very letter, and … not allow a manuscript to remain incorrect or indistinct, lest the difficulty of ascertaining the meaning … should increase the obscurities of the work for those that read it" (4). Rufinus is clearly concerned to correct the corruptions he perceives to have entered the Greek manuscript tradition of Origen's *De principiis*. Thus, the changes he makes are in no way seen as a deception, rather they are viewed as a means of restoration.[7]

---

texts." See Kim Haines-Eitzen, *Guardians of Letters: Literacy, Power, and the Transmitters of Early Christian Literature* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2000) 126.

[6] All translations from Rufinus' prologue are taken from Origen, *On First Principles* (trans. G.W. Butterworth; Gloucester, Mass.: Peter Smith, 1973).

[7] Rufinus further explains his method of translating Origen's works in his *Translation of Pamphilus' Defence of Origen* and in his *Epilogue to Pamphilus the Martyr's Apology for Origen* and, of course, in his *Apology* against the charges of Jerome. In his *Epilogue*, for example, Rufinus writes, "Whenever they [heretics] found in any of the renowned writers of old days a discussion of those

This is important. The point is not whether or not there really was textual corruption. Rather, the point is that textual corruption is *perceived* to be present by a copyist or translator. In the case of the Ignatian long recension, nonetheless, I argue that not only is textual corruption within the middle recension perceived; but that it is actually present. Though, of course, I do not contend that the interpolator is correct in his perception of textual corruption every time I find evidence of this perception. I do argue, however, that the interpolator's fundamental conviction of textual corruption is correct, and that this is what enables him to have the freedom to carry out his interpolations and forgeries.

Jerome would later attack Rufinus for his translation of Origen's *De principiis*.[8] When, however, we turn to Jerome's own writings we find that he does describe his method of translation in a way that is consistent with Rufinus' description of his own and Jerome's method as detailed above. In addition Rufinus points out, in his *Apology* 1.21, that his method of translating Greek texts of Origen's writings into Latin is consistent with the method Jerome himself employs. In his *Letter to Vigilantius*, Jerome defends his method of accepting the parts of Origen that are not deemed heretical in his day and excising those parts of Origen that are deemed heretical. He writes, "If then I have taken over what is good in him and have either cut away or *altered* or ignored what is evil, am I to be regarded as guilty on the score that through my agency those who read Latin receive the good in his writings

---

things which pertain to the glory of God so full and faithful that every believer could gain profit and instruction from it, they have not scrupled to infuse into their writings the poisonous faint of their own false doctrines; this they have done, either by inserting things which the writers had not said or by changing by interpolation what they had said, so that … they meant it to appear that well-known and orthodox men had held as they did." Translation taken from *NPNF* 2.3. Rufinus goes on to perform for his readers a similar task that I am carrying out for my readers. He gives evidence for this practice of intentional textual corruption from the writings of Clement the disciple of the apostles, Clement of Alexandria, Dionysius of Alexandria, Hilary, and Cyprian. Rufinus also testifies that Origen himself was aware of corruptions in his writings. Of course, contra Rufinus, my contention in this thesis is that the eventual orthodox party is also guilty of making renowned Christian writers from a prior day say what the orthodox wish they had said.

[8] The goal of this discussion is to accurately paint a picture of the manner in which early Christians dealt with texts they suspected had become corrupt, and then to place the Ignatian long recension within this framework. The goal is not a detailed description of the later controversies over Origen. The classic work that performs this task is Elizabeth A. Clark, *The Origenist Controversy: The Cultural Construction of an Early Christian Debate* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1992). Chapter four, "Rufinus's Defense against Charges of Origenism," is particularly relevant to the present discussion. Joseph W. Trigg provides a helpful introduction to Origen, as well as a concise treatment of the later controversy that surrounded him. He says, "An unequivocal death by martyrdom would have been better for Origen's posthumous reputation." See Joseph W. Trigg, *Origen* (The Early Church Fathers; London and New York: Routledge, 1998), 61.

without knowing anything of the bad?"[9] Observe here that Jerome acknowledges not only leaving out what he considers erroneous in Origen's works but he also speaks of *altering* what he finds in Origen's works. We are confronted here, in the writings of Jerome and Rufinus, with parallel forms of interpolations and omissions to what we find in the Ignatian long recension.

It is to be noted that Rufinus and Jerome appear to be engaged in two activities in relation to Origen's writings. On the one hand, they are restoring places in the manuscripts of Origen's writings they perceive to be corrupt. On the other hand, they are also doing something other than simply correcting a text they perceive to be corrupted. They seek to retain what is good, by the established orthodoxy of their day, and excise what is considered to have been Origen's erroneous theological positions. Instead of condemning Origen *in toto*, Rufinus and Jerome – though Jerome would later change his mind and condemn Origen outright – want to continue to acknowledge Origen's positive contributions to the church.

I have provided evidence, from a time period roughly parallel to the traditional dating of the Ignatian long recension, which demonstrates early Christians did alter the texts of respected ancestors if they thought the text had become corrupt. Their goal was to restore the text – and more importantly the theological belief of the personality in question – to a more pristine form.[10] I now turn attention to an example of this practice which occurs centuries before the emergence of the long recension.

Marcion is well known for the limitations he proposed in relation to the books (Luke's gospel and ten letters of Paul) and the forms of those books (purged of Jewish interpolations) that he thought should be accepted as authoritative Christian literature. In *Adversus Marcionem* 4.5, Tertullian gives a reason why Marcion argued

---

[9] Translation taken from *NPNF* 2.6. Italics mine.

[10] For further discussion and additional quotations from Rufinus relevant to the argument here see Catherine M. Chin, "Rufinus of Aquileia and Alexandrian Afterlives: Translation as Origenism," *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 18.4 (2010): 617-647, especially p. 627. Chin says, in relation to Rufinus' methodology of removing problematic texts from Origen and also adding additional text to Origen's writings, that Rufinus sees himself as a transmitter of Origen and not as an author distinct from Origen. About those who critized Rufinus by suggesting he should put his own name on the works of those he translates due to his habit of adding his own words, Chin writes, "Here we have two competing notions of authorship: on the one hand, those who wish the translator to have authorial status …, and on the other, an insistence that credit taken for transmitting prior material constitutes literary theft. Rufinus insists on remaining a transmitter."

for his truncated version of Luke's gospel.[11] Tertullian says, "In short, he simply amended what he thought was corrupt; though, indeed, not even this justly, because it was not really corrupt." In this case, Marcion thinks that Luke's gospel has acquired inauthentic additions. Thus, he removes them as he seeks to restore Luke to its unadulterated form. Tertullian, of course, disagrees with Marcion. Nonetheless, he provides us with additional evidence for one reason for the early Christian practice of tampering with preexisting versions of the writings of respected members of the Christian community.

Evidence from the Ignatian Long Recension

The above discussion has brought forth evidence that enables us to see an early Christian literary environment in which persons were much aware that manuscripts became corrupt, either due to innocent errors in transmission or to the introduction of intentional errors. Furthermore, we have seen that there was a desire to restore these texts that had become adulterated due to perceived corruptions. In the case of Origen, for example, it was thought appropriate to incorporate into his text what he was thought to have said, if it could not be determined exactly what he said.

What about the actual text of the long recension? When we turn our attention to it, do we find additional evidence to support my theory that the long recension was intended to clear up confusion brought about by textual corruptions to the middle recension? Yes, we do. We find that the long recension attempts to clear up confusion found within the middle recension on two fronts. First, due to the scribal intensification of the Ignatian God language demonstrated in the first chapter, the long recension seeks to reinstate a clear demarcation between God and Jesus via an articulation of Jesus' subordination to God. I will refer to this type of textual restoration as "Christological Demarcation." Second, there are places, of much more mundane significance, where the long recension simply makes better sense.

---

[11] The consensus is that Tertullian is the most reliable source for Marcion's life and beliefs. This is the conclusion of Sebastian Moll's article, "Three Against Tertullian: The Second Tradition About Marcion's Life," *Journal of Theological Studies* 59.1 (2008): 169-180. He concludes that most of the information provided by Pseudo-Tertullian, Epiphanius, and Philastrius, which is not found in Tertullian's writings, is not historically trustworthy. This information includes reports that Marcion was from Sinope, that his father was a bishop, that Marcion abused a virgin, and that Marcion went to Asia-Minor after his father banned him for abusing the virgin. Moll acknowledges, of course, that Tertullian contains "Kirchenklatsch" in his writings. The best example is Tertullian's account that Marcion repented at the end of his life and tried to restore those he had led astray to the church. Even so, Moll concludes, in his last paragraph, that Tertullian's account of Marcion's life is "more reliable" than what is found in the "second tradition."

Therefore, the interpolator sought to smooth over the rough edges that he encountered in the Ignatian manuscript before him. I will refer to this type of textual restoration as "Basic Clarification." Before turning to these two matters, I need to address briefly the textual tradition behind the long recension.

The Textual Tradition Behind the Long Recension

Fundamental information regarding the manuscript tradition of the Ignatian middle recension is readily available in modern editions of the Apostolic Fathers, such as those discussed in the first chapter. Because, however, there has been minimal engagement with the long recension since the acrid debates over Ignatian authenticity during Lightfoot's day, I offer a few comments about the textual tradition behind any eclectic text of the long recension.

An investigation of the textual evidence relating to the long recension quickly reveals that matters are considerably simpler than with the middle recension. Lightfoot provides a detailed discussion in his "Manuscripts and Versions," as well as a concise discussion in the introduction to his text of the long recension.[12] We learn that the seven interpolated letters occur in only two languages: Greek and Latin. This is a stark contrast with the more numerous translations of the middle recension. The six additional forgeries, in addition to Greek and Latin, occur in Armenian. This is because the forgeries are attached to the Armenian of the middle recension, as is the case with the Greek and Latin. Finally, there is a fragment of the end of *Hero* in Coptic.

Though Lightfoot discusses eleven different Greek manuscripts of the long recension, he concludes that only five have independent worth, the remaining being copies of one of these five. The five manuscripts are: g1 (Augustanus – eleventh century), g2 (Vaticanus 859 – twelfth century), g3 (Nydpruccianus – no longer in existence), g4 (Constantinopolitanus – eleventh century), and g5 (Vaticanus Regius – eleventh century – containing much of *Ephesians*). The first printed text of the long recension was made by Valentius Paceus in 1557 and it was from g1. The second printed text was published two years later by Andrew Gesner. He made use of g3.

Lightfoot discusses fourteen manuscripts of the Latin long recension dating from the ninth through the sixteenth centuries. He begins his discussion, however,

---

[12] Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, 2.1.109-134 and 2.3.127-134 respectively.

with, "The following is a complete list of the MSS which have come to my knowledge. Probably however others may lie hidden in public or private libraries of which no catalogues exist or are accessible."[13] In contrast with the Greek manuscripts of the long recension, where Lightfoot elevates five as valuable for text critical purposes, he writes the following about the Latin manuscripts of the long recension: "This version is exceptionally slovenly and betrays gross ignorance of the Greek language. Frequently sentences are rendered without any regard to the grammar of the original."[14] Lightfoot does concede that the Latin was apparently translated from a manuscript older than the extant Greek manuscripts. Therefore, there are several places where the Latin can help correct errors or enable omissions from the Greek to surface. Due to the Latin's limited textual value, Lightfoot decides:

> Under these circumstances it seemed to me that I should only be wasting time and encumbering my pages to no purpose, if I attempted to produce a revised text of this Latin version with its proper 'apparatus criticus,' and I have been content to avail myself of the labours of my predecessors …[15]

The Latin of the middle recension, as with the Greek and the Armenian of the middle recension, also contains the additional forgeries. Thus, the Latin version of the Ignatian long recension consists of the fourteen manuscripts known to Lightfoot of the interpolated and forged letters and the forged letters found in the two Latin manuscripts of the middle recension discovered by Ussher.

I conclude this brief overview with a reminder that "the *authorities for the text* of these epistles are not the same throughout."[16] The reason for this is twofold: 1) most of the manuscripts are incomplete at the beginning or the end, and 2) the forged letters are also attached to the seven letters of the middle recension. I refer readers to the most helpful listing and categorization of the interpolated and forged letters with the respective manuscripts found in Lightfoot's *Apostolic Fathers* 2.3.128-130.

---

[13] Ibid., 2.1.126.

[14] Ibid., 2.1.133.

[15] Ibid., 2.1.134.

[16] Ibid., 2.3.128.

Basic Clarification and Christological Demarcation Chart

I begin my investigation of the long recension with a chart that lays out all of the texts that will be included in the forthcoming discussion. My investigation of the letters will follow the order in which they appear in the Greek manuscripts of the long recension. The order is *Mary to Ignatius, Ignatius to Mary, Trallians, Magnesians, Tarsians, Philippians, Philadelphians, Smyrnaeans, Polycarp, Antiochenes, Hero, Ephesians,* and *Romans.* Of course, this part of the discussion will only deal with the seven Eusebian letters in their interpolated form.

Text	**Type of Interpolation**
1- *Trallians* 3	Basic Clarification and Christological Demarcation
2 – *Trallians* 4	Basic Clarification
3 – *Trallians* 13	Christological Demarcation
4- *Magnesians* 7	Basic Clarification and Christological Demarcation
5 – *Magnesians* 13 (1)	Basic Clarification
6 – *Magnesians* 13 (2)	Basic Clarification
7 – *Philadelphians* Inscription	Basic Clarification and Christological Demarcation
8 – *Philadelphians* 1	Christological Demarcation
9 – *Smyrnaeans* Inscription	Christological Demarcation
10 – *Smyrnaeans* 1	Christological Demarcation
11 – *Smyrnaeans* 10	Basic Clarification and Christological Demarcation
12 – *Polycarp* 3	Christological Demarcation
13 – *Ephesians* 6	Christological Demarcation
14 – *Ephesians* 7	Christological Demarcation
15 – *Ephesians* 8	Basic Clarification
16 – *Romans* Inscription (1)	Christological Demarcation

17 – *Romans* Inscription (2)	Christological Demarcation
18 – *Romans* 3	Christological Demarcation
19 – *Romans* 6	Christological Demarcation

Trallians

Trallians 3.1 in Lightfoot's text of the middle recension reads, Ὁμοίως πάντες ἐντρεπέσθωσαν τοὺς διακόνους ὡς Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν, ὡς καὶ τὸν ἐπίσκοπον ὄντα τύπον τοῦ πατρός, τοὺς δὲ πρεσβυτέρους ὡς συνέδριον Θεοῦ καὶ [ὡς] σύνδεσμον ἀποστόλων ... "Likewise let everyone reverence the deacons as Jesus Christ, as also the bishop who is the image of the Father, and the presbyters as the council of God and as the college of the apostles."[17] This text, in the middle recension, is full of variants. Before I discuss the variants, I want to draw attention to Lightfoot's text of this same passage in the long recension. It is, ὑμεῖς δὲ ἐντρέπεσθε αὐτοὺς ὡς Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν οὗ φύλακές εἰσιν τοῦ τόπου, ὡς καὶ ὁ ἐπίσκοπος τοῦ πατρὸς τῶν ὅλων τύπος ὑπάρχει, οἱ δὲ πρεσβύτεροι ὡς συνέδριον Θεοῦ καὶ σύνδεσμος ἀποστόλων Χριστοῦ – "And you reverence them [deacons] as Christ Jesus of whose place they are the keepers, as the bishop also exists as the image of the Father of all things, and the presbyters as the council of God and the college of the apostles of Christ."

Based on Lightfoot's text of both recensions, there does not appear to be much difference. In light of the many variants of the middle recension that accompany this text, it is intriguing that three modern editors, introduced in the first chapter, of Ignatius' letters of the middle recension all agree word for word with Lightfoot's textual decisions. While Bihlmeyer, Ehrman, and Holmes all agree with Lightfoot, the pre-critical *Ante-Nicene Fathers* translation of Roberts and Donaldson indicates a fundamentally different reconstructed text. Their translation reads, "In like manner, let all reverence the deacons as an appointment of Jesus Christ, and the bishop as Jesus Christ, who is the Son of the Father, and the presbyters as the Sanhedrin of God, and assembly of the apostles."

[17] All Ignatian translations, unless otherwise noted, are my own.

The reason the *Ante-Nicene Fathers* translation is so different from translations based on Lightfoot's text is because Roberts and Donaldson here follow the Latin text. First, the reading, "as an appointment of Jesus Christ" is found only in the Latin of the middle recension. Second, in both the Greek and Latin of the middle recension the word "Son" that accompanies the phrase, "the Son of the Father" is found instead of the word "image," as found in Lightfoot's text. "Image" – τύπον – is found in the Syriac fragments, the Greek of the long recension, and is paraphrased in the Armenian Antioch.[18]

Clearly Lightfoot's decisions make for a cleaner text. In his text, the deacons are paralleled with Christ and the bishop with the Father. In the translation of the *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, the traditional Ignatian hierarchy of bishop/Father and deacons/Christ is not maintained. Rather both the deacons and the bishop are paralleled with Jesus Christ. The translation of the *Ante-Nicene Fathers* is awkward. Unfortunately, there is no indication as to what text this translation is based on. Apparently, Roberts and Donaldson simply translated the Latin of the middle recension because they were of the opinion that the Greek of the middle recension made no sense.

The evidence gathered from this text is evidence for both types of scribal change: basic clarification and Christological demarcation. Due to the corrupt nature of the text of the middle recension the interpolator possessed, and/or his possible knowledge of corruptions in other translations, the interpolator seeks to restore the text. He does so by making the text more easily understood via Ignatius' traditional Christ/deacon and Father/bishop hierarchical analogy.

Lightfoot's text of the middle recension of *Trallians* 4 is rather confusing as it stands. Due to the confusion, we will see that Lightfoot attempts to remedy the problem in his English translation. Lightfoot's text is:

> Πολλὰ φρονῶ ἐν Θεῷ ἀλλ᾽ ἐμαυτὸν μετρῶ, ἵνα μὴ ἐν καυχήσει ἀπόλωμαι νῦν γάρ με δεῖ πλέον φοβεῖσθαι καὶ μὴ προσέχειν τοῖς φυσιοῦσιν με οἱ γὰρ λέγοντές μοι μαστιγοῦσιν με. ἀγαπῶ μὲν γὰρ τὸ παθεῖν, ἀλλ᾽ οὐκ οἶδα εἰ ἄξιός εἰμι τὸ γὰρ ζῆλος πολλοῖς μὲν οὐ φαίνεται, ἐμὲ δὲ [πλέον] πολεμεῖ. χρῄζω οὖν πραότητος, ἐν ᾗ καταλύεται ὁ ἄρχων τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου.

[18] For a complete listing of the variants associated with this text see Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, 2.2.156-157.

> I think many things in God but I measure myself, in order that I might not be destroyed by boasting, for now it is necessary for me to have great fear and to not pay attention to the ones puffing me up, for the ones who speak such things to me afflict me. For I love to suffer, but I do not know if I am worthy. For envy is not manifest to many, but it [greatly] wars against me. Therefore I need humility, by which the ruler of this age is destroyed."

On the one hand, this is a familiar sounding Ignatian text. It reminds us of Ignatius' words, from the middle recension, to the Roman Christians. In *Romans* 5, Ignatius writes, "Let nothing visible or invisible envy me, in order that I might attain Jesus Christ." In both instances, however, "envy" seems out of place.[19] If Ignatius is concerned that the Roman Christians might demonstrate their love for him by seeking his release (*Rom.* 1), why then would they envy his ordeal? The interpolator seeks to clear up this confusion in both passages. In *Trallians* 4.10-11[20] of the long recension we find, τὸ γὰρ ζῆλος τοῦ ἐχθροῦ πολλοῖς μὲν οὐ φαίνεται, ἐμὲ δὲ πολεμεῖ - "for the envy of the enemy is not manifest to many, but it wars against me." The interpolator's addition of τοῦ ἐχθροῦ – "the enemy" helps to smooth this passage out. Now we see, with the interpolator's help, that Ignatius must fight against becoming conceited due to those praising him. In addition, he must also fight against envy, imparted by Satan, towards those who are free and not about to suffer and die. Due to this fight with envy, Ignatius states that he does not know if he is worthy to die a martyr's death.[21]

When we look to the manuscript tradition of this text, we find the textual tradition is stable. There are differences in the manuscripts but they are minor. The only major variant is that in the Syriac short recension, *Trallians* 4 and 5 are found at

---

[19] I will discuss the *Romans* 5 text when I discuss other issues of basic clarification and Christological demarcation in the Romans letter, later in this chapter.

[20] To assist the reader in finding passages from the Ignatian long recension, I provide the line numbers, after the chapter numbers, from Lightfoot's text.

[21] My interpretation of this text is different from that of William Schoedel. We agree on the more straightforward aspect of this text. Schoedel writes, "Feelings of pride, we are told, are awakened by those who speak to him [Ignatius] of his martyrdom." We differ in that Schoedel concludes, "What he goes on to suggest is that temptations to self-assertion call his commitment into question. And so subtle and powerful are these temptations that he attributes them (apparently) to the 'envy' of supernatural forces invisibly urging on his well-wishers." Schoedel acknowledges the ambiguous nature of any interpretation of this text with his use of "(apparently)." In addition, in a footnote he indicates that previous commentators have debated the meaning of ζῆλος and he argues against the "subtler" usages these commentators have suggested. I acknowledge Schoedel's interpretation is a possibility and I appreciate his admission of the difficulty this passage presents. Yet, I think my interpretation is of greater probability. See William R. Schoedel, *Ignatius of Antioch* (Hermeneia; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1985), 144.

the end of *Romans*. In relation to τὸ γὰρ ζῆλος πολλοῖς μὲν οὐ φαίνεται there are no variants listed. In a similar fashion the τὸ γὰρ ζῆλος τοῦ ἐχθροῦ πολλοῖς μὲν οὐ φαίνεται, ἐμὲ δὲ πολεμεῖ of the long recension has no variants. It is worth noting, however, that all manuscripts of the long recension add ὁ διάβολος after the concluding τούτου of the middle recension.

Based on the manuscript evidence, we can conclude that, on this occasion, the interpolator added τοῦ ἐχθροῦ and ὁ διάβολος in order to clear up confusion.

This is the conclusion that Lightfoot reaches. He writes, "The interpolator therefore correctly interprets the sense, when he adds τοῦ ἐχθροῦ after ζῆλος."[22] Furthermore Lightfoot feels no hesitation about translating this part of the middle recension of *Trallians* 4 as, "For though I desire to suffer, yet I know not whether I am worthy: for the envy of the devil is unseen indeed by many, but against me it wages the fiercer war." Though the word "devil" appears nowhere in the manuscript tradition of the middle recension, Lightfoot puts it in his translation with no indication that it is an addition, not even in his Greek text.

Trallians 13 provides the last example I want to draw from the Trallian letter. There is a small but Christologically significant difference between the middle and long recension of the last (middle recension) or next to last (long recension) sentence. Lightfoot's text of the middle recension of *Trallians* 13.3 reads ἀλλὰ πιστὸς ὁ πατὴρ ἐν Ἰησοῦ Χριστῷ πληρῶσαί μου τὴν αἴτησιν καὶ ὑμῶν ἐν ᾧ εὑρεθείημεν ἄμωμοι – "but the Father in Jesus Christ is faithful to fulfill my request and yours in whom may we be found blameless." Lightfoot's text of the long recension of *Trallians* 13.4-6 reads ἀλλὰ πιστὸς ὁ πατὴρ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ πληρῶσαί μου τὴν αἴτησιν καὶ ὑμῶν ἐν ᾧ εὑρεθείημεν ἄμωμοι – "but the Father of Jesus Christ is faithful to fulfill my request and yours in whom may we be found blameless." The difference between the two recensions consists of: 1) the deletion of the preposition ἐν in the long recension and, therefore 2) the necessary case change from the dative Ἰησοῦ Χριστῷ to the genitive Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.

We see here a clear concern to restore a text that sounds too "miahypostatic" to one that is more "dyohypostatic."[23] To someone of a non-Nicene persuasion, the

---

[22] Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, 2.2.162. His interpretation, however, is different than mine.

[23] The terms "miahypostatic" and "dyohypostaic are taken from Joseph T. Lienhard, "The 'Arian' Controversy: Some Categories Reconsidered," *Theological Studies* 48.3 (1987): 415-437. I interact considerably with this article in the first chapter.

version found in the middle recension merges the Farther into Jesus such that the distinction between the two becomes blurred. The genitive case of the long recension serves to clearly demarcate between the Father and Jesus Christ. It also serves to restore pre-Nicene subordinationist rhetoric.

As with *Trallians* 4, the evidence suggests a change by the interpolator from the text of the Ignatian letters. The last example from *Trallians* is solid evidence for the concern of the interpolator to restore what is, in his opinion, an authentic voice to Ignatius of Antioch.

Magnesians

Magnesians was responsible for much of our discussion of "Free Standing Arian Controversy Variants" in the first chapter. Though applicable here as well, I will not discuss *Magnesians* 8 because it was examined in the first chapter and I do not need to add anything to that previous discussion. I do, however, want to return to *Magnesians* 7 and 13, as they contain additional evidence specifically applicable to this chapter. In addition, there is other evidence from *Magnesians* that serves to advance my argument that the interpolator carries out his task with the goal of achieving both a more polished Ignatian text and a restored, pre-Nicene, Ignatian voice.

We have already noted that the Greek of the long recension of *Magnesians* 7 omits the ἡνωμένος ὤν – "being united" found in the Greek and Latin of the middle recension. In place of the ἡνωμένος ὤν the long recension, in all manuscripts, adds a reference to John 5.30. Lightfoot's text reads Ὥσπερ οὖν ὁ Κύριος ἄνευ τοῦ πατρὸς οὐδὲν ποιεῖ οὐ δύναμαι γάρ, φησίν, ποιεῖν ἀφ᾽ ἑαυτοῦ οὐδέν. οὕτω καὶ ὑμεῖς ἄνευ τοῦ ἐπισκόπου, μηδὲ πρεσβύτερος, μὴ διάκονος, μὴ λαϊκός – "Therefore just as the Lord does nothing without the Father, 'for I am unable,' he says, 'to do anything by myself.' Thus also you do nothing without the bishop, not even the presbyter, not the deacon, and not the people." Thus, we find that where some manuscripts of the middle recension soften the subordinationist tone of this text, the long recension accents it.

The concluding sentence of the middle recension of *Magnesians* 7 is confusing. Lightfoot's text is, πάντες ὡς εἰς ἕνα ναὸν συντρέχετε Θεοῦ, ὡς ἐπὶ ἓν θυσιαστήριον, ἐπὶ ἕνα Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν τὸν ἀφ᾽ ἑνὸς πατρὸς προελθόντα καὶ εἰς ἕνα ὄντα καὶ χωρήσαντα – "Everyone run together as into one temple of

God, as to one altar, to one Jesus Christ who came forth from one Father and being one also returned." I have provided a literal translation. Different editors try to clarify the confusion by their translation. Lightfoot, for example offers this translation: "Hasten to come together all of you, as to one temple, even God; as to one altar, even to one Jesus Christ, who came forth from One Father and is with One and departed unto One." Lightfoot tries to maintain the characteristic Ignatian hierarchy between God and Jesus in this translation, but this is not the way the Greek reads.[24]

The translation of Holmes, who reconstructs the same Greek text as Lightfoot, is "Let all of you run together as to one temple of God, as to one altar, to one Jesus Christ, who came forth from one Father and remained with the One and returned to the One." Holmes decides to translate ὄντα with "remained" in an effort to bring clarity to the Greek text. Ehrman, however, provides us with a translation that best demonstrates the ambiguity of the text. He too concurs with Lightfoot's Greek text. His translation is, "You should all run together, as into one temple of God, as upon one altar, upon one Jesus Christ, who came forth from one Father and was with the one *[Or: and was one with him]* and returned to the one."[25]

The interpolator of the long recension seeks to clear up the confusion with this rendition of the concluding sentence of *Magnesians* 7: πάντες ὡς εἷς εἰς τὸν ναὸν Θεοῦ συντρέχετε, ὡς ἐπὶ ἓν θυσιαστήριον, ἐπὶ ἕνα Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν τὸν ἀρχιερέα τοῦ ἀγεννήτου Θεοῦ - "Everyone run together as into one temple of God, as to one altar, to one Jesus Christ the high priest of the unbegotten God." The long recension actually does make explicit the Ignatian hierarchy, which Lightfoot tries to convey in his translation of the middle rescension's version of this Magnesian text. This is an interesting find because Lightfoot clearly thinks there is some corruption to the text of the middle recension. He says in his notes that the genitive Θεοῦ should be changed to the accusative Θεὸν.[26] He makes this argument even though there is nothing in the existing manuscript tradition that contains the accusative. In other words, even though there is no variation here in the manuscript tradition, Lightfoot still thinks the text has become corrupt. The interpolator agrees with Lightfoot. He does not introduce the accusative Θεὸν. He does, however, provide

---

[24] For Lightfoot's explanation of his translation see Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, 2.2.122-123.

[25] It is worth noting that Bihlmeyer, *Apostolischen Väter*, 90 also agrees with Lightfoot's Greek text. He, however, provides no German translation.

[26] Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, 2.2.123.

both clarification and Christological demarcation with, ἐπὶ ἕνα Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν τὸν ἀρχιερέα τοῦ ἀγεννήτου Θεοῦ – "to one Jesus Christ the high priest of the unbegotten God."

The comparison of Lightfoot's translation of the middle recension of *Magnesians* 7.2 with the actual change found in the Greek of the long recension provides a helpful illustration to a point already made. The point is: just because there is not variation in the textual tradition of the middle recension of a particular text, this does not *guarantee* that the reading is likely authentic.[27] It also bears repeating that whether or not there actually is textual corruption or textual confusion in a particular text of the middle recension is *not* the crux of my argument. My goal is to demonstrate the likelihood that the interpolator *perceives* there to be corruption and/or confusion, and therefore he acts accordingly.

Magnesians 13 was crucial to my argument in the first chapter. More specifically, I dwelt on the absence of the κατὰ σάρκα from some manuscripts of the middle recension. I return now to *Magnesians* 13, but to different issues. There are two sentences, within the middle recension, that add a degree of confusion to the text. As it so happens, these two sentences are of relevance to Christological matters as well.

The first part of the first sentence of the middle recension according to Lightfoot's text is:

> Σπουδάζετε οὖν βεβαιωθῆναι ἐν τοῖς δόγμασιν τοῦ Κυρίου καὶ τῶν ἀποστόλων, ἵνα πάντα ὅσα ποιεῖτε κατευοδωθῆτε σαρκὶ καὶ πνεύματι, πίστει καὶ ἀγάπῃ, ἐν υἱῷ καὶ πατρὶ καὶ ἐν πνεύματι, ἐν ἀρχῇ καὶ ἐν τέλει, μετὰ τοῦ ἀξιοπρεπεστάτου ἐπισκόπου ὑμῶν ...
>
> Therefore be eager to be established in the decrees of the Lord and the apostles, in order that in whatever you do you might prosper, in flesh and spirit, in faith and in love, in the Son and in the Father and in the Spirit, in the beginning and in the end, with your most esteemed bishop …

The reader does not necessarily recognize how awkward this sentence is until s/he reads it in the long recession. Lightfoot's text is:

---

[27] I remind readers of my statement in relation to the three times in the text of the middle recension where there are no variants to Ignatius' God language (*Eph*. 18.2; *Rom*. Inscription (1); *Pol*. 8.1). I wrote, "Thus, to the extent that the textual evidence allows us to know exactly what the historical Ignatius wrote, we can determine that on at least three occasions Ignatius calls Jesus 'God.'" Even here, we cannot know with absolute certainty that Ignatius called Jesus "God," no matter how safe such an assumption might appear.

> Σπουδάζετε οὖν βεβαιωθῆναι ἐν τοῖς δόγμασιν τοῦ Κυρίου καὶ τῶν ἀποστόλων, ἵνα πάντα ὅσα ποιεῖτε κατευοδωθήσεται, σαρκί τε καὶ πνεύματι, πίστει καὶ ἀγάπῃ, μετὰ τοῦ ἀξιοπρεπεστάτου ἐπισκόπου ὑμῶν ...
>
> Therefore be eager to be established in the decrees of the Lord and the apostles, in order that whatever you do will prosper, both in flesh and in spirit, in faith and in love, with your most esteemed bishop …

We notice the change from the aorist subjunctive passive κατευοδωθῆτε to the future indicative passive κατευοδωθήσεται. Of much greater significance and interest, however, is the decision of the interpolator to delete Trinitarian ἐν υἱῷ καὶ πατρὶ καὶ ἐν πνεύματι, as well as the accompanying ἐν ἀρχῇ καὶ ἐν τέλει.

The addition of Trinitarian formulae is one characteristic of the interpolator's additions to his text of the middle recension (e.g., *Magn*. 15; *Phld*. 4 [twice], 6 [twice], 9; *Smyrn*. 13; *Eph*. 20, 21; *Rom*. Inscription). This passage, then, is an anomaly. Why would the interpolator delete this example of Trinitarian rhetoric from his work? One answer is that it was not a part of his text of the middle recension. This is, of course, possible even though there is no variation in the manuscript tradition of this Trinitarian text in the middle recension. Nor is there any variation on the deletion of this Trinitarian text in the manuscripts of the long recension. Yet, in this instance, it seems more likely that the interpolator chose to delete "in the Son and in the Father and in the Spirit" because it makes the sentence cumbersome. In contrast with this sentence in the middle recension, the version in the long recension is a more lucid statement.

The last sentence of *Magnesians* 13 contains phenomona similar to the above discussion of the first part of the first sentence of *Magnesians* 13. Lightfoot's text of the middle recension is, ὑποτάγητε τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ καὶ ἀλλήλοις, ὡς Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς τῷ πατρὶ [κατὰ σάρκα] καὶ οἱ ἀπόστολοι τῷ Χριστῷ καὶ τῷ πατρί, ἵνα ἕνωσις ᾖ σαρκική τε καὶ πνευματική - "Be submissive to the bishop and to one another as Jesus Christ (was) to the Father [according to the flesh] and the apostles to Christ and to the Father, in order that there might be unity both fleshly and spiritual." Lightfoot's text of the long recension is ὑποτάγητε τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ καὶ ἀλλήλοις, ὡς ὁ Χριστὸς τῷ πατρὶ, ἵνα ἕνωσις ᾖ κατὰ Θεὸν ἐν ὑμῖν – "Be submissive to the bishop and to one another as the Christ (was) to the Father, in order that there might be unity according to God among you."

We see that in addition to the previously discussed deletion of κατὰ σάρκα, the long recension also deletes καὶ οἱ ἀπόστολοι τῷ Χριστῷ καὶ τῷ πατρί. In addition the long recension also has κατὰ Θεὸν ἐν ὑμῖν in place of σαρκική τε καὶ πνευματική found in the middle recension. Lightfoot is of the opinion that the omission of "and the apostles to Christ and to the Father" in the long recension is due to homoioteleuton.[28] Yet, Lightfoot himself is of the opinion that the manuscripts of the Greek and Latin of the middle recension are corrupt at this point. These manuscripts add καὶ τῷ πνεύματι to … τῷ Χριστῷ καὶ τῷ πατρί. While a decision for or against this reading can be argued for, Lightfoot thinks that its inclusion is "suspicious in itself."[29]

Building on our previous discussion of the beginning of *Magnesians* 13, I contend the high likelihood that the interpolator's omission of "and the apostles to Christ and to the Father" is not due to homoioteleuton. Rather, the omission is intentional. The interpolator perceived textual corruption in this part of his copy of the middle recension of *Magnesians*. Thus, his deletion is intended to bring about greater clarity to the text. The fact is that *Magnesians* 13 makes considerably more sense, both grammatically and theologically, in the long recension than it does in the middle recension.

<u>Philadelphians</u>

As we turn our attention to the interpolator's version of the Philadelphian letter, we continue to see his concern for a clear demarcation between the Father and the Son. The final portion of the middle recension of *Philadelphians* inscription is potentially confusing; and the interpolator responds with his own clarification. Lightfoot's text of the middle recension is:

> μάλιστα ἐὰν ἐν ἑνὶ ὦσιν σὺν τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ καὶ τοῖς σὺν αὐτῷ πρεσβυτέροις καὶ διακόνοις ἀποδεδειγμένοις ἐν γνώμῃ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, οὓς κατὰ τὸ ἴδιον θέλημα ἐστήριξεν ἐν βεβαιωσύνῃ τῷ ἁγίῳ αὐτοῦ πνεύματι.
>
> especially if they might be one with the bishop and the presbyters with him and the deacons, having been appointed by the mind of Jesus Christ, whom [the bishop, presbyters, and deacons] he confirmed according to his will through strengtheing by his holy spirit.

[28] Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, 2.2.138.

[29] Ibid.

This text, which is found in the Greek of the middle recension, is not easy reading.

There are, however, variants that indicate an attempt to smooth this passage out. For example, the Latin of the middle recension has *si in uno simus* – "if we might be one" in place of the Greek of the middle recension, ἐὰν ἐν ἑνὶ ὦσιν – "if they might be one." The Armenian contains the reading, *si stetis in concordia* – "if you all might remain in harmony." The Latin contains the first person plural. The Armenian contains the second person plural. And the Greek of the middle recension contains the third person plural. If the Medicean manuscript contains the reading that the translators of the Latin and Armenian used, it is clear that these translations are tying to make better sense out of this Greek text. Furthermore, the σὺν αὐτῷ - "with him" found in the Greek and Latin of the middle recension between the definite article τοῖς and the noun πρεσβυτέροις is not necessary. Thus, it comes as no surprise that the Armenian and, as we shall see, the Greek of the long recension omit it.

In addition to these grammatical issues, the wording in the Greek of the middle recension represents an ambiguous demarcation between the persons of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit. According to this text, it is Jesus who appointed the bishop, the presbyters, and the deacons; and the Holy Spirit belongs to Jesus. God is nowhere to be found in this reading.

Notice how the awkward grammatical constructions are smoothened out and the demarcation between Father, Son, and Holy Spirit is inserted in the long recension. Lightfoot's text of *Philadelphians* inscription.5-10 is:

> μάλιστα ἐὰν ἐν ἑνὶ ὦσιν σὺν τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ καὶ τοῖς πρεσβυτέροις καὶ διακόνοις, ἀποδεδειγμένοις ἐν θελήματι Θεοῦ πατρὸς διὰ τοῦ Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὅς κατὰ τὸ ἴδιον βούλημα ἐστήριξεν αὐτοῦ βεβαίως τὴν ἐκκλησίαν ἐπὶ τῇ πέτρᾳ οἰκοδομῇ πνευματικῇ ἀχειροποιήτῳ ...
>
> especially if they might be one with the bishop and the presbyters and deacons, having been appointed by the will of God the Father, through the Lord Jesus Christ, who [God] according to his own will surely established his church upon the spiritual rock, a building not made by a human hand ..."

The most obvious observation is that God is no longer absent. The bishop, presbyters, and deacons have been appointed, not by "the mind of Jesus Christ," but by the "the will of God the Father." Jesus, however, is not absent from this appointment. He is the agent through whom God has appointed them. The Greek word ὅς – "who" – refers back to "God." Thus, it is God who establishes his church

upon a spiritual rock not made with human hands. Here we have a clear demarcation between Father and Son via a moderate subordinationism. As with the Armenian translation, we find that the Greek of the long recension removes the redundant "with him" that accompanies "with the presbyters" in the Greek of the middle recension.

This text from the inscription of *Philadelphians* simply makes better sense in the long recension and the relationship of Father and Son is without ambiguity.

Philadelphians 1 is almost word for word in both the middle and the long recension, with one significant exception. In this section Ignatius praises the Philadelphian bishop for his silence and harmony with God. For example, according to Lightfoot's text of the middle recension, Ignatius begins this section with: Ὃν ἐπίσκοπον ἔγνων οὐκ ἀφ᾽ ἑαυτοῦ οὐδὲ δι᾽ ἀνθπώπων κεκτῆσθαι τὴν διακονίαν τὴν εἰς τὸ κοινὸν ἀνήκουσαν, οὐδὲ κατὰ κενοδοξίαν, ἀλλ᾽ ἐν ἀγάπῃ Θεοῦ πατρὸς καὶ Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ - "which bishop I know not to have acquired his office by himself nor through men, neither according to conceit, but pertaining to the common service (of the church) in the love of God the Father and the Lord Jesus Christ ..."

In contrast with the last example from *Philadelphians,* we see in this text a clear demarcation between Father and Son. Yet the interpolator feels the need to insert a clear subordination of the Son to the Father. Lightfoot's text of the long recension of the opening sentence of *Philadelphians* 1 is, Θεασάμενος ὑμῶν τὸν ἐπίσκοπον, ἔγνων ὅτι οὐκ ἀφ᾽ ἑαυτοῦ οὐδὲ δι᾽ ἀνθπώπων ἠξιώθη τὴν διακονίαν τὴν εἰς τὸ κοινὸν ἀνήκουσαν ἐγχειρισθῆναι, οὐδὲ κατὰ κενοδοξίαν, ἀλλ᾽ ἐν ἀγάπῃ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ Θεοῦ πατρὸς τοῦ ἐγείραντος αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν – "Having beheld your bishop, I know that he was not deemed worthy by himself nor through men, nor through deceit, to be entrusted with the office that pertains to the common service (of the church), but in the love of Jesus Christ and of God the Father who raised him from the dead ..."

Once again, we find here more polished Greek. More significant, however, we see a concern to further distinguish between God the Father and Jesus Christ via Jesus' subordination to the Father. It was God who raised Jesus from the dead.

Smyrnaeans

The interpolation of *Smyrnaeans* inscription is of a similar nature to that of *Philadelphians* 1. As with *Philadelphians* 1, there is already a clear demarcation

between God and Jesus, yet the interpolator feels the need to insert a statement of the clear subordination of Jesus to God. Thus, there can be no danger that the two figures might be merged into one.

The opening words of the middle recension of *Smyrnaeans* Inscription in Lightfoot's text are, Ἰγνατιος, ὁ καὶ Θεοφόρος, ἐκκλησίᾳ Θεοῦ πατρὸς καὶ τοῦ ἠγαπημένου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ... – "Ignatius, also Theophorus, to the church of God the Father and of the beloved Jesus Christ, …" The long recension of this same phrase in Lightfoot's text is, Ἰγνατιος, ὁ καὶ Θεοφόρος, ἐκκλησίᾳ Θεοῦ πατρὸς ὑψίστου καὶ τοῦ ἠγαπημένου υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, - "Ignatius, also Theophorus, to the church of God the Father most high and his beloved Son Jesus Christ, …"

The variants to the middle recension of this phrase are intriguing. Only the Greek of the long recension contains ὑψίστου. The Greek, Latin, Armenian, and Coptic do not know this reading. Yet, in addition to the Greek of the long recension, the Armenian and Coptic of the middle recension also contain υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ. Thus, in order to more accurately portray the hierarchical relationship of the metaphor Father and Son, the interpolator adds ὑψίστου.

In the first chapter I drew attention to the variants associated with Lightfoot's text of the middle recension of the first sentence of *Smyrnaeans* 1. The sentence is, Δοξάζω Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν τὸν θεὸν τὸν οὕτως ὑμᾶς σοφίσαντα – "I glorify Jesus Christ the God who thus made you wise." Recall that the Armenian and Coptic both omit τὸν θεὸν. Lightfoot's text of the long recension of this phrase is, Δοξάζω τὸν Θεὸν καὶ πατέρα τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, τὸν δι᾽ αὐτοῦ οὕτως ὑμᾶς σοφίσαντα – "I glorify the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who thus made you wise through him." Recall also that Lightfoot is of the opinion that τὸν θεὸν goes with τὸν οὕτως ὑμᾶς σοφίσαντα, rather then with Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν. The interpolator, apparently, reads this differently than Lightfoot. Once again, we see the characteristic manner in which the interpolator takes middle recension passages and provides clear demarcation, as well as hierarchy between God and Jesus.

A final example from *Smyrnaeans* comes from section ten. This one is an example of the interpolator's desire for both basic clarification and Christological demarcation. In the first chapter, I drew attention to *Smyrnaeans* 10.1. Lightfoot's text of the middle recension is in part καλῶς ἐποιήσατε ὑποδεξάμενοι ὡς διακόνους [Χριστοῦ] θεοῦ - "you did well having received [Philo and Rheus

Agathopous] as deacons of [Christ] God." We remember that Lightfoot favors the reading from the Armenian which omits Χριστοῦ, over the Greek of the middle recension which contains Χριστοῦ θεοῦ. The interpolator's reading makes more sense. The Greek of the long recension, in contrast with the Armenian which omits "Christ," omits "God." Lightfoot's text of the long recension is, καλῶς ἐποιήσατε ὑποδεξάμενοι ὡς διακόνους Χριστοῦ – "you did well having received [Philo and Rheus Agathopous] as deacons of Christ."

If, as Lightfoot contends, the reading διακόνους Χριστοῦ θεοῦ is the result of scribal confusion, then it follows that the Armenian translator and the interpolator of the long recension attempt to correct the confusion; but they go in different directions as they do so.

Polycarp

Polycarp and *Romans* are the two letters least impacted by the interpolator's work. There is, however, one significant case of Christological demarcation that I want to draw attention to from Ignatius' letter to Polycarp in the long recension. In *Polycarp* 3.2 of the middle recension, Lightfoot's text reads, τοὺς καιροὺς καταμάνθανε τὸν ὑπὲρ καιρὸν προσδόκα, τὸν ἄχρονον, τὸν ἀόρατον, τὸν δι᾽ ἡμᾶς ὁρατόν, τὸν ἀψηλάφητον, τὸν ἀπαθῆ, τὸν δι᾽ ἡμᾶς παθητόν, τὸν κατὰ πάντα τρόπον δι᾽ ἡμᾶς ὑπομείναντα – "Observe the times. Expect the one beyond time, the eternal one, the invisible one, the one visible for our sake, the one not capable of being handled, the one unable to suffer, the one who for our sake became able to suffer, the one who endured all manner of things for our sake." In *Polycarp* 3, Ignatius is exhorting Polycarp to stand up and defeat, like an athlete, the ones who espouse false teaching. The last sentence of 3.1 in Lightfoot's text is, μάλιστα δὲ ἔνεκεν Θεοῦ πάντα ὑπομένειν ἡμᾶς δεῖ, ἵνα καὶ αὐτὸς ἡμᾶς ὑπομείνῃ – "It is especially necessary for us to bear all things for the sake of God, in order that He might bear us." In the light of 3.1, 3.2 is ambiguous. Who is it that became visible and suffered? Is it God or is it Jesus? Nowhere in *Polycarp* 3 is the name Jesus mentioned; not in Lightfoot's text, nor in the variants he lists in his apparatus.

Lightfoot's text of the long recension of *Polycarp* 3.2 is:

> προσδόκα Χριστὸν τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ τὸν ἄχρονον ἐν χρόνῳ τὸν ἀόρατον τῇ φύσει, ὁρατὸν ἐν σαρκί τὸν ἀψηλάφητον καὶ ἀναφῆ ὡς ἀσώματον, δι᾽ ἡμᾶς δὲ ἁπτὸν καὶ ψηλαφητὸν ἐν σώματι τὸν ἀπαθῆ ὡς

> Θεόν, δι᾽ ἡμᾶς δὲ παθητὸν ὡς ἄνθρωπον τὸν κατὰ πάντα τρόπον δι᾽ ἡμᾶς ὑπομείναντα
>
> Expect Christ the Son of God, the eternal one in time, the invisible one in nature, the one visible in flesh, the one not capable of being handled and untouchable as without a body, but for our sake touched and handled in body, the one unable to suffer as God, but able to suffer for our sake as man, having endured all manner of things for our sake.

The interpolator clearly identifies the one spoken of in the middle recension's version of *Polycarp* 3.2 as "Christ the Son of God."

Ephesians

The Ephesian letter is filled with evidence for my thesis that the interpolator seeks to insert a clear demarcation between God and Jesus where the demarcation is not so clear in the middle recension, and that the interpolator also seeks to clarify the text of the middle recension where it seems clouded in other non-Christological statements. I find examples for basic clarification changes in the long recension of sections 8, 16, and 18. I find examples of Christological demarcation in sections 2, 3, 6, 7, 15, and 18. Due to the plentiful evidence already brought forward, I will discuss only three of these examples.

In the long recension of *Ephesians* 6.14-15, we find this sentence in Lightfoot's text, τὸν οὖν ἐπίσκοπον δηλονότι ὡς αὐτὸν τὸν Κύριον δεῖ προσβλέπειν, τῷ Κυρίῳ παρεστῶτα – "Therefore it is clear that it is necessary to look upon the bishop as the Lord himself, standing before the Lord." Lightfoot's text of the middle recension is, τὸν οὖν ἐπίσκοπον δηλονότι ὡς αὐτὸν τὸν Κύριον δεῖ προσβλέπειν – "Therefore it is clear that it is necessary to look upon the bishop as the Lord himself." This is an interesting example because the added demarcation found in the long recension is not between God and Jesus, but between the Lord and the bishop. Apparently, the interpolator is also uncomfortable with the manner in which the text of the middle recension merges the figures of Jesus and the bishop. Thus, he makes it clear that even as the bishop is to be looked upon as the Lord himself, the bishop is subordinate to the Lord.

With *Ephesians* 7.2 we approach, once again, Ignatius' well known creed-like statement. Lightfoot's text of the middle recension is:

> εἷς ἰατρός ἐστιν, σαρκικὸς καὶ πνευματικός, γεννητὸς καὶ ἀγέννητος, ἐν ἀνθρώπῳ θεός, ἐν θανάτῳ ζωὴ ἀληθινή, καὶ ἐκ Μαρίας καὶ ἐκ θεοῦ, πρῶτον παθητὸς καὶ τότε ἀπαθής, Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς ὁ Κύριος ἡμῶν

> there is one physician fleshly and spiritual, begotten and unbegotten, God in man, in death true life, both from Mary and from God, first subject to suffering and then incapable of suffering, Jesus Christ our Lord.

We notice, here, that the physician – Jesus – is called both "begotten" and "unbegotten." Naturally, the interpolator will view this passage as textually corrupt due to its perceived miahypostatic nature. The text becomes a dyohypostatic text in the long recension. Lightfoot's reading is (lines 35-40):

> ἰατρὸς δὲ ἡμῶν ἐστιν ὁ μόνος ἀληθινὸς Θεός, ὁ ἀγέννητος καὶ ἀπρόσιτος, ὁ τῶν ὅλων Κύριος, τοῦ δὲ μονογενοῦς πατὴρ καὶ γεννήτωρ. ἔχομεν ἰατρὸν καὶ τὸν Κύριον ἡμῶν Θεὸν Ἰησοῦν τὸν Χριστόν, τὸν πρὸ αἰώνων υἱὸν μονογενῆ καὶ λόγον, ὕστερον δὲ καὶ ἄνθρωπον ἐκ Μαρίας τῆς παρθένου
>
> But our physician is the only true God, the unbegotten and unapproachable, the Lord of everything, the Father and begetter of the only son. We also have a physician our Lord God Jesus Christ, the only begotten son and word before the ages, and then man from Mary the virgin.

In the text of the middle recension, there is one physician. This text lends itself nicely to the later monophysite proponents. In the hands of the interpolator, however, the word εἷς is removed. In its place, we find two physicians. There is the only true God who is unbegotten and unapproachable. There is also "our Lord God Jesus Christ," who is the begotten son of the Father. The line of distinction between Father and Son is erased in the middle recension. In the long recension, it is written in bold. It is important to note that even though the demarcation between Father and Son is obvious in the *Ephesians* 7 of the long recension, Jesus is still called "God." I suggest we see here an attempt to return to pre-Nicene Christology where Jesus is equated with God and Jesus is subordinate to God.

The final example that I want to highlight from the Ephesian letter is found in section eight. This is an example of a basic clarification that, once made, makes the sentence in question much more logical. The concluding sentence of *Ephesians* 8 in the middle recension of Lightfoot's text is, ἃ δὲ καὶ κατὰ σάρκα πράσσετε, ταῦτα πνευματικά ἐστιν ἐν Ἰησοῦ γὰρ Χριστῷ πάντα πράσσετε – "and even what you do according to the flesh, these things are spiritual, for you do all things in Jesus Christ." This is another example of an occasion where the reader might not be immediately aware of the potential confusion of this sentence until the same sentence is read in the long recension. Lightfoot's text of this sentence (8.13-14) in the long recension is, ὑμεῖς δέ, πλήρεις ὄντες τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος, οὐδὲν σαρκικὸν

ἀλλὰ πνευματικὰ πάντα πράσσετε – "but you being full of the Holy Spirit, you do nothing fleshly but all things spiritual."

The sense of this text of the middle recension, with an allusion to Romans 8.5 and 8.8 in the New Testament, is to suggest that even the more mundane activities of Ephesian Christians are done for the cause of Christ (cf. Col 3.17, 23). The results of our discussion of κατὰ σάρκα in the first chapter, however, indicate that this is an odd way to employ κατὰ σάρκὰ. The interpolator finds it odd to label as "spiritual" those things done "according to the flesh." Thus, when we compare the two recensions, this sentence in the long recension makes better sense. The interpolator concludes that an error, perhaps in this case unintentionally, has entered the textual tradition. Thus, he inserts in his manuscript what he thinks Ignatius must have actually said.

Romans

As we conclude our investigation of the interpolator's basic clarifications and Christological demarcations, I want to bring forward four examples from the Roman letter. All four of these come from texts already discussed in the first chapter.

The first two examples are from Roman inscription. Lightfoot's text of *Romans* inscription (1) reads, κατὰ πίστιν καὶ ἀγάπην Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν – "according to the faith and love of Jesus Christ our God." It is to be remembered that this is one of the three examples of Ignatian God language where there are no textual variants. Lightfoot's text of this same text in the long recension (lines 13-14) is, κατὰ πίστιν καὶ ἀγάπην Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν – "according to the faith and love of Jesus Christ our God and saviour." We see, once again, that the interpolator does not hesitate to call Jesus "God." He is keen, however, to clearly distinguish between God and Jesus, when that distinction has become marred in the textual tradition of the middle recension. Here, he adds the word, "saviour."

This portion of *Romans* inscription, therefore, is now consistent with the earlier statement from Lightfoot's text of the middle recension of *Romans* inscription, ἐν μεγαλειότητι πατρὸς ὑψίστου καὶ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ μόνου υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ – "in the majesty of the Father most high and Jesus Christ his only Son." It is significant that the seemingly minor changes in the interpolator's version of this phrase, as found in Lightfoot's text, support my overall thesis concerning the genesis

of the long recension. The text is, ἐν μεγαλειότητι ὑψίστου Θεοῦ πατρὸς καὶ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ μονογενοῦς αὐτοῦ υἱοῦ – "in the majesty of the most high Father God and Jesus Christ his only begotten Son." The addition of "God" adds rhetorical clarity and force to the phrase. The addition of "only begotten" instead of simply "only" adds theological demarcation to the phrase.

The last phrase found in Lightfoot's text of *Romans* inscription (2) states, πλεῖστα ἐν Ἰησοῦ Χριστῷ τῷ θεῷ ἡμῶν ἀμώμως χαίρειν – "abundant greeting blamelessly in Jesus Christ our God." The variants to this phrase have already been examined. This last phrase in Lightfoot's text of the long recension is, πλεῖστα ἐν θεῷ καὶ πατρὶ καὶ Κυρίῳ ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστῷ ἀμώμως χαίρειν – "abundant greeting blamelessly in the God and Father and in our Lord Jesus Christ." We know that the interpolator does not find the labelling of Jesus as "God" problematic. Thus, in light of the first occurrence in the inscription of Ignatius calling Jesus "God," the interpolator probably concludes that sufficient. Thus, he drops the phrase here and customarily paints a picture of two clearly distinguishable figures.

In Lightfoot's text of *Romans* 3.3 in the middle recension, Jesus is called "God." But there is more. Jesus is said to be "in the Father." The text reads, ὁ γὰρ θεὸς ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦς Χριστός, ἐν πατρὶ ὤν, μᾶλλον φαίνεται – "for our God Jesus Christ, being in the Father, is more manifest." This text could be translated, "being with the Father," but it does not appear that this is how the interpolator reads it. In the long recension we find that it is omitted and replaced by a quotation from John 15.19. We can clearly perceive why this text would be problematic to the interpolator. The text places Jesus in the Father instead of beside or under the Father.

We find in *Romans* 6 a similar practice to that in *Romans* inscription (1). Just as the interpolator adds "saviour" in *Romans* inscription (1), he adds "Christ" in *Romans* 6. *Romans* 6.3 of the middle recension in Lightfoot's text is, ἐπιτρέψατέ μοι μιμητὴν εἶναι τοῦ πάθους τοῦ θεοῦ μου – "permit me to be an imitator of the suffering of my God." Lightfoot's text of this sentence in the long recension (6.35-36) is, ἐπιτρέψατέ μοι μιμητὴν εἶναι πάθους Χριστοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ μου – "permit me to be an imitator of the suffering of Christ my God." We see here that the interpolator maintains the propensity to call Jesus "God," even as he draws a line of distinction between God and Jesus.

The God/Christ Language of the Interpolated and Forged Letters

Before moving forward with a detailed textual analysis of the interpolated and forged letters, it is important to note that the Ignatian long recension acknowledges the diversity of thought surrounding the relationship of the Son to the Father. In *Tarsians* 2.19-23, pseudo-Ignatius writes:

> Ἔγνων ὅτι τινὲς τῶν τοῦ Σατανᾶ ὑπηρετῶν ἐβουλήθησαν ὑμᾶς ταράξαι. οἱ μέν, ὅτι Ἰησοῦς δοκήσει ἐγεννήθη καὶ δοκήσει ἐσταυρώθη [καὶ δοκήσει ἀπέθανεν]. οἱ δέ, ὅτι οὐκ ἔστιν υἱὸς τοῦ δημιουργοῦ. οἱ δέ, ὅτι αὐτός ἐστιν ὁ ἐπὶ πάντων θεός. ἄλλοι δέ, ὅτι ψιλὸς ἄνθρωπός ἐστιν.
>
> I know that some of the ministers of Satan have desired to disturb you. Some [say] that Jesus was born in appearance and Jesus was crucified in appearance [and Jesus died in appearance]; but others [say] that he is not the Son of the Creator; some [say] that he is the God over all; but others [say] that he is a mere man.

We encounter similar statements in *Antiochians* 1-6. I provide a brief sample from 1.33ff:

> πᾶσαν Ἰουδαϊκὴν καὶ Ἑλληνικὴν ἀπορρίψαι πλάνην καὶ μήτε πλῆθος θεῶν ἐπεισάγειν μήτε τὸν Χριστὸν ἀρνεῖσθαι προφάσει τοῦ ἑνὸς θεοῦ.
>
> destroy every Jewish and Greek error and neither introduce a multitude of gods nor deny Christ for the reason of [belief in] one God.

After an examination of biblical passages where Moses, or the prophets, or the evangelists declare there to be only one God, but they also acknowledge a second figure along with God, now understood to be Jesus, pseudo-Ignatius says in 5.37ff

> Πᾶς οὖν ὅστις ἕνα καταγγέλει θεὸν ἐπ᾽ ἀναιρέσει τῆς τοῦ Χριστοῦ θεότητος υἱός ἐστιν διαβόλου καὶ ἐχθρὸς πάσης δικαιοσύνης
>
> Everyone therefore who declares one God for the purpose of destroying the divinity of Christ, he is the son of the devil and enemy of all righteousness.

It is true that these extremes illustrated by the above texts were in existence before the fourth century, as the personalities of Paul of Samasota and Sabellius demonstrate. Nonetheless, the degree to which these extremes are put forth and then condemned in the Ignatian long recension reveals an intensification of concerns from the third-century debates over Paul and Sabellius (in addition to the above texts see

e.g. *Hero* 2).[30] Thus, it is within this fourth-century framework that the Ignatian long recension calls for the reestablishment of an earlier Christological pattern that allows for the survival of the pre-Nicene Christological paradox, detailed in the first chapter, that understands Jesus to be both equal with and subordinate to God.

The Ignatian long recension consistently refers to Jesus as God, repeatedly equates Jesus with God, and emphatically declares Jesus subordinate to God without any of the commonplace fourth-century qualifications of causality or incarnation. In order to establish just how central, and seemingly non-problematic, the Christological pattern of equality and subordination is for pseudo-Ignatius, I will now list each place where Jesus is referred to as God, equated with God, and subordinated to God. I do so, once again, in the order of the letters found in the Greek manuscripts of the long recension. Thus, the forgeries are mixed in with the interpolated letters.

Jesus as God in the Ignatian Long Recension

I begin this next stage of our Christological profile with the places where pseudo-Ignatius refers to Jesus as God. As we saw in chapter one, much of the Ignatian God language from the middle recension is negated in the long recension. However, we noticed in the first stage of this Christological profile that Jesus is still referred to as God in the long recension. In order to demonstrate just how frequently this occurs, I list twenty places and offer brief remarks. In this Christological profile, we find Jesus called God in *Magnesians* (once), *Tarsians* (three times), *Philippians* (three times), *Philadelphians* (three times), *Smyrnaeans* (three times), *Polycarp* (twice), *Ephesians* (three times), and *Romans* (twice). Furthermore, we find that the interpolator/forger directs the title God to Jesus via Jesus' status as preexistent Word (nine times), as resurrected Christ (twice), as the human Jesus of the New Testament gospels (seven times), as referred to in Scripture (twice), in a manner identical with that found in the middle recension (once), and in a generic sense (once). This chart summarizes the forthcoming discussion.

[30] In this text pseudo-Ignatius applies Matt 7.15 and 1 Cor 13.2-3 to those who teach beyond what is commanded. He concludes this section by referring to those who say that Christ is a "mere man" as Christ slayers – εἴ τις ἄνθρωπον λέγει ψιλὸν τὸν Κύριον, Ἰουδαῖός ἐστιν χριστοκτόνος.

Text	Manner Jesus is Referred to as God
1) *Magnesians* 6	Word
2) *Tarsians* 1	Resurrected Christ
3) *Tasians* 4	Word
4) *Tarsians* 6	Word and Scripture
5) *Philippians* 2	Word
6) *Philippians* 6	Human Jesus
7) *Philippians* 9	Human Jesus
8) *Philadelphians* 4	Word
9) *Philadephians* 6	Word
10) *Philadelphains 6*	Word
11) *Smyrnaeans* 1	Word
12) *Smyrnaeans* 3	Resurrected Christ and Scripture
13) *Smyrnaeans* 5	Human Jesus
14) *Polycarp* 8	Identical with the Middle Recension
15) *Polycarp* 3	Human Jesus
16) *Ephesains* 7	Word
17) *Ephesians* 15	Human Jesus
18) *Ephesians* 19	Human Jesus
19) *Romans* Inscription	Generic
20) *Romans* 6	Human Jesus

Magnesians

The interpolator writes in *Magnesians* 6.35ff:

ὃς πρὸ αἰῶνος παρὰ τῷ πατρὶ γεννηθεὶς ἦν λόγος θεός, μονογενὴς υἱός, καὶ ἐπὶ συντελείᾳ τῶν αἰώνων ὁ αὐτὸς διαμένει τῆς γὰρ βασιλείας αὐτοῦ οὐκ ἔσται τέλος, φησὶν Δανιὴλ ὁ προφήτης.

> Who before the age with God the Father was begotten, God the Word, only-begotten Son, and he remains at the consummation of the ages for his kingdom will have no end, says the prophet Daniel.

This text is an expansion from the middle recension. It highlights a common theme from the Ignatian long recension. The interpolator/forger has no hesitation about identifying the *logos* with Jesus and then calling the *logos* θεός.

Tarsians

I call attention to three places in *Tarsians* where Jesus is referred to as God. The first is found in 1.10-13:

> Διὸ ἕτοιμός εἰμι πρὸς πῦρ, πρός θηρία, πρὸς ξίφος, πρὸς σταυρόν· μόνον, ἵνα [τὸν] Χριστὸν ἴδω τὸν σωτῆρά μου καὶ θεόν, τὸν ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ ἀποθανόντα.
>
> Therefore I am prepared [to go towards] fire, beasts, sword, the cross, only that I might see Christ my Savior and God, the one who died for me.

In contrast with the first example from *Magnesians* 6, it is Christ who is called God. Furthermore, the one called God is in his post-resurrection state in contrast with his preexistent state as the *logos*.

The next example comes from *Tarsians* 4.11-13. Pseudo-Ignatius is battling against false teachings and he writes:

> Καὶ ὅτι οὗτος ὁ γεννηθεὶς ἐκ γυναικὸς υἱός ἐστιν τοῦ θεοῦ, καὶ ὁ σταυρωθεὶς πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως καὶ θεὸς λόγος, καὶ αὐτὸς ἐποίησεν τὰ πάντα ...
>
> And this one who was born from a woman is the Son of God, and the one who was crucified [is] the first born of all creation and God the Word, and he made all things …

Here we discover an incarnational link between the crucified one and the first born of all creation. Once again, it is the *logos* that is called God.

In *Tarsians* 6.10-12, after arguing in section five that Jesus is not the Supreme God, pseudo-Ignatius then turns to argue against the other extreme – neither is Jesus a mere man. Towards the end of this part of his argument, he quotes John 1.1 in order to demonstrate that the one who had his beginning from Mary could not be a mere man:

> ἐν ἀρχῇ γὰρ ἦν ὁ λόγος, καὶ ὁ λόγος ἦν πρὸς τὸν θεόν, καὶ θεὸς ἦν ὁ λόγος.

> For in the beginning the Word was, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God.

Not only does pseudo-Ignatius refer to Jesus as God via the now familiar *logos* motif, but here he also does so via the use of Scripture. We see then from the forged letter to the *Tarsians* two additional examples of pseudo-Ignatius labeling Jesus as God via the *logos* and one example where the resurrected Jesus is called God.

Philippians

When we move on to *Philippians*, we find Jesus referred to as God in a variety of intriguing ways. I will reserve discussion for some of these texts for the next section, where I point to places where Jesus is equated with God.

In *Philippians* 2.28ff, pseudo-Ignatius discusses the three persons of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. He writes:

> Εἷς οὖν θεὸς καὶ πατήρ, καὶ οὐ δύο οὐδὲ τρεῖς ... εἷς δὲ καὶ υἱός, λόγος θεός
>
> There is then one God and Father, and not two nor three … and also one son, God the Word.

Once again the God reference is to "God the Word." Our next example, however, provides us with a different usage.

In *Philippians* 6.32ff, pseudo-Ignatius writes at the beginning of his lengthy address to Satan:

> Πῶς δὲ οὐχ οὗτος θεός, ὁ νεκροὺς ἀνιστῶν, χωλοὺς ἀρτίους ἀποστέλλων, λεπροὺς καθαρίζων, τυφλοὺς ὀμματῶν, τὰ ὄντα ἢ αὔξων ἢ μεταβάλλων, ὡς τοὺς πέντε ἄρτους καὶ τοὺς δύο ἰχθύας καὶ τὸ ὕδωρ εἰς οἶνον, τὸν δὲ σὸν στρατὸν ῥήματι μόνον φυγαδεύων;
>
> But how is this one not God, the one raising the dead, sending forth the lame complete, cleansing lepers, giving eyes to the blind, things being either increasing or changing, such as the five loaves and the two fish and the water into wine, and the one driving into exile your army by word alone.

Here, for the first time in our profile, we find pseudo-Ignatius referring to the human Jesus of the New Testament gospels as God.

Likewise, in *Philippians* 9.4-7, the rubric of God is applied to the earthly Jesus. This time the context is pseudo-Ignatius' dialogue with Satan concerning Satan's misunderstandings over Jesus' baptism and Satan's consequent demonstration of his ignorance during Jesus' temptation in the wilderness.

> διὰ τί οὖν πεινᾷ; ἵνα δείξῃ ὅτι κατ᾽ ἀλήθειαν ἔλαβε σῶμα ὁμοιοπαθὲς ἀνθρώποις. διὰ μὲν τοῦ πρώτου ἔδειξεν ὅτι θεός, διὰ δὲ τοῦ δευτέρου ὅτι καὶ ἄνθρωπος.
>
> Why therefore did he hunger? In order that he might show that he truly received a body of like passions with [other] men. Through the first he showed that he is God, through the second also man.

The Philippian letter is of particular value in my efforts to demonstrate the presence of a common pre-Nicene paradoxical Christological pattern. We have noticed three places where Jesus is referred to as God by pseudo-Ignatius. When we return to the Philippian letter in our discussion of places pseudo-Ignatius equates Jesus with God, we will meet two additional texts.

Philadelphians

In his letter to the *Philadelphians*, the interpolator labels Jesus as God on three occasions. He does so once in section four and twice in section six. Section four represents a major and fascinating expansion from the Ignatian middle recension.[31] The foundation from which the interpolator builds is the theme of unity. After reproducing the command from the middle recension to have one Eucharist, the interpolator adds the following trinitarian statement in 4.40ff:

> ἐπείπερ καὶ εἷς ἀγέννητος, ὁ θεὸς καὶ πατήρ, καὶ εἷς μονογενὴς υἱός, θεὸς λόγος καὶ ἄνθρωπος καὶ εἷς ὁ παράκλητος, τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας ἓν δὲ καὶ τὸ κήρυγμα, καὶ ἡ πίστις μία, καὶ τὸ βάπτισμα ἕν, ...
>
> Since also there is one ungenerated, God also the Father, and one only generated Son, God the Word and man, and one Comforter, the Spirit of truth, and also one preaching, and one faith, and one baptism …

Once again the Son is "God the Word."

Philadelphians 6.7-11 is also a major expansion from the Ignatian middle recension. As the interpolator refutes varies heresies from his day, he writes:

> ἐάν τις λέγῃ μὲν ἕνα θεόν, ὁμολογεῖ δὲ καὶ Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν, ψιλὸν δὲ ἄνθρωπον εἶναι νομίζῃ τὸν Κύριον, οὐχὶ θεὸν μονογενῆ καὶ σοφίαν καὶ λόγον θεοῦ, ἀλλ᾽ ἐκ ψυχῆς καὶ σώματος αὐτὸν εἶναι νομίζῃ, ὁ τοιοῦτος ὄφις ἐστιν ...

[31] In *Philadelphians* 4, we learn that the interpolator believes that the apostle Paul was a married man. He draws upon the examples of Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Joseph, Isaiah, the rest of the prophets, Peter, and Paul as evidence that marriage is not to be frowned upon; even as there is a respectable place for celibacy.

> If anyone might say there is one God, and also confesses Christ Jesus, but supposes the Lord to be a mere man, and not the only generated God and Wisdom and Word of God, but supposes him to be of soul and body, such a one is a snake …

In this text, not only do we find the interpolator once again referring to Jesus as the "only generated God," but we are also exposed to his belief that Jesus did not possess a human soul.

The interpolator also negates the reality of a human soul in Jesus the second time he refers to Jesus as God in *Philadelphians* 6.20-23. He writes:

> ἐάν τις ταῦτα μὲν ὁμολογῇ, καὶ ὅτι θεὸς λόγος ἐν ἀνθρωπίνῳ σώματι κατῴκει, ὢν ἐν αὐτῷ ὁ λόγος, ὡς ψυχὴ ἐν σώματι, διὰ τὸ ἔνοικον εἶναι θεὸν ἀλλ᾽ οὐχὶ ἀνθρωπείαν ψυχήν, λέγει δὲ ...
>
> If anyone might confess these things, and that God the Word dwelt in a human body, the Word being in it, as a soul in the body, because of the fact that God is indwelling but not a human soul, but he says …

As we prepare to move on to the letter to the *Smyrnaeans*, it is important to recall that in the Ignatian middle recension, *Philadelphians* and *Magnesians* are the two letters from the middle recension where Ignatius does not refer to Jesus as God. Yet, in the interpolator's rendition, there are numerous places where Jesus is referred to as God.

<u>*Smyrnaeans*</u>

The interpolator refers to Jesus as God on three occasions in *Smyrnaeans*. In *Smyrnaeans* 1.7, 14-17 he says:

> Δοξάξω τὸν θεὸν καὶ πατέρα τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, τὸν δι᾽ αὐτοῦ οὕτως ὑμᾶς σοφίσαντα ... τὸν τοῦ θεοῦ υἱόν , τὸν πρωτότοκον πάσης κτίσεως, τὸν θεὸν λόγον, τὸν μονογενῆ υἱόν· ὄντα δὲ ἐκ γένους Δαυεὶδ κατὰ σάρκα, ἐκ Μαρίας τῆς παρθένου, βεβαπτισμένον ὑπὸ Ἰωάννου, ...
>
> I glorify the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, the one who made you wise in this manner through him … the Son of God, the firstborn of all creation, God the Word, the only generated Son, being from the descent of David according to the flesh, from Mary the virgin, having been baptized by John, …

Once again, the God reference is to the *logos*. By now, this comes to us as no surprise.

Later in the letter, as the interpolator intensifies the concern of the historical Ignatius in relation to docetism, he draws on the post-resurrection exchange between Jesus and Thomas found in John 20.24-28. He writes in section 3.45ff:

> καὶ τῷ θωμᾷ λέγει· φέρε τὸν δάκτυλόν σου [ὧδε] ... διὸ καὶ θωμᾶς φησὶν αὐτῷ, ὁ Κύριός μου καὶ ὁ θεός μου.
>
> and he says to Thomas, "bring your finger [here] …" and therefore Thomas says to him, "My Lord and my God."

The interpolator employs John 20.28 as evidence that Jesus had a physical body, not only on earth, but also in his resurrected state.

A final place from the Ignatian long recension of *Smyrnaeans* where Jesus is called God is in section five. In section five, the interpolator follows the middle recension closely. He does, however, change the wording of one sentence in a significant manner. The interpolator asks in 5.32-34:

> τί γὰρ ὠφελεῖ, εἰ ἐμὲ ἐπαινεῖ τις τὸν δὲ Κύριόν μου βλασφημεῖ, μὴ ὁμολογῶν αὐτὸν σαρκοφόρον θεόν ;
>
> for how is it a benefit, if someone commends me but blasphemes my Lord, not confessing him God bearing flesh?

From these three occurrences, we note that pseudo-Ignatius labels Jesus as God via the familiar Word category, a quotation from the New Testament, and an explicit reference to the incarnation.

Polycarp

Turning our attention to Ignatius' letter to Polycarp, we find two occurrences where pseudo-Ignatius refers to Jesus as God. It is to be recalled that in *Polycarp* and *Romans* there is only minimal difference between the middle and long recensions. Therefore, one of the occurrences in the Ignatian long recension of the letter to Polycarp is also present in the middle recension. In fact, *Polycarp* 8 was cited in the first chapter as one of the three occurrences, in the middle recension, where there are no God language variants.

Polycarp 3.40ff, however, is different. Section three does contain variation from the middle recension. In this variation, the interpolator refers to Jesus as God. He writes:

> προσδόκα Χριστὸν τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ· τὸν ἄχρονον ἐν χρόνῳ· τὸν ἀόρατον τῇ φύσει, ὁρατὸν ἐν σαρκί· τὸν ἀψηλάφητον καὶ ἀναφῆ ὡς ἀσώματον, δι᾽ ἡμᾶς δὲ ἁπτὸν καὶ ψηλαφητὸν ἐν σώματι· τὸν ἀπαθῆ ὡς

> θεόν, δι᾽ ἡμᾶς δὲ παθητὸν ὡς ἄνθρωπον· τὸν κατὰ πάντα τρόπον δι᾽ ἡμᾶς ὑπομείναντα.
>
> Await Christ the Son of God; the timeless one in time; the one invisible by nature, visible in flesh, the one untouchable and intangible as without a body, but for our sake touchable and tangible in body; the one impassable as God, but suffering for our sake as man; enduring for us in every way.

In this text, the interpolator clearly labels Jesus with the word θεός. As he does so, we are exposed to his belief that Jesus suffered in his capacity as a human being.

Ephesians

In the lengthy Ephesian letter, I highlight three occasions where the interpolator refers to Jesus as God. The first explicit reference to Jesus as God occurs in the interpolator's rendition of the famous and problematic text from *Ephesians* 7. The variants and issues surrounding this text were discussed in chapter one. The interpolator writes in 7.35-40:

> ἰατρὸς δὲ ἡμῶν ἐστιν ὁ ἀληθινὸς θεός, ὁ ἀγέννητος καὶ ἀπρόσιτος, ὁ τῶν ὅλων Κύριος, τοῦ δὲ μονογενοῦς πατὴρ καὶ γεννήτωρ. ἔχομεν ἰατρὸν καὶ τὸν Κύριον ἡμῶν θεὸν Ἰησοῦν τὸν Χριστόν, τὸν πρὸ αἰώνων υἱὸν μονογενῆ καὶ λόγον, ὕστερον δὲ καὶ ἄνθρωπον ἐκ Μαρίας τῆς παρθένου· ...
>
> But the true God is our physician, the ungenerated and unapproachable, the Lord of all, Father and Generator of the only generated. We also have a physician our Lord God Jesus the Christ, the only generated Son and Word before the ages, and afterwards also man from the virgin Mary …

This is an illustrative text of the Christology that surfaces in the Ignatian long recension. There is a clear distinction between the "true God" and "our Lord God Jesus the Christ." Yet, the rubric God is explicitly applied to Jesus.

In *Ephesians* 15.13-16 the interpolator, copying from the middle recension, emphasizes the importance of the actions of a Christian teacher being in concord with his words. The interpolator then adds:

> ὁ Κύριος ἡμῶν καὶ θεὸς Ἰησοῦς ὁ Χριστός, ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ζῶντος, πρῶτον ἐποίησεν καὶ τότε ἐδίδαξεν, ὡς μαρτυρεῖ Λουκᾶς, οὗ ὁ ἔπαινος ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ διὰ πασῶν τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν.
>
> Our Lord and God Christ Jesus, the Son of the living God, first he did and then he taught, as Luke testifies, whose commendation is in the gospel through all the churches.

The "Lord and God Christ Jesus" is the model for Christian teachers.

Our final stop in *Ephesians* is 19.28-30. This section appears to be an allusion to Matthew 2.1-12. This is Matthew's account of the star that guided the wise men to the place where the child Jesus was. In a slightly expanded version of the middle recension, the interpolator writes:

> ... καὶ τυραννικὴ ἀρχὴ καθῃρεῖτο, θεοῦ ὡς ἀνθρώπου φαινομένου, καὶ ἀνθρώπου ὡς θεοῦ ἐνεργοῦντος· ...
>
> … and the tyrannical authority was destroyed, God being manifest as man, and man working as God; …

The interpolator proclaims that in the incarnation, God was made manifest as a man, and the "ruler of this age" was defeated. This use is similar to that found in *Smyrnaeans* 5.

Romans

We now reach our final destination in our catalogue of places from the Ignatian long recension where pseudo-Ignatius refers to Jesus as God. There are two such occurrences in the Roman letter. Both of these places represent minor yet significant expansions from the middle recension.

> In the opening inscription, the interpolator greets the Romans with:
>
> Ἰγνατιος, ὁ καὶ θεοφόρος, τῇ ἠλεημένῃ ἐν μεγαλειότητι ὑψίστου θεοῦ πατρὸς καὶ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ μονογενοῦς αὐτοῦ υἱοῦ, ἐκκλησίᾳ ἡγιασμένῃ καὶ πεφωτισμένῃ ἐν θελήματι θεοῦ τοῦ ποιήσαντος τὰ πάντα ἃ ἔστιν, κατὰ πίστιν καὶ ἀγάπην Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν, ...
>
> Ignatius, also called Theophorus, to the church having received mercy by the grandeur of God the Father most high and Jesus Christ his only generated Son, [the church] having been consecrated and enlightened by the will of God who made all things which are, according to the faith and love of Jesus Christ our God and Saviour.

Here we find that pseudo-Ignatius has σωτῆρος ἡμῶν. Clearly, he does this in order to maintain the demarcation between God and Jesus that is found in the phrase ὑψίστου θεοῦ πατρὸς καὶ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ μονογενοῦς αὐτοῦ υἱοῦ. Even so, we find that τοῦ θεοῦ is applied to Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. This is an important observation because recall that in some manuscripts of the middle recension (Medicean, Latin, Armenian martyrology, and Syriac martyrology), *Romans* inscription ends with πλεῖστα ἐν Ἰησοῦ Χριστῷ τῷ θεῷ ἡμῶν ἀμώμως χαίρειν – much blameless rejoicing in Jesus Christ our God. Even if the interpolator has the

Greek that lies behind the Armenian, which omits τῷ θεῷ ἡμῶν, he still changes the text before him to πλεῖστα ἐν θεῷ καὶ πατρὶ καὶ Κυρίῳ ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστῷ ἀμώμως χαίρειν – much blameless rejoicing in the God and Father and our Lord Jesus Christ. Pseudo-Ignatius consistently refers to Jesus as God and clearly maintains Jesus' distinction from God throughout all of his letters. *Romans* inscription, however, is a model example of his Christology.

The second place pseudo-Ignatius labels Jesus as God in his version of *Romans* is in 6.35-36. In a most similar fashion to *Romans* inscription, the interpolator writes, ἐπιτρέψατέ μοι μιμητὴν εἶναι πάθους Χριστοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ μου – permit me to be an imitator of the suffering of Christ my God. Recall once again that some manuscripts of the middle recension (Medicean, Latin, Syriac Fragment 3, Armenian, and Syriac martyrology) simply read, ἐπιτρέψατέ μοι μιμητὴν εἶναι πάθους τοῦ θεοῦ μου – permit me to be an imitator of the suffering of my God. Clearly this is a reference to Jesus' suffering. Thus, in an effort to avoid merging the two figures too closely together, the interpolator has Χριστοῦ. As we have seen throughout this inventory, however, the interpolator has no hesitation about referring to Jesus as God.

I have identified and briefly discussed twenty places from the Ignatian long recension where the interpolator/forger refers to Jesus as God. As demonstrated in the first chapter, it is the case that in many places where the Ignatius of the middle recension refers to Jesus as God, the long recension contains variants of negation. It is extremely important, however, to emphasize how frequently pseudo-Ignatius labels Jesus as God. We have seen that as he does so, pseudo-Ignatius consistently maintains a clear distinction between God the Father and God the Son.

Jesus Equated with God in the Ignatian Long Recension

As is well known, it is not remarkable for a non-Nicene representative to refer to Jesus as God. It is remarkable, however, for a fourth-century non-Nicene personality to equate Jesus with God.

Philippians

I have already alluded to the importance of the Philippian forgery for the comprehension of pseudo-Ignatius' Christology. Two of the three places I have found where the interpolator/forger equates Jesus with God emerge from *Philippians*. The first occurrence is from *Philippians* inscription:

> ἔλεος, εἰρήνη ἀπὸ θεοῦ πατρὸς καὶ Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὅς ἐστιν σωτὴρ πάντων ἀνθρώπων, μάλιστα πιστῶν.
>
> Mercy [and] peace from God the Father and the Lord Jesus Christ, who is the savior of all men, especially of believers.

Here we find 1 Timothy 4.10 applied to God and Jesus. In 1Timothy 4.10, however, σωτὴρ is applied only to God. There is no mention of Jesus. Thus, we find pseudo-Ignatius equating Jesus with God in this application of Scripture.

We return now to *Philippians* 2.8-15. The last two sentences are foundational to my argument that pseudo-Ignatius is a non-Nicene representative who not only freely refers to Jesus as God, but also equates Jesus with God. Due to their importance, I quote them in full.

> οὔτε οὖν τρεῖς πατέρες οὔτε τρεῖς υἱοὶ οὔτε τρεῖς παράκλητοι, ἀλλ᾽ εἷς πατὴρ καὶ εἷς υἱὸς καὶ εἷς παράκλητος. διὸ καὶ [Κύριος] ἀποστέλλων τοὺς ἀποστόλους μαθητεῦσαι πάντα τὰ ἔθνη ἐνετείλατο αὐτοῖς βαπτίζειν εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ καὶ ἁγίου πνεύματος· οὔτε εἰς ἕνα τριώνυμον οὔτε εἰς τρεῖς ἐνανθρωπήσαντας, ἀλλ᾽ εἰς τρεῖς ὁμοτίμους.
>
> Therefore there are neither three fathers nor three sons nor three comforters, but there is one Father and one Son and one Comforter. Therefore when [the Lord] sent out the apostles to teach all nations he commanded them to baptize in the name of the Father and the Son and Holy Spirit; not into one having three names nor into three incarnates, but into three possessing equal honor.

All non-Nicenes, of course, do not equate Jesus with God. Most non-Nicenes seem to gravitate to the other side of the pre-Nicene Christological paradox. Most non-Nicenes see Jesus as a secondary divinity alone. The author of the Ignatian long recension, however, clearly allows the tension to remain. Not only is Jesus understood to be God (as with most every other fourth-century theological camp), but he also "possesses equal honor"[32] with God.[33] The Ignatian long recension represents a petition to return to an earlier way of handling mysterious Trinitarian

[32] There are no significant variants within the manuscript tradition. The only variant, according to Lightfoot, is that one manuscript has ὁμωνύμους for ὁμοτίμους.

[33] It is also worth noting that in addition to the Son, the Holy Spirit is also understood to be equal with God in *Philippians* 2. There are numerous Trinitarian texts in the Ignatian long recension (*Trallians* 1; *Magnesians* 15; *Philippians* 1, 2; *Philadelphians* 4 [twice], 6 [twice], 9; *Smyrnaeans* 13; *Antiochenes* 14; *Hero* 7; *Ephesians* 20, 21; *Romans* inscription). The intensification of interest in the Holy Spirit is additional evidence for the fourth-century provenance of the long recension.

issues. This earlier manner consists fundamentally of allowing the paradoxical combination of equality and subordination to remain in place.[34]

When commenting on this text, Lightfoot says about pseudo-Ignatius, "If he avoids the word ὁμοούσιος, he uses ὁμότιμος instead."[35] Lightfoot then goes as far as to say:

> It is difficult to interpret this otherwise than as a virtual acknowledgment of the Nicene doctrine, especially when we compare it to such passages as Athan. *Expos. Fid.* I … where he calls the Son τὴν ἀληθινὴν εἰκόνα τοῦ πατρὸς ἰσότιμον καὶ ἰσόδοξον, or Greg. Naz. *Orat.* 31 12 …, where this father speaks of τὸ ἐν τοῖς τρισὶν ὁμότιμον τῆς ἀξίας καὶ τῆς θεότητος …[36]

Lightfoot's comments on this Philippian passage complement nicely the results of the research revealed in this thesis that the Ignatian long rencesion is not in accordance with the theological understanding of Arius, and thus should not be called Arian.[37] Of course, as we shall see, the forger's/interpolator's unqualified subordination of the Son to the Father, make it impossible to label his Christology Nicene.

Romans

The final place I want to draw attention to from the Ignatian long recension where pseudo-Ignatius, in addition to calling Jesus God, also equates Jesus with God is found in *Romans* 2.10-14. The interpolator writes:

---

[34] This text from *Philippians* 2 is clear evidence that pseudo-Ignatius cannot be a sympathizer with Arius. In his *Thalia*, as recorded in Athanasius' *De Synodis* 15, Arius says, "Thus there is a Triad, not in equal glories. Not intermingling with each other are their subsistences. One more glorious than the other in their glories unto immensity." Translation taken from the *NPNF* 2.4. Furthermore the *Philippian* 2 text is one of the passages that led F.X. Funk to say the interpolator "shows himself most clearly to have been a follower of the Nicene faith" (… se fidei Nicaenae sectatorem fuisse manifestissime prodit). See Franciscus Xaverius Funk, ed. *Patres Apostolici* (vol.2; Tübingen: Libraria Henrici Laupp, 1901), xi.

[35] Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, 2.1.270.

[36] Ibid.

[37] Lightfoot lists seven arguments commonly put forward in order to prove pseudo-Ignatius an Arian. After listing each argument he offers a rebuttal. Reason six for pseudo-Ignatius' supposed Arianism is that he never uses the word ὁμοούσιος even though he must have been familiar with the word. Lightfoot's response is, "But if he had any respect for the verisimilitude of his forgery, he would naturally avoid a word of which the previous history had been carefully investigated, and which was known not to have been used except rarely, and then only in a non-Nicene and heretical sense, as a definition of the Sabellianism of Paul of Samosata." See Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, 2.1.269

> ..., ἵνα ἐν ἀγάπῃ χορὸς γενόμενοι ᾄσητε τῷ πατρὶ ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ, ὅτι τὸν ἐπίσκοπον Συρίας κατηξίωσεν ὁ θεὸς εὑρεθῆναι εἰς δύσιν, ἀπὸ ἀνατολῆς μεταπεμψάμενος τῶν ἑαυτοῦ παθημάτων μάρτυρα. καλὸν τὸ διαλυθῆναι ἀπὸ κόσμου πρὸς θεόν, ἵνα εἰς αὐτὸν ἀνατείλω.
>
> in order that being a chorus you might sing with love to the Father through Christ Jesus. For God deemed the bishop of Syria worthy – having summoned him to the West from the East – to be found a witness of his own sufferings. It is good to be released from the world to God, in order that I might rise to him.

This is an instructive text for understanding the interpolator's Christology. The main point here is that the interpolator substitutes God when we would expect Jesus. The text contains a clear reference to Jesus' sufferings; yet the interpolator refers back to ὁ θεὸς when mentioning that God has found him worthy "of his own sufferings." Even though the interpolator equates Jesus with God in this text, there is still a clear demarcation via his statement, ἵνα ἐν ἀγάπῃ χορὸς γενόμενοι ᾄσητε τῷ πατρὶ ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ.

It is to this issue of the clear Christological demarcation found in the Ignatian long recension that I now turn my attention. I have identified twenty places where pseudo-Ignatius refers to Jesus as God. I have also identified three places where Jesus is equated with God in the Ignatian long recension. Now I will display fourteen places where Jesus is explicitly subordinated to God by the forger/interpolator. We will find that this subordination is not qualified in any manner. This is, of course, in stark contrast with the emerging orthodox party.

Jesus Subordinated to God in the Ignatian Long Recension

Before I offer a brief discussion of each of these fourteen texts, I want to simply list them. They are: *Mary of Cassobelae to Ignatius* 2; *Ignatius to Mary of Cassobelae* Inscription; *Magnesians* 7, 13; *Tarsians* 5; *Philippians* 7; *Philadelphians* 4; *Smyrnaeans* 9; *Antiochenes* 14; *Ephesians* 3, 6, 9, 18; *Romans* Inscription.

Mary of Cassobelae to Ignatius

Our first stop is the forged correspondence between Mary of Cassobelae and Ignatius. This correspondence purports to have occurred while Ignatius was still in Antioch but under arrest. The first example I draw attention to illustrates nicely the subtle yet consistent manner in which pseudo-Ignatius subordinates Jesus to God throughout his corpus. In this letter, Mary requests that Ignatius send certain young men to her so that the Christian community she belongs to will have ministerial

leadership. She asks Ignatius not to be alarmed over their youth. She then proceeds to cite numerous examples from the Scriptures of young leaders. As she does so, she (pseudo-Ignatius) writes in 2.9-11:

> ἀνάσκαλον δὲ τῷ λογισμῷ σου διὰ τοῦ δοθέντος σοι παρὰ θεοῦ διὰ Χριστοῦ πνεύματος αὐτοῦ, καὶ γνώσῃ ὡς Σαμουὴλ μικρὸν παιδάριον ὁ βλέπων ἐκλήθη, ...
>
> But be rekindled in your mind through his Spirit having been given to you by God through Christ, and you will know that Samuel the seer was called as a small child, …

We notice that God's spirit was given to Ignatius διὰ Χριστοῦ. Even as Jesus is called God, and even equated with God in the Ignatian long recension, the distinction between God and Jesus is consistently maintained via Jesus' mediator role between God and humanity.

Ignatius to Mary of Cassobelae

The next example is as explicitly subordinationist as the previous example is implicitly subordinationist. In the inscription to his reply to Mary, pseudo-Ignatius says:

> Ἰγνατιος, ὁ καὶ θεοφόρος, τῇ ἠλεημένῃ χάριτι θεοῦ πατρὸς ὑψίστου καὶ Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἀποθανόντος, πιστοτάτῃ, ἀξιοθέῳ, χριστοφόρῳ θυγατρὶ Μαρίᾳ, πλεῖστα ἐν θεῷ χαίρειν.
>
> Ignatius, also God bearer, by the grace of God the Father the most High and the Lord Jesus Christ who died for us, to the merciful, faithful, God-worthy, Christ-bearing daughter Mary, abundant greetings in God.

Not only is there a clear demarcation between Father and Son in this text, there is a clear hierarchy. In fact, the θεοῦ πατρὸς ὑψίστου καὶ Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ is reminiscent of the *Romans* inscription – which is the same in the middle and long recensions.

Magnesians

This hierarchy is maintained in *Magnesians* 7.8-11, 16-18. The interpolator writes:

> Ὥσπερ οὖν ὁ Κύριος ἄνευ τοῦ πατρὸς οὐδὲν ποιεῖ· οὐ δύναμαι γάρ, φησίν, ποιεῖν ἀφ᾽ ἑαυτοῦ οὐδέν. οὕτω καὶ ὑμεῖς ἄνευ τοῦ ἐπισκόπου, μηδὲ πρεσβύτερος, μὴ διάκονος, μὴ λαϊκός ... πάντες ὡς εἷς εἰς τὸν ναὸν θεοῦ συντρέχετε, ὡς ἐπὶ ἓν θυσιαστήριον, ἐπὶ ἕνα Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν τὸν ἀρχιερέα τοῦ ἀγεννήτου θεοῦ.

> Therefore just as the Lord does nothing without the Father, "For I am not able," he says, "to do anything from myself." In this way you also [do nothing] without the bishop, neither the presbyter, nor the deacon, nor the people … Everyone run together as to one temple of God, as to one altar, to one Jesus Christ the high priest of the ungenerated God.

We are presented with Jesus' obvious subordinate nature to God via a quotation from John 5.30. This quotation is not found in the Ignatian middle recension. There is also found in this text the Ignatian customary parallel between the subordination of Jesus to God and the subordination of everyone to the bishop. Furthermore, this section ends with a reference to Jesus as the "high priest of the ungenerated God." The high priest, of course, serves the role of mediator between humanity and God.

There is no need to spend significant time with *Magnesians* 13.18-21 because I discussed it in great detail in the first chapter. I cannot, however, afford to skip over it in this Christological profile of the Ignatian long recension. The interpolator simply states:

> ὑποτάγητε τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ καὶ ἀλλήλοις, ὡς ὁ Χριστὸς τῷ πατρί, ἵνα ἕνωσις ᾖ κατὰ θεὸν ἐν ὑμῖν.
>
> Be subordinate to the bishop and to one another, as Christ to the Father, in order that there might be unity according to God amongst you.

Again, the point here is that there is no "according to the flesh" in the interpolator's version. Jesus is strictly understood to be subordinate – to have a lesser role – than that of the Father.

Tarsians

In *Tarsians*, pseudo-Ignatius is battling against the extreme views some Christians have concerning Jesus. Some say Jesus only appeared to be born and to die. Others say that Jesus is not the Son of the Creator. Still others say that Jesus is God over all. In *Tarsians* 5.21-28, pseudo-Ignatius argues that Jesus is not the same as the God that is over all via quotations from John 20.17 and 1 Corinthians 15.28.

> Καὶ ὅτι οὐκ αὐτός ἐστιν ὁ ἐπὶ πάντων θεὸς ἀλλ᾽ υἱὸς ἐκείνου, λέγει, ἀναβαίνω πρὸς τὸν πατέρα μου καὶ πατέρα ὑμῶν καὶ θεόν μου καὶ θεὸν ὑμῶν· καί, ὅτε ὑποταγῇ αὐτῷ τὰ πάντα, τότε καὶ αὐτὸς ὑποταγήσεται τῷ ὑποτάξαντι αὐτῷ τὰ πάντα, ἵνα ᾖ ὁ θεὸς τὰ πάντα ἐν πᾶσιν. οὐκοῦν ἕτερός ἐστιν ὁ ὑποτάξας καὶ ὢν τὰ πάντα ἐν πᾶσιν, καὶ ἕτερος ᾧ ὑπετάγη, ὃς καὶ μετὰ πάντων ὑποτάσσεται.
>
> And because he is not the God over all things but the Son of that one, he says, "I ascend to my Father and your Father and my God and your God; and when

> all things might be subordinated to him, then also he himself will be subordinated to the one who subordinated all things to him, in order that God might be all things in everything. Therefore the one who subordinated and being all things in everything is one, and another to whom [things] were subordinated, who also is subordinated with all things.

This text represents a straightforward reading of John 20.17 and 1 Corinthians 15.28. In contrast with the developing Nicene party, there is no qualification put around the New Testament presentation of Jesus' subordination to God. Subordination is clearly the manner in which pseudo-Ignatius maintains a clear demarcation between God and Jesus, even as he maintains a Christology which views Jesus as equal with God.[38]

Philippians

In the Philippian letter, pseudo-Ignatius is engaged in a similar Christological argument to that found in *Tarsians*. In 7.13-16, in dialogue with Satan, he writes:

> Πῶς δὲ πάλιν οὐκέτι σοι δοκεῖ ὁ Χριστὸς εἶναι ἐκ τῆς παρθένου, ἀλλ᾽ ὁ ἐπὶ πάντων θεός, ὁ ὤν, ὁ παντοκπάτωρ; τίς οὖν ὁ τοῦτον ἀποστείλας, εἰπέ· τίς ὁ τούτου κυριεύων; γνώμῃ δὲ τίνος οὗτος ἐπειθάρχησεν;
>
> But again how does the Christ no longer appear to you to be from the virgin, but [appears to be] the God over all, the one being, the Almighty: Tell me who therefore sent this one? Who is Lord of this one? And whose will did this one obey?

Over and over again the Ignatian long recension seeks to provide an answer to those who would merge the persons of Father and Son together so closely that any discernable distinction is difficult to determine.

Philadephians

Philadelphians 4.7-13 (p.210) represents a major expansion from the Ignatian middle recension. As a part of this expansion, we find the interpolator emphasizing the importance of unity in both the church and larger society. In what is surely evidence of a fourth-century time period, the interpolator says:

> οἱ ἄρχοντες πειθαρχείτωσαν τῷ Καίσαρι· οἱ στρατιῶται τοῖς ἄρχουσιν· οἱ διάκονοι τοῖς πρεσβυτέροις· ἀρχιερεῦσιν οἱ πρεσβύτεροι·

[38] Again, this is an important point. The fundamental purpose of Jesus' subordination to God in early Christian writings must be to maintain both an exalted Christology and the distinction between God and Jesus.

> καὶ οἱ διάκανοι καὶ ὁ λοιπὸς κλῆρος ἅμα παντὶ τῷ λαῷ καὶ τοῖς στρατιώταις καὶ τοῖς ἄρχουσι καὶ τῷ Καίσαρι, τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ· ὁ ἐπίσκοπος τῷ Χριστῷ, ὡς ὁ Χριστὸς τῷ πατρί· καὶ οὕτως ἡ ἑνότης διὰ πάντων σώζεται.
>
> Rulers be obedient to Caesar; soldiers be obedient to rulers; deacons be obedient to the presbyters; presbyters to high-priests; and the deacons and the rest of the clergy together with all the people and with the soldiers and with the rulers and with Caesar be obedient to the bishop; the bishop be obedient to Christ as Christ is obedient to the Father; and in this way unity is preserved by all.

As the interpolator emphasizes the importance of submission in the church to the bishop, he draws on the most appropriate model for a Christian community: the subordination of Christ to the Father.[39]

Smyrnaeans

We have already visited *Smyrnaeans* 9 during our discussion of places where Jesus is called God. We also find here that Jesus is subordinated to God. The interpolator says in *Smyrnaeans* 9.31-33:

> οἱ λαϊκοὶ τοῖς διακόνοις ὑποτασσέσθωσαν· οἱ διάκονοι τοῖς πρεσβυτέροις· οἱ πρεσβύτεροι τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ· ὁ ἐπίσκοπος τῷ Χριστῷ, ὡς αὐτὸς τῷ πατρί.
>
> Let the people be subject to the deacons; let the deacons submit to the presbyters; let the presbyters submit to the bishop; let the bishop submit to the Christ as he submits to the Father.

This text, of course, is of the same nature as *Philadelphians* 4. While both of these texts have a focus on the bishop in the middle recension, the exact texts quoted and translated above are interpolations into the middle recension.

Antiochenes

Pseudo-Ignatius writes in *Antiochenes* 14.16-19:

> Ταῦτα ἀπὸ Φιλίππων γράφω ὑμῖν. ἐρρωμένους ὑμᾶς ὁ ὢν μόνος ἀγέννητος διὰ τοῦ πρὸ αἰώνων γεγεννημένου διαφυλάξαι πνεύματι καὶ σαρκί, καὶ ἴδοιμι ὑμᾶς ἐν τῇ τοῦ Χριστοῦ βασιλείᾳ.
>
> I write these things to you from Philippi. May the one who is alone ungenerated perserve you in spirit and in flesh through the one having been

[39] For a discussion of this text see James D. Smith III, "On Pseudo-Ignatius' Fourth-Century Antiochene Assertion of Episcopal Supremacy," in *Studia Patristica* (ed. F. Young, M. Edwards, and P. Parvis; Vol. XLII; Leuven, Paris, Dudley Mass.: Peters, 2006), 231-236.

> generated before the ages and may He preserve you in spirit and flesh and may I behold you in the Kingdom of Christ.

In this text, we behold a subordinate Christology that is *before the ages*. Pseudo-Ignatius clearly understands Jesus to have always been subordinate to God.

Ephesians

The interpolator makes some intriguing moves when he comes to the *Ephesian* letter. There are four subordinationist texts that are worthy of notice from the *Ephesian* letter. The interpolator, encouraging the church towards unity, writes in *Ephesians* 3.14-16:

> καὶ γὰρ Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς πάντα κατὰ γνώμην πράττει τοῦ πατρός, ὡς αὐτός που λέγει· ἐγὼ τὰ ἀρεστὰ αὐτοῦ ποιῶ πάντοτε.
>
> For even Jesus Christ does all things according to the will of the Father, as He somewhere says, "I always do things pleasing to him."

Here, the interpolator offers an alteration and an expansion of the middle recension with a quotation from John 8.29.

In *Ephesians* 6.14-15, the interpolator's text contains a slight, but significant, variation from the middle recension. He writes:

> τὸν οὖν ἐπίσκοπον δηλονότι ὡς αὐτὸν τὸν Κύριον δεῖ προσβλέπειν, τῷ Κυρίῳ παρεστῶτα·
>
> Therefore it is plain that it is necessary to look upon the bishop as the Lord himself, placed beside the Lord.

With the addition of τῷ Κυρίῳ παρεστῶτα, the interpolator adds an additional figure reminiscent of Genesis 19.24 and Psalm 110.1.[40]

As we move on to *Ephesians* 9.23-29, we discover an expansion from the middle recension with three quotes from John's gospel. The interpolator adds:

> ὡς καὶ ὁ Κύριος τὰ παρὰ τοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῖν κατήγγελλεν· ὁ λόγος γάρ, φησίν, ὃν ἀκούετε, οὐκ ἔστιν ἐμὸς ἀλλὰ τοῦ πέμψαντός με πατρός· καὶ περὶ τοῦ πνεύματος τοῦ ἁγίου, οὐ λαλήσει, φησίν, ἀφ᾽ ἑαυτοῦ, ἀλλ᾽ ὅσα ἂν ἀκούσῃ παρ᾽ ἐμοῦ. καὶ περὶ ἑαυτοῦ φησι πρὸς τὸν πατέρα· ἐγώ σε, φησίν, ἐδόξασα ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς· τὸ ἔργον ὃ ἔδωκάς μοι, ἐτελείωσα· ἐφανέρωσά σου τὸ ὄνομα τοῖς ἀνθρώποις.

[40] The text is a bit ambiguous. Instead of a second figure reminiscent of Genesis 19.24 and Psalm 110.1, it could be that it is the bishop who stands by the Lord.

> as also the Lord declared things from the Father to you; for the word which you hear, he says, is not mine but (that) of the Father who sent me; and concerning the Holy Spirit, he says, he will not speak of himself, but all that he should hear from me; and concerning himself he says to the Father, I glorified you, he says, upon the earth; the work which you gave me, I completed; I revealed your name to humanity.

With the use of these there Johannine texts (14.24, 16.13, and 17.4, 6), the interpolator places more emphasis on Jesus' subordinate position to God.

In a dyohypostatic version of what is found in the middle recension, the interpolator writes in *Ephesians* 18.10-13:

> ὁ γὰρ τοῦ θεοῦ υἱός, ὁ πρὸ αἰώνων γεννηθεὶς καὶ τὰ πάντα γνώμῃ τοῦ πατρὸς συστησάμενος, οὗτος ἐκυοφορήθη ἐκ Μαρίας κατ᾽ οἰκονομίαν, ἐκ σπέρματος μὲν Δαυεὶδ πνεύματος δὲ ἁγίου.
>
> For the Son of God, the one having been generated before the ages and having established all things by the will of the Father, He was conceived from Mary according to the plan, from the seed of David and the Holy Spirit.

In the interpolator's version there is a clear distinction between Jesus and God via Jesus' secondary role to God. We also observe that, as with *Antiochenes* 14.16-19, the preexistent Son (generated before the ages) is subordinate to God (having established all things by the will of the Father).

Romans

Romans inscription has already received much discussion throughout this thesis. There is, however, another aspect of the long recension of *Romans* inscription.18-19 that is relevant to the current Christological profile. The interpolator says:

> …, ἣν καὶ ἀσπάζομαι ἐν ὀνόματι θεοῦ παντοκράτορος καὶ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ·
>
> …, which I also greet in the name of God almighty and Jesus Christ his son.

Παντοκράτορος in not found in the manuscript tradition of the middle recension. Its presence in the long recension further serves to distinguish between Father and Son via the Son's subordination to the Father.

Conclusion

The hard conclusions that can be drawn from the Christological profile of the Ignatian long recension found in the above investigation are numerous. I conclude this chapter by listing these conclusions, beginning with the more peripheral issues

spoken of in the introduction of this chapter and moving to the more central issues that will prepare us for our engagement with the *Ekthesis Macrostichos* Creed found in the next chapter.

First, I suggest that it is most likely that the author/interpolator/forger of the Ignatian long recension accomplished his work is two stages. He began by working with the authentic seven Ignatian letters listed by Eusebius of Caesarea. As argued for above, due to his *perception* of textual corruption, both minor and major, the interpolator set to work on the authentic Ignatian letters. As we saw above, where the figures of Father and Son were merged together close enough to cause discomfort, the interpolator provided Christological demarcation. I identified fifteen places in the interpolated letters where the interpolator introduced Christological demarcation into his version of the Ignatian letters. Furthermore, I identified eight places where the interpolator simply clarifies, or cleans up, language from the authentic letters. Both types of alteration, "Christological Demarcation" and "Basic Clarification" were introduced with the goal of restoring a more authentic Ignatian voice to the letters that bear his name. We have seen precedent for this practice amongst Christians of antiquity.

Next, the interpolator/forger then added the six additional forgeries to round out this fourth-century version of the Ignatian corpus. The move that he makes here, in relation to the out and out forgeries, is no different than someone writing letters in the name of the apostle Paul to address issues that had arisen after Paul's lifetime. This too was a common practice amongst Christians of antiquity.

In the next chapter, we will engage the variety of opinions that have been offered in an attempt to identify the person(s) responsible for the Ignatian long recension. We will see that the issue of whether or not that same hand is responsible for the interpolations and the forgeries has been debated. Lightfoot, as we shall see, is of the opinion that a single hand is responsible for all thirteen letters. The Christological profile revealed in this chapter serves as additional evidence that Lightfoot is right in this conclusion. We note that the Christology of both the interpolated letters and the forgeries is remarkably consistent.

The Christology found in these letters is the focal point of this chapter. In the first chapter, I discussed a pre-Nicene Christological paradox. I argued that before the eruption of the Arian crisis, pre-Nicene Christians were content to live with a paradoxical understanding of the relationship of the Son to the Father: the Son was

understood to be both subordinate to and equal with the Father. The evidence presented in this chapter displays the same paradoxical understanding of subordination and equality. Therefore, the Ignatian long recension is, I contend, an appeal to return to an earlier way of Christological thinking before the Arian controversy began.

We were not surprised to find that Jesus is referred to as God in the long recension. However, in light of the fact that the God language of the Ignatian middle recension is often negated in the interpolator's/forger's work, we might have been surprised at the frequency with which Jesus is called God in the Ignatian long recension. I identified twenty places where the interpolator/forger refers to Jesus as God in the interpolated parts of the authentic letters and in the forgeries.

While it was not surprising to find a fourth-century non-Nicene representative calling Jesus God (as most everyone in fourth-century debates referred to Jesus as God in some sense), it was rather surprising to find Jesus equated with God in the Ignatian long recension. Yet, I interpret the God references in *Philippians* inscription, 2.8-15, and *Romans* 2.10-14 to go beyond what many others in the non-Nicene party would say about the divinity of Christ. We heard Lightfoot state that *Philippians* 2.8-15 equates Jesus with God in a manner complementary with that of Nicene and pro-Nicene proponents. In light of the call for an earlier manner of Christological thinking that enables the survival of the paradox and mystery of the relationship of the Son to the Father, it is not surprising that the key Nicene word *homoousios* is missing. In the next two chapters, we will have sufficient opportunity to engage the condemnation of the use of *homoousios* by Paul of Samosata, bishop of Antioch in the third century. For our current discussion, the reality of a pre-Nicene condemnation of *homoousios*, coupled with the controversy over the term that emerged after the council of Nicaea, is enough for us to understand why the interpolator/forger would reject the word, even as he seems to accept something of its foundational meaning – unity with God.

Perhaps even Athanasius of Alexandria, based on his acceptance of the party of Basil of Ancyra towards the end of his *De synodis*, could have gathered at the pub for a friendly drink with the person behind the Ignatian long recension if not for the long recension's explicit subordination of the Son to the Father. This Christological profile demonstrated the rejection of any Nicene qualification of Jesus' subordination to his incarnation. Of the fourteen texts that were examined to illustrate the clear-cut,

no holds barred, subordination of the Son to the Father, we discovered two texts that clearly label the *preexistent* Son as subordinate to the Father (*Antioch.*14.16-19 and *Eph.* 18.10-13). As such, the Ignatian long recension represents a strong rejection of the development by some Nicenes of limiting the Son's subordination to the Father to the Son's incarnation.[41]

The Ignatian long recension is an affirmation of an earlier manner of Christological thinking that understands the Son to be both equal with and subordinate to God. As I will argue in the next chapter, the *Ekthesis Macrostichos* does as well.

[41] Alexander of Alexandria does not appear to do this.

CHAPTER THREE

THE IGNATIAN LONG RECENSION IN FOURTH-CENTURY CHRISTOLOGICAL CONTEXT

Introduction

In the previous chapter I provided a Christological profile of the Ignatian long recension. This profile will serve as the foundation upon which the arguments and conclusions of this chapter are built. In this chapter, I will direct attention to the fourth-century Christological context within which the Ignatian long recension found life. After surveying the opinions that other scholars have put forth in relation to the person(s) responsible for the Ignatian long recension, as well as other issues that accompany the quest for the responsible person(s), I will then argue that the call for a return to an earlier pre-Nicene manner of thinking about the relationship of the Son to the Father, found in the Ignatian long recension, is also found in the *Ekthesis Macrostichos* creed of Antioch 344. In other words, both the Ignatian long recension and the *Macrostichos* creed call for a return to the paradoxical understanding of the Son as both equal with and subordinate to the Father. Furthermore, this chapter will provide further evidence that, contra James D. Smith III, there is no reason why the Ignatian long recension could not have been in circulation by or even a few years before 350.[1]

Past Attempts to Identify the Ignatian Interpolator and Forger

J.B. Lightfoot predicted that efforts to defend the authenticity of the long recension "will be kept up at long intervals till the end of time."[2] As it turns out, the only name that is today still well-known for the defense of the authenticity of the long recension is the eighteenth-century scholar William Whiston.[3] Since the work of Lightfoot and Theodor Zahn, no one has argued for the authenticity of the long recension. In fact, my previous demonstration of fourth-century textual alterations to the text of the Ignatian middle recension is as close as one gets in modern scholarship

---

[1] James David Smith III, "The Ignatian Long Recension and the Christian Communities in Fourth Century Syrian Antioch" (Th.D. diss., Harvard University, 1986),

[2] J.B. Lightfoot, *The Apostolic Fathers* (Part 2, 3 vols.; *Ignatius, St. Polycarp*; 2nd ed.; London and New York: Macmillan and Co., 1889), 2.1.245.

[3] William Whiston, *Primitive Christianity Reviv'd* (5 vols.; London: Booksellers of London and Westminster, 1711-1712), vol.1.

to arguing, not for the authenticity of the long recension, but for significant corruptions in the corpus of Ignatius' letters that the consensus deems 'authentic.' Scholars have, however, made attempts to remove the mask from the person who penned the long recension. In the process, these scholars have also put forth theories as to whether or not the same hand is behind the interpolated letters as the forged letters, the date of the long recension, and the relationship of the long recension to the *Apostolic Constitutions*.

J.B. Lightfoot

The most appropriate place to begin is, not surprisingly, J.B. Lightfoot. The reason for this is twofold: 1) in the process of his own arguments Lightfoot interacts with the arguments of other well-established scholars from his day and 2) some other scholars discussed here make Lightfoot their primary conversation and/or sparring-partner. Lightfoot draws four significant conclusions that subsequent scholarship has debated. First, the same hand that interpolated the Eusebian seven Ignatian letters also forged the additional six.[4] Second, the portrayal of church organization in these letters "points to a time not earlier than the middle of the fourth century, while on the other hand there is nothing in the notices which suggests a date later than the end of the same century."[5] Third, closely related to this last conclusion is the deduction that the interpolator/forger of the Ignatian long recension borrowed from the already existing *Apostolic Constitutions*. Finally, after a demonstration of the variety of opinions of scholars concerning the actual identity of the interpolator (Acacius of Caesarea = Zahn)[6] or the interpolator's theological school (Arian = Leclerc, Grabe, Newman, and Zahn; Apollinarian = Funk; Arian and Apollinarian = Ussher; Orthodox = Cotelier)[7], Lightfoot decides that because "there may be some difficulty in fixing the precise position of the writer himself,"[8] the writer produces "an eirenicon" and is "propounding in the name of a primitive father of the church … a

---

[4] Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, 2.1.246-257. For Lightfoot, this includes the forgery to the Philippians. This letter, in particular, has been debated because it does not appear in the Greek and Latin manuscripts of the middle recension. In addition, *Philippians* appears last in the Armenian collection. Furthermore, the style of this letter stands out from the rest because it is an address from Ignatius to Satan. Lightfoot deals with all of these issues and mounts an overwhelming case for the same hand behind the Philippian letter as the rest of the letters found in the Ignatian long recension.

[5] Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, 2.1.257.

[6] Ibid., 2.1.267

[7] Ibid., 2.1.267-268.

[8] Ibid., 2.1.266-267.

statement of doctrine in which he conceived that reasonable men on all sides might find a meeting point."[9] Lightfoot's proposal here is characteristically reasonable. Even so, I will soon part company with Lightfoot's suggestion that the interpolator/forger was a peacemaker.

First, however, I offer a few comments about the problem with viewing the Christology of the Ignatian long recension as strictly Arian, orthodox, or Apollinarian. Once again, Lightfoot's responses to these suggestions continue to have staying power. In the last chapter I referred to Lightfoot's list of reasons why scholars such as Leclerc, Grabe, Newman, and Zahn label the Ignatian long recension Arian, and we were exposed to some of Lightfoot's counter arguments. Now, I wish to interact with Lightfoot's response to the suggestion that the interpolator/forger represents an orthodox or an Apollinarian stance.

Lightfoot draws attention to some of the same passages I discussed in the last chapter as places in the Ignatian long recension where Jesus is equated with God. For example, he notes the use of ὁμοτίμους in *Philippians* 2. In the last chapter we observed Lightfoot's strong language when discussing this text, "It is difficult to interpret this otherwise than as a virtual acknowledgement of the Nicene doctrine, …"[10] Lightfoot also sees the fact that the Son is repeatedly referred to as begotten or existing πρὸ αἰώνων (*Eph.* 7, 18; *Magn.* 6, 11; *Tars.* 6; *Antioch.* 14) as complementary with an orthodox position. Furthermore, in contrast with Arius, the Ignatian long recension refers to the Son as τῇ φύσει ἄτρεπτος – by nature unchangeable.

However, Lightfoot concludes, "If it is highly questionable whether he disputed the perfect Godhead of our Lord, it is certain that he denied the perfect manhood."[11] As evidence for this, Lightfoot points to *Smyrnaeans* 4 where the interpolator omits τοῦ τελείου ἀνθρώπου. Furthermore, in *Philippians* 5 it is stated that Christ did not have a human soul (τὸν οὐκ ἀνθρωπείαν ψυχὴν ἔχοντα). Where this belief is stated in the negative in *Philippians* 5, the same belief is stated in the positive in *Philippians* 6. Lightfoot notes, "In both passages … copyists or

[9] Ibid., 2.1.273.

[10] Ibid., 2.1.270.

[11] Ibid., 2.1.271.

translators have tampered with the text, altering it so as to remove this blemish of heterodoxy."[12]

Thus far, according to Lightfoot, the Ignatian long recension cannot be Arian nor can it be orthodox as some past scholars have posited. However, does the denial of a human soul make the interpolator/forger an Apollinarian? Lightfoot says no. He differentiates between the belief of Apollinaris himself and that of followers of Apollinaris. Apollinaris divides human nature into three parts: mind (or spirit), soul, and body. Thus, he thinks that the Logos took the place of the human mind (νοῦς). According to Epiphanius, however, certain Apollinarians denied the human soul of Jesus (ψυχή) as well as the human mind of Jesus. Thus, the Ignatian long recension follows this belief and not that strictly of Apollinaris himself.

Lightfoot notes the observation of F.X. Funk that while Apollinarians and Arians agree that Christ had no human soul, they hold this view for opposite reasons. The Arians, on the one hand, hold this view with the goal of lowering God the Word in contrast with God the Father. The Apollinarians, on the other hand, hold this view in order to maintain the sinlessness of the Son. It is the reason of the Apollinarians on the denial of a human soul in Christ that the Ignatian long recension adopts. Lightfoot finds Funk's argument conceivable but says, "Yet, notwithstanding these resemblances, the Apollinarian leanings of the writer seem to me more than questionable."[13] Lightfoot goes on to observe that the "Apollinarians took the ὁμοούσιος of the Nicene creed as their starting point."[14] Of course, ὁμοούσιος is nowhere found in the Ignatian long recension. Because of their emphasis on "one nature," Apollinarians had no quarrels with phrases such as "God was born of Mary" and "God suffered on the cross."[15] Language like this is not found in the Ignatian long recension.

Lightfoot demonstrates the difficult task of nailing down the Christology found in the Ignatian long recension due to its ambiguous nature. Therefore, the scholars that he interacts with were in some sense right but none of them fully correct. Subsequent scholarship, as we shall see, has taken up the question where

---

[12] Ibid.

[13] Ibid., 272.

[14] Ibid.

[15] Ibid.

Lightfoot left it. Even though I am indebted to Lightfoot for his masterful discussion of the Christology of the Ignatian long recension, as stated above my own interpretation of the evidence eventually parts company with his. The reason, as I shall contend, that "it seems impossible to decide with certainty the position of the Ignatian writer"[16] is because the Ignatian long recension does not fit neatly into any of the commonly-defined fourth-century Nicene or non-Nicene categories – *homoousian*, *homoian*, *homoiousian*, or *heteroousian* – because it does not use the distinctive vocabulary of any of these. Nor, for the same reason, is it an attempt to make peace between these positions. Rather, it is a demand for an earlier manner of thinking about the relationship of the Son to the Father. This earlier manner of thinking contains characteristics of both Nicene and non-Nicene Christology. However, it does not fit comfortably into either camp.

Dieter Hagedorn and Company

While Lightfoot is satisfied with labeling the interpolator/forger a peace maker, other scholars have put forward suggestions as to the actual identity of the one responsible for the long recension. As already noted, Theodor Zahn suggests that the hand of Acacius of Caesarea, successor to Eusebius, produced the Ignatian long recension. After denying the presence of both the developed theology of Eunomius and the moderate Arianism of Basil of Ancyra in the long recension, Zahn states, "Wenn es erlaubt wäre, zu rathen, würde ich sagen, was jetzt nur zur Veranschaulichung des Postulats dienen möge, dass Pseudoignatius jener Acacius gewesen sei, der Schuler und Biograph Eusebs von Cäsarea …"[17]

This is an interesting suggestion, as all attempts to name the person responsible tease the mind. I find Zahn's proposal especially attractive in light of my own interpretation of the Ignatian long recension and R.P.C. Hanson's treatment of Acacius. Hanson says that Acacius' theology is no mystery. Rather, "He is an Homoian Arian, deriving from the thought of Eusebius of Caesarea, as much theology which was not pro-Nicene did between 330 and 350, who has no great objection to using the word *ousia* to define the Son's relation to the Father as long as his subordination is preserved."[18] Furthermore, Zahn's proposal of Acacius of

---

[16] Ibid.

[17] Theodor Zahn, *Ignatius von Antiochien* (Gotha: Friedrich Andreas Perthes, 1873), 141.

[18] R.P.C. Hanson, *The Search for the Christian Doctrine of God: The Arian Controversy, 318-381* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Baker Academic, 2005; first published 1988), 583.

Caesarea would potentially go well with my dating of the Ignatian long recension as Acacius was bishop from 339-c.360.[19]

Of all the persons who have been put forward as the one responsible for the Ignatian long recension, I find Zahn's suggestion of Acacius the most plausible. Yet, it must be admitted that even this possibility comes to us with many unanswered questions. We simply do not have the kind of evidence available to pinpoint the person(s) responsible.

Even so, in more recent times other names have been put forth. In 1969 Reinoud Weijenborg concluded that "Evagrius Ponticus of Antioch might be the author of the L.R. of the Ignatian letters."[20] With a highly speculative historical reconstruction, Weijenborg suggests that Evagrius, an "Antiochian playboy and forger," after a failed career in secular government entered ecclesiastical affairs.[21] From this perch, he "may well have written as a *deacon* of Antioch some time between 380 and 388 the L.R. of the Ignatian letters in order to promote himself as a candidate to the succession of Paulinus by exalting the *deacon* Heron as successor of Ignatius."[22]

As Weijenborg's language makes clear – "may well have written" – the proposal that Evagrius can claim responsibility for the Ignatian long recension is not accompanied with a high degree of certainty. Furthermore, the Ignatian long recension contains none of Evagrius' characteristic concerns or vocabulary. In addition, if, as I think, Arnold Amelungk (to be discussed shortly) is correct that the *Macrostichos* was a source used by the interpolator/forger then the *Macrostichos* is the most likely theological context for the long recension.

In 1973, Dieter Hagedorn argued that Julian, to whom is ascribed a commentary on Job, is the author of the Ignatian long recension as well as the

---

[19] We have excerpts of a work by Acacius against Marcellus preserved by Epiphanius and Acacius' creed from Seleucia. Unfortunately, this is all we have. For discussion of these works see Hanson, *The Search for the Christian Doctrine of God*, 373-374 and 579-583. See also Joseph T. Leinhard, "Acacius of Caesarea: *Contra Marcellum*. Historical and Theological Considerations," *Cristianesimo nella Storia* 10 (1989): 1-22. There is a lacuna in scholarship in relation to Acacius of Caesarea. There is no recent monograph in existence devoted to Acacius.

[20] Reinoud Weijenborg, "Is Evagrius Pontius the Author of the Longer Recension of the Ignatian Letters?," *Antoniaum* 44 (1969): 339-347. The quotation is from the last sentence of the article.

[21] Ibid., 343.

[22] Ibid. Italics his.

Apostolic Constitutions.[23] Henry Chadwick finds Hagedorn's work persuasive. He refers to Hagedorn's presentation of parallels between the Job commentary, the Ignatian long recension, and the *Apostolic Constitutions* as a "convincingly … momentous conclusion."[24] Yet, Hagedorn's conclusion concerning the identity of the author does not come without lingering doubts. He *may* be right that

> Solange man nur die AK und die Pseudo-Ignatianen kannte, konnte man noch versuchen, ihr Verhältnis zueinander anders als durch die Identität der Autoren zu erklären; dennoch hatten deren Verteidiger (Lagarde, Harnack, Funk) auch damals schon die besseren Argumente für sich. Nun, da eine dritte Schrift aufgetaucht ist, die dieselben Beziehungen zu den AK und zu Ignatius aufweist, sind alle jene anderen Deutungsversuche ganz unhaltbar. Die einzige mögliche Erklärung für die sachlichen und sprachlich-stilistischen Parallelen zwischen allen drei Werken ist die Identität ihres Autors.[25]

Nonetheless, even if he is correct, the identity of the actual author remains elusive. Building on the work of others, Hagedorn is emphatic that this commentary cannot be from Origen due to "der dogmatischen Position des Verfassers des Hiobkommentars."[26] Furthermore, even if Hagedorn is correct that the author of the *Apostolic Constitutions*, the Ignatian long recension, and the commentary on Job is Julian, we do not know who this Julian was. Hagedorn suggests the possibility of a Cilician bishop mentioned by Philostorgius in his *Historia ecclesiastica* 8.2.[27] This is, though, only a faint possibility. There is no conclusive evidence.[28] A final problem with Hagedorn's conclusion is that in order for his argument to be right, the author of the Ignatian long recension needs to be a strict Arian. As I argued in the last chapter, this is simply not so. Thus, if the author of the Job commentary is a strict Arian, the author cannot be the same as the author of the Ignatian long recension.

---

[23] Dieter Hagedorn, *Der Hiobkommentar des Arianers Julian* (Berlin and New York: Walter De Gruyter, 1973).

[24] Henry Chadwick, review of Dieter Hagedorn, *Der Hiobkommentar des Arianers Julian*, *Journal of Theological Studies* 28 (1977):559-561.

[25] Hagedorn, *Der Hiobkommentar*, LII.

[26] Ibid., XXXIV.

[27] Hagedorn, *Der Hiobkommentar*, LVII.

[28] Hagedorn himself says this. He writes on page LVII, "Philostorgios, Kirchengeschichte 8, 2 … erwähnt zwar in einer Liste von um 364 n. Chr. durch die Eunomianer eingesetzten Bischöfen auch einen Julian, und zwar als Bischof von Kilikien, aber bei der Häufigkeit des Namens und dem Fehlen irgendwelcher weiterer Anhaltspunkte wird man sich scheuen, daraus schon eine Identität zu konstruieren. Berufenere werden vielleicht weiterfinden."

Finally, it is important to note that Hagedorn's actual list of parallels between the commentary on Job and the *Apostolic Constitutions* is considerably stronger than his list of parallels between the commentary on Job and the Ignatian long recension. Therefore in addition to the above concerns about Hagedorn's thesis we can add this: while his proposed parallels might make a case for some sort of authorial continuity between the Job commentary and the *Apostolic Constitutions*, the proposed parallels between the Job commentary and the Ignatian long recension are less than persuasive.[29] Hagedorn suggests thirty-five places where there are parallels between the Job commentary and the *Apostolic Constitutions*. Yet he only suggests eleven parallel places between the Job commentary and the Ignatian long recension.

I note that of these eleven, nine of Hagedorn's proposed parallels are not remarkable. I provide three examples in order to give the reader a feel for how tendentious these nine parallels are. 1) Hagedorn notes the presence of the Greek phrase νηπιοκτόνον δόγμα in the Job commentary 3.10 and the Greek phrase νηπιοκτόνον πρόσταγμα in *Philippians* 8. 2) In a similar fashion the expression μία γὰρ ἐστιν ἀνθρωπότης is found in the Job commentary 5.6 and in *Philadelphians* 4 we find μία γὰρ φύσις καὶ ἓν τὸ γένος τῆς ἀνθρωπότητος. 3) The Job commentary contains the words οὐδὲν γὰρ τῷ θεῷ τῶν ὄντων ὡς ὂν λελόγισται πρὸς τὴν φύσιν in 17.5. *Philippians* 10 has ᾧ τὰ ὄντα λελόγισται ὡς μὴ ὄντα.

As for the remaining two parallels that may add strength to Hagedorn's argument, I provide the one that I find the most interesting. In the Job commentary 263.12, we encounter the characteristics of the devil:

> δολερὸς γάρ ἐστι καὶ κλεψίνους, σοφὸς τοῦ κακοποιῆσαι'· τὸ δὲ καλὸν ὅτι ποτέ ἐστιν ἀγνοεῖ σοφιστὴς ἀπατηλὸς ὕπουλος εἴρων, ἄλλα μὲν προβαλλόμενος, ἕτερα δὲ δεικνύς, καὶ φιλανθρωπίαν ὑποκρινόμενος ἐξαίφνης πολέμιος ἀναφαίνεται.

In *Philippians* 4 there are some similar phrases:

> ποικίλος γάρ ἐστιν ὁ τῆς κακίας στρατηγός, κλεψίνους, ἄστατος, ἑαυτῷ ἐναντίος καὶ ἄλλα μὲν προβαλλόμενος, ἕτερα δὲ δεικνύς. σοφὸς γάρ ἐστι τοῦ κακοποιῆσαι, τὸ δὲ καλὸν ὅτι ποτέ ἐστιν ἀγνοεῖ.

---

[29] For the parallels see Hagedorn, *Der Hiobkommentar,* XLII-XLVIII and IL-LI.

Here we do find the same wording of ἄλλα μὲν προβαλλόμενος, ἕτερα δὲ δεικνύς. Even though this example is more convincing than the others, it does not represent overwhelming evidence in favor of the same person responsible for both the Job commentary and the Ignatian long recension. In fact, after reviewing his list of eleven parallels as a whole, coupled with my research from the previous chapter on the Christology of the Ignatian long recension, I must part company with Chadwick's assessment. I am not persuaded that the same hand is responsible for the Job commentary and the Ignatian long recension.[30]

James D. Smith III and Company

There are two doctoral theses written on the Ignatian long recension. The first, written by Harold Ford in 1961, "A Comparison of the Recensions of the Ignatian Corpus," would be more appropriately entitled, "A Radical New Proposal for the Date of the Long Recension."[31] The reason I suggest this is because he argues repeatedly for a date of 110-300 for the long recension. The reason for this date is that "there is no question but that Gnosticism is more directly and emphatically the object of attack of the expander of the Ignatius corpus than it was of Ignatius himself."[32] Though Ford's exact terminology changes throughout his thesis, he does

[30] It is beyond the scope of this thesis to deal in detail with the *Apostolic Constitutions*. However, I do want to say something about Marcel Metzger's conclusions in his *Les Constitutions Apostoliques*. He writes, "De toutes ces indications on conclura donc que le compilateur et son atelier ont travaillé en Syrie, à Antioche ou à proximité, et en un laps de temps assez resserré pour qu'on puisse attributer au meme chef d'équipe la direction des trois ouvrages, successivement le *Commentaire sur Job*, autour de 360, les *CA* et l'interpolation des *Lettres d'Ignace* vers 380." See Marcel Metzger, *Les Constitutions Apostoliques* (Sources Chrétiennes; 3 vols.; Paris: Bd De Latour-Maubourg, 1985), 1.61. He builds his case on Hagedorn's examination of the Job commentary, which I consider questionable. The evidence in this thesis will further question such a late date for the Ignatian long recension. Later in this chapter I will suggest that that Ignatian long recension could have been in circulation as early as 350. I will also contend that there is nothing within the text of the Ignatian long recension to link it to Antioch other than the name of the martyr himself. Based on the research displayed in this thesis there are potentially serious problems with linking the Job commentary to the same hand as the Ignatian long recension. Granted, it is possible that the Ignatian long recension was not in existence until 380 and my forthcoming argument is not diminished if a date of circa 380 is indeed accurate. It is likely, however, that the Ignatian long recension was circulating some thirty years earlier. As for Metzger's claim that *Trall.* 7.3 of the Ignatian long recension refers to the *Apostolic Constitutions*, if this is so then, according to my reading of the evidence, it will be possible that the *Apostolic Constitutions* too was composed earlier than 380. If this is so and if Hagedorn is correct in dating the Job commentary to 380 then we are better able to understand the Christological differences between the Arian Job commentary and the much more conservative Ignatian long recension.

[31] Harold W. Ford, "A Comparison of the Recensions of the Ignatian Corpus" (Th.D. diss., Illif School of Theology, 1961).

[32] Ibid., 62.

narrow the gap between 100 and 300C.E. to the last quarter and, at other times, to the last half of the third century.[33] Thus, while Ford does not specify an individual he thinks responsible for the long recension, he does say that the theological position of this person(s) is "exceedingly difficult to say." Ford goes on to say that, in contrast with Lightfoot, "it would seem, rather, that the writer belongs to the period leading to the Council of Nicaea …"[34] Thus, the Ignatian forger and interpolator, living in the last quarter of the third century, did his work with the purpose of building up the monarchial and sacerdotal position of the local bishops in opposition to the then tendency to elevate the Roman bishop over the other bishops.[35]

After reading Ford's thesis, I do not get the impression that he himself is persuaded that the Ignatian long recension is a pre-Nicene product.[36] And, in fact, the evidence he puts forward serves, rather, to cement that view of Lightfoot concerning the fourth-century provenance of this work.[37] Nonetheless, I do have some sympathy with Ford's work. While I uphold the consensus view that the Ignatian long recension is a post-Nicene fourth-century product, I also think that the interpolator/forger intends to recapture a pre-Nicene understanding of the relationship between Father and Son. I will further defend this understanding later in this chapter.

The second doctoral thesis has already taken centre stage in the introduction to my work. In his 1986, "The Ignatian Long Recension and Christian Communities in Fourth Century Syrian Antioch," James David Smith III initially concedes that "given the variety of redactors whose names have been put forward already, any

---

[33] Ibid., 258 and 265. On page 258, Ford writes that the long recension fits very well into the last quarter of the third century as a polemic against Marcion's docetism and against the monarchianism of Theodotus and/or Paul of Samosata.

[34] Ford, "A Comparison of the Recensions of the Ignatian Corpus," 138.

[35] Ibid., 256.

[36] Ford writes in relation to the long recension of *Phld*. 6, "Certainly there are shades of Marcionism and Gnosticism, but also the Arian controversy and others leading up to the council of Chalcedon in A.D. 451." Later he writes, "It is possible that some note of Arianism is involved in the later notions of the pseudepigraphic Ignatius. In any event, it is quite clear that at least one half of the Tarsian letter is polemically anti-docetic." See Ford, "A Comparison of the Recension of the Ignatian Corpus," 71 and 77.

[37] For example Ford is of the opinion that the interpolator's expansion of *Magn*. 6 with the phrase "kingdom shall have no end," is an attempt to "connect the person of Jesus with the Old Testament" via the book of Daniel. Ford makes no mention of Marcellus here when clearly this statement is intended to condemn Marcellian theology. See Ford, "A Comparison of the Recension of the Ignatian Corpus," 66.

attempt to affirm one of these, or posit yet another, must await the discovery of new and decisive evidence."[38] Like Lightfoot, Smith, *at first*, appears content to identify the general theological party the interpolator/forger represents. He states that in Syrian Antioch, "the Homoian community there 'resurrected' Ignatius as a holy man and venerable advocate in order to encounter the advances being made by the growing Nicene coalition, while giving a positive missionary statement of the Homoian Christian position."[39] Yet, later in the thesis Smith writes, "It cannot be demonstrated that Euzious was the editor of the LR and the AC, nor can a conclusive case be made for anyone else. Most likely, consideration should be given to one of Euzoius' lesser-known Antiochene lieutenants, Asterius or Crispinus."[40]

Smith's thesis is significantly more cogent than Ford's. Smith theorizes that the remains of Ignatius, mentioned by Jerome in his *De Viris Illustribus* 16, were located in Antioch sometime during the decade between Julian's death and Jerome's arrival. Oversight of the cemetery in Antioch belonged to the church in power. At the time of Pseudo-Ignatius, the Arians were in power. I provide Smith's summary of his hypothesis once again:

> … the Arian party in Antioch located the remains of the venerable martyr-bishop Ignatius in the Christian cemetery ca. AD 364-373 … The 'rediscovery' of the Ignatian relics and the 'redaction' of the Ignatian literary corpus belong together, as products of the same community. This community, in a time of need, sought to appropriate Ignatius as their own saint and advocate. They had this opportunity because of his relative obscurity – his persona was a field not yet cultivated.[41]

---

[38] James David Smith III, "The Ignatian Long Recension and the Christian Communities in Fourth Century Syrian Antioch" (Th.D. diss., Harvard University, 1986), 5.

[39] Ibid., 6.

[40] Ibid., 128. In a paper presented at the Thirteenth International Conference on Patristic Studies, Smith appears to go one step further and identity Euzoius himself as the hand responsible for the Ignatian long recension. He writes, "In response [to divisions in Antioch], the evidence suggests that Euzoius mounted two initiatives: the first was a critical ecclesiastical mission to Alexandria, while the second involved the enlistment of Ignatius' relics and writings in seeking to create an Antiochene Homoean advocate and hero." Smith goes on to say that Athanasius' *Vita Antonii* in support of the Nicene position "motivated Euzoius, the Alexandrian native." In this paper, Smith can even take pleasure "to hear Prof. Henry Chadwick's conviction [expressed in a private conversation] that Euzoius' creation of the LR, in his Antiochene struggle against competing religious communities, seems quite evident." Yet, the results of the research displayed in the last chapter contradict Smith's conclusion that "the Ignatian LR readily fits what can be known of the Antiochene Homoean position, not inconsistent with the broad confession of Arius and Euzoius some four decades earlier." See James D. Smith III, "Reflections on Euzoius in Alexandria and Antioch," in *Studia Patristica* (ed. M.F. Wiles and E.J. Yarnold with the assistance of P.M. Parvis; Vol. XXXVI; Leuven: Peters, 2001), 514-519. The quotations are from pages 516, 518, and 519.

[41] Smith, "The Ignatian Long Recension," 13-14

The remainder of Smith's thesis is spent defending this hypothesis. As interesting as it is, I see two major problems. First, if the long recension was not produced in Antioch, Smith's entire thesis falls apart. He is correct to say that Antioch deserves first place of consideration due to the association of Ignatius with Antioch.[42] Yet there is nothing within the text of the long recension that points to Antioch or any other specific place from which the long recension was composed. We simply do not know specifics about the community behind the Ignatian long recension.

Second, I am convinced that Ignatius was *not* an obscure figure before the fourth century. Smith draws this conclusion based on Lightfoot's collection of Ignatian quotations and references through the year 400.[43] As is well known, Ignatius is quoted directly on three occasions by two different men – Irenaeus and Origen. Irenaeus, in his *Adversus haereses* 5.28.4, quotes from chapter four of Ignatius' letter to the Romans. While this quotation is obviously from the Roman letter, Irenaeus refers to the author of this text as "a certain man." The only other person known to provide direct quotations from the Ignatian corpus before Eusebius of Caesarea is Origen. Origen quotes *Romans* 7 in his *Commentary on the Song of Songs* and he quotes *Ephesians* 19 in his *Homily on Luke*. In addition to these three direct pre-Eusebian quotations, however, Lightfoot gathers references and allusions to Ignatius' writings from eleven different people and/or works before Eusebius. Among the eleven are Polycarp, Melito, Athenagoras, Theophilus of Antioch, Clement of Alexandria, and Tertullian. Smith says, "Ignatius was held in reverent obscurity by the ancient church. A survey of the quotations of, and references to, Ignatius through the year 400 (as collected by Lightfoot) illustrates this point."[44] I interpret this same evidence in the reverse direction. Ignatius was a well-known and respected figure before the fourth century and, as this thesis contends, throughout all of the fourth century.

Furthermore, Eusebius of Caesarea had already provided detailed discussion concerning Ignatius of Antioch by the turn of the fourth century – some sixty or seventy years prior to Smith's proposed date for the rediscovery of Ignatius' relics in

---

[42] Ibid., 5-6

[43] Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, 2.1.135-145.

[44] Smith, "The Ignatian Long Recension," 14.

Antioch and the redaction of the Ignatian long recension. Thus, if Ignatius was not an obscure figure then Smith's overall thesis confronts another major obstacle. I will have considerably more to say about Smith's work in the concluding chapter of this thesis.

Othmar Perler and Company

Perhaps the most influential work done on the identity of the hand behind the Ignatian long recension is that of Othmar Perler. Perler seeks to demonstrate that the Christology found in the Ignatian long recension can be matched with the Christology found in the writings of Eusebius of Emesa. Perler says:

> Hier wie dort begegnen wir der gleichen exegetisierenden theologischen Methode, die sich ängstlich an die Schrift hält. Hier wie dort finden wir die wesentlich gleiche arianisierende Trinitätslehre bei aller Betonung der Gottheit des Logos. Hier wie dort dieselbe Christologie nach dem Schema „Logos-Fleisch." [45]

In addition to the Logos-Flesh pattern of Eusebius of Emesa and Pseudo-Ignatius, Perler draws attention to the need of both writers to explain Jesus' baptism by John. He writes:

> Eusebius' Ausführungen in De fide wurden durch die Erwähnung der Taufe Jesu veranlaßt. Er wollte jedes Mißverständnis beheben. Aus gleichen Erwägungen heraus ergänzt Pseudo-Ignatius den echten Ignatius in Smyr. 1, 1-2: „... der getauft wurde von Johannes, damit durch ihn jegliche Gerechtigkeit erfüllt würde, der heilig, ohne Sünde mandelte."[46]

Of course, the reason Eusebius, and according to Perler Pseudo-Ignatius, is so intent on making certain there is no confusion over the nature of Jesus' baptism is because of their absolute conviction of Jesus' *Söndelosigkeit*. There is then a direct connection between Jesus' sinlessness and the belief of both writers that Jesus did not have a human soul. The belief that Jesus did not have a soul was strong evidence for F.X. Funk and F. Diekamp that Pseudo-Ignatius was an Apollinarian. Arians, however, also deny Jesus a soul and Eusebius of Emesa „ zur weitmaschigen Gruppe der Halbarianer gehört ..."[47] Therefore, according to Perler, the author of the Ignatian

---

[45] Othmar Perler, "Pseudo-Ignatius und Eusebius von Emesa," *Historisches Jahrbuch* 77 (1958): 73-82. The quotation is taken from the second paragraph of the article.

[46] Ibid., 79.

[47] Ibid., 74. For an argument that questions the commonplace understanding that Arians did not believe Jesus possessed a human soul see William P. Haugaard, "Arius: Twice a Heretic? Arius and the Human Soul of Jesus Christ," *Church History* 29.3 (1960): 251-263.

long recension is a semi-arian with a theological understanding like that of Eusebius of Emesa. In fact in the concluding footnote to the article, with an unexpected turn of events, Perler does not resist the temptation to name an actual author – Silvanus of Tarsus.[48]

I say that Perler's article has been the most influential on later scholars because his argument has been met with substantial agreement. K.J. Woollcombe writes:

> Since the end of the second world war, however, Pseudo-Ignatius has been treated with greater respect, and scholars are beginning to realise that he cannot be overlooked in any analysis of the fourth century controversies. P. Henri de Riedmatten allotted a section to him in his monograph on Paul of Samosata, and, more recently, Prof. O. Perler has investigated and, in my view, established a doctrinal connexion between the forger and Eusebius of Emesa … The purpose of this paper is to invite more general agreement with the conclusions of de Riedmatten and Perler …"[49]

In a similar fashion, Aloys Grillmeier states, "The newly discovered writings and the Christology of Eusebius of Emesa now also seem to offer the possibility of determining rather more closely the origin of the *Pseudo-Ignatian* epistles and their place in history. In fact, they belong in the sphere of christological views of Eusebius."[50] In the footnote that accompanies this statement, Grillmeier credits Perler with this discovery.

In relation to Perler's work, we have already observed the highly speculative nature of an attempt at naming anyone as the individual responsible for the Ignatian long recension. As with previous scholars discussed, Perler's identification of Silvanus of Tarsus is no more convincing than any of the other suggestions made. In relation to Perler's labeling of Eusebius of Emesa as a semi-arian, Hanson's treatment of Eusebius of Emesa is instructive. He says:

> Both Altaner and Quasten describe Eusebius of Emesa as 'semi-Arian.' If this means anything other than that he was a follower of the theology of Basil of Ancyra and his school, the term is so vague as to be useless. If it means that Eusebius was an adherent of Basil of Ancyra's school of thought, it is

---

[48] Perler, "Pseudo-Ignatius und Eusebius von Emesa," 82.

[49] K.J. Woollcombe, "The Doctrinal Connexions of the Pseudo-Ignatian Letters," *Studia Patristica* 6 (1962): 269-273. The quotation is from pages 269 and 270. The book by de Riedmatten is *Les Actes du Procès de Paul de Samosate* (Friborg: Editions St. Paul, 1952).

[50] Aloys Grillmeier, *Christ in Christian Tradition: From the Apostolic Age to Chalcedon (451)* (trans. John Bowden; 2d revised ed.; Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1975), 306.

> manifestly incorrect. He never mentions *ousia* or *homoios kat' ousian* (like according to *ousia*) once …He is assuredly a standing warning against throwing around irresponsibly labels like 'Arian' or 'orthodox' or 'Semi-Arian' when dealing with this period.[51]

Though Perler's work has been well received, we are still left with a desire for more precision. Perler's suggestion of Eusebius of Emesa fits once again with my argument that a date in the 340s or early 350s is the most plausible for the Ignatian long recension. Otherwise, however, there is nothing specifically to link Eusebius of Emesa with the long recension, other than his general theological and social milieu. It may be that forthcoming scholarship on Eusebius of Emesa will cast additional light on the question. However, at present his candidacy for the authorship of the Ignatian long recension can remain little more than interesting speculation.

Milton P. Brown and Company

Before I move forward to make my contribution to this subject with a demonstration of the doctrinal connections between the Ignatian long recension and the *Macrostichos* creed, I want to discuss briefly two other articles and then discuss in more detail one small book.

In 1960 Jack Hannah argued, in a manner reminiscent of Ford's arguments in his doctoral thesis, that the long recension of the Eusebian seven Ignatian letters was made around 140 in Ephesus.[52] Though his dating is even earlier than Ford's, Hannah, like Ford, believes that what Lightfoot interprets to indicate a fourth-century time frame (such as implicit references to Marcellus in the long recension of *Magn.* 6) can just as easily be understood as a reaction to second-century docetism.[53] Hannah praises the work of J.B. Lightfoot and then respectfully offers reasons as to why Lightfoot is wrong when Lightfoot concludes that the same person who interpolated the seven Eusebian letters also forged the additional letters of the long recension. According to Hannah, Lightfoot is right to date the spurious letters to the fourth century but not the interpolated letters. Lightfoot fails to notice there are different New Testament text types found in the interpolated letters and in the spurious letters. The interpolated letters contain a western text type and the spurious

---

[51] Hanson, *The Search for the Christian Doctrine of God*, 397-398.

[52] Jack W. Hannah, "The Setting of the Ignatian Long Recension," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 79.3 (1960): 221-238.

[53] Ibid., 227.

letters contain the much later koine text type.[54] Thus, the interpolated and the spurious letters come from two different hands and two different time periods. Another conclusion that parts company with Lightfoot, based on the above argument, is that the author of the *Apostolic Constitutions* borrowed from the Ignatian long recension![55]

Four years later, Milton P. Brown responded to Hannah in the same journal with the article "Notes on the Language and Style of Pseudo-Ignatius."[56] It is an understatement to say Brown does not find Hannah's arguments persuasive. The first sentence of this article is, "In case any of you wonder at the troubling waters that have for so long remained placid, you may find the disturbing angel in the *JBL* for September, 1960 … - an article entitled, 'The Setting of the Ignatian Long Recension,' by Jack W. Hannah."[57] Brown criticizes Hannah for drawing his textual conclusions based only on New Testament variant readings listed in the Nestle text, "obviously a very small proportion of the total number of such quotations."[58] Furthermore, he states that there is a lack of consistency in Hannah's results. For example, there are both western and koine readings found in the quotation of John 8.58 in *Magnesians* 9 of the long recension. After responding to Hannah's main line of argument, Brown highlights the high degree of consistency between the manner of scriptural citation, the Scripture passages cited, and the language and style of both the interpolated letters and the forgeries. Among other pieces of evidence, Brown provides a list of Greek words that are found in both the interpolated letters and the spurious letters. These are words that are peculiar to the Ignatian long recension because they are not found in the Apostolic Fathers whose words are included in Goodspeed's *Index Patristicus*. The words in Goodspeed's index serve as a helpful measuring stick for a Christian vocabulary from approximately 95-180. Thus, in addition to serving as evidence for a single hand behind the interpolated letters and the forgeries, this linguistic evidence also serves to date the long recension to a much later time than that argued for by Hannah. Brown concludes his brief article with, "In

---

[54] Ibid., 223-224.

[55] Ibid., 225

[56] Milton P. Brown, "Notes on the Language and Style of Pseudo-Ignatius," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 83.2 (1964): 146-152.

[57] Ibid., 146.

[58] Ibid., 147.

sum, it should be clear, from the various pieces of evidence here presented – the common sources and method of quotation, the language and style – that the cumulative weight tips the scales overwhelmingly in favor of an integrity of redaction."[59]

Neither Hannah nor Brown attempts to identify a person or a particular school of thought for the hand behind the Ignatian long recension. They do, however, seek to identify the number of persons involved in the construction of the long recension and the time period when the person(s) lived. The Christological profile of the Ignatian long recension presented in the previous chapter serves as additional evidence to support the conclusions of first Lightfoot and then Brown "in favor of an integrity of redaction."

Arnold Amelungk

My own conclusion that the Christology of the Ignatian long recension is fundamentally the same as that found in the *Ekthesis Macrostichos* creed had been reached, and the below demonstration of the very close relationship between the two documents written, long before Arnold Amelungk's *Untersuchungen über Pseudo-Ignatius* was brought to my attention.[60]

Obviously, I think Amelungk's conclusion that there is a close literary relationship between the Ignatian long recension and the *Macrostichos* is correct. In this brief study Amelungk offers his interpretation of the following categories for both the interpolated letters and the forgeries: 1) Die Lehre von Gott-Vater, 2) Die Lehre von Gott-Logos, 3) Die Lehre vom Pneuma hagion, and 4) Die Bekämpfung der Haeretiker. Amelungk situates his findings in such as way as to build upon the work of Zahn and Harnack as well as to prove erroneous Funk's conviction that Pseudo-Ignatius was an Apollinarian. Amelungk writes:

> Funk steht nach dem Resultate seiner Prüfung des Ignatius-Materials nicht an, auch die Ap. Const. als ein Werk apollinaristischen Fälschertums zu betrachten. Trotz der Einwendungen Funk's teilen wir auf Grund unserer Neuprüfung des Materials den Standpunkt Zahn's und Harnack's: auch wir können in der Fälschung der Ignatianen nur eine eusebianische

---

[59] Ibid., 152.

[60] Arnold Amelungk, *Untersuchungen über Pseudo-Ignatius* (Marburg: G. Otto's Hofbuchdruckerei in Darmstadt, 1899; repr., Kessinger Publishing's Legacy Reprints). I am grateful to Professor Bart Ehrman for making me aware of this work.

> Tendenzschriftstellerei erblicken. Damit bestimmt sich für uns auch der semiarianische, d.h. eusebianische Charakter der Ap. Const.[61]

Amelungk's "Neuprüfung" is a reference to his chart on pages 75-82 where he lays out in parallel columns the many places where he sees a close affinity between both the interpolated and forged Ignatian letters and the *Macrostichos*. The following sentence serves as a summary to the contents found in the parallel columns:

> Mehrfach bot sich uns in den vorangehenden Betrachtungen Gelegenheit, auf die überreichen Beziehungen und die grosse Ähnlichkeit hinzuweisen, die zwischen dem Ausdrucke und der Gedankenwelt der Interpolation bezw. Fiction und der Ekthesis makrostichos bestehen.[62]

I now provide a sample of some of the significant parallels that Amelungk points to between the Ignatian long recension and the *Macrostichos*. These parallels demonstrate the same theological ideas in the Ignatian long recension and the *Macrostichos*. My own forthcoming contributions will add to this type of evidence.

He begins his demonstration with the opening of the *Macrostichos*: Πιστεύομεν εἰς ἕνα θεὸν πατέρα παντοκράτορα, κτίστην καὶ ποιητὴν τῶν πάντων, ἐξ οὗ πᾶσα πατριὰ ἐν οὐρανῷ καὶ ἐπὶ γῆς ὀνομάζεται (1).[63] He parallels this with the long recension of *Philippians* 1: εἷς ἔστιν ὁ τῶν ὅλων θεὸς, πατὴρ τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐξ οὗ τὰ πάντα ..., the long recension of *Philadelphians* 4: εἷς ἀγέννητος, ὁ θεός καὶ πατὴρ ..., and the long recension of *Ephesians* 6: εἷς θεὸς καὶ πατὴρ πάντων, ὁ ἐπι πάντων καὶ διὰ πάντων καὶ ἐν πᾶσιν ...[64]

Amelungk nexts points to similar vocabulary and phrases in the *Macrostichos* and the Ignatian long recension via the next few lines of the *Marostichos* and the Ignatian long recension of *Magnesians* 11 as well as the Ignatian long recension of *Trallians* 9. I provide a small sampling of this part of Amelungk's work. The *Macrostichos* reads:

---

[61] Amelungk, *Untersuchungen über Pseudo-Ignatius*, 72.

[62] Ibid., 71.

[63] I quote the Greek text for both the *Macrostichos* and the Ignatian long recension as it is in Amelungk's book. The section numbers I provide for the *Macrostichos* are from Hanns Christof Brennecke, Uta Heil, Annette von Stochhausen, und Angelika Wintjes, eds., *Athanasius Werke: Dokumente Zur Geschichte Des Arianischen Streites* (Vol.3; Part 1; Berlin and New York: Walter De Gruyter, 2007), 280-287.

[64] There are additional places in the Ignatian long recension where Amelungk finds a close relationship to the *Macrostichos*. They are *Smyrn.* 9 and *Magn.* 11.

> καὶ εἰς τὸν μονογενῆ αὐτοῦ υἱὸν, τὸν κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν, τὸν πρὸ πάντων τῶν αἰώνων ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς γεννηθέντα, θεὸν ἐκ θεοῦ, φῶς ἐκ φωτὸς, δι᾽ οὗ ἐγένετο τὰ πάντα, τὰ ἐν οὐρανοῖς καὶ τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, τὰ ὁρατὰ καὶ τὰ ἀόρατα, λόγον ὄντα καὶ σοφίαν καὶ δύναμιν καὶ ζωὴν καὶ φῶς ἀληθινὸν, τὸν ἐπ᾽ ἐσχάτων τῶν ἡμερῶν δι᾽ ἡμᾶς ἐνανθρωπήσαντα καὶ γεννθέντα ἐκ τῆς ἁγίας παρθένου, ... (2)

The long recension of *Magnesians* 11 contains these words: ἀλλὰ πεπληροφορῆσθαι ὑμᾶς ἐν Χριστῷ τῷ πρὸ πάντων μὲν αἰώνων γεννηθέντι παρὰ τοῦ πατρὸς, γεννωμένῳ δὲ ὕστερον ἐκ Μαρίας τῆς παρθένου δίκα ὁμιλίας ἀνδρὸς. In *Trallians* 9, Amelungk points to additional phrases that are similar to section two of the *Macrostichos*: ὅταν χωρὶς Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ λαλῇ τις, τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ, τοῦ γενομένου ἐκ Δαβὶδ, τοῦ ἐκ Μαρίας ὅς ἀληθῶς ἐγεννήθη καὶ ἐκ θεοῦ καὶ ἐκ παρθένου, ἀλλ᾽ οὐκ ὡσαύτως ...

The phrase ἢ τὸν αὐτὸν εἶναι πατέρα καὶ υἱὸν καὶ ἢ ἅγιον πνεῦμα occurs in section 4 of the *Macrostichos*. The phrase ταὐτὸν δὲ εἶναι πατέρα καὶ υἱὸν καὶ πνεῦμα ἅγιον ... occurs in the long recension of *Trallians* 6.

The *Macrostichos* states: οὔτε μὴν τρία ὁμολογοῦντες πράγματα καὶ τρία πρόσωπα, τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ καὶ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος κατὰ τὰς γραφὰς τρεῖς διὰ τοῦτο τοὺς θεοὺς ποιοῦμεν (7). The long recension of *Philippians* 2 states: οὔτε οὖν τρεῖς πατέρες οὔτε τρεῖς υἱοὶ οὔτε τρεῖς παράκλητοι ...

This is a small sampling of the material found in Amelungk's chart on pages 75-83 of his book. Taken as a whole, the material that Amelungk points to in the *Macrostichos* and in the Ignatian long recension mounts a persuasive case that these two documents contain fundamentally the same Christological outlook.

The parallels, then, between the Ignatian long recension and the *Macrostichos* that I now draw attention to will serve to complement and rejuvenate Amelungk's late nineteenth–century work. For my purposes, however, I wish to demonstrate that the same pre-Nicene paradoxical understanding of the relationship of the Son to the Father that I argued for in the Ignatian long recension also exists in the *Macrostichos*. Shortly, I will draw attention to prominent metaphors used by early Christians to articulate the relationship of the Son to the Father. My contention is that these metaphors allow for the paradox of equality and subordination to remain in place, while affirming the basic idea that *homoousios* would come to have in the fourth-

century debates – the Son's unity with God and not with the created order. It is this manner of articulating the relationship of the Son to the Father that the Ignatian long recension and the *Macrostichos* wish to maintain. The resolution to the fourth-century conflicts offered by the Ignatian long recension and the *Macrostichos* then is a call for reform.

In the pages to come my work should serve to bring Amelungk's conclusions up to date in light of modern scholarship on the fourth-century Christologcial controversy that bears the name of Arius. Amelungk refers to the Christology of the Ignatian long recension and the *Macrostichos* as a "semiarianische" theology. No scholar today takes the term "semi-arian" with any degree of seriousness. Amelungk was working in a day when it was acceptable to label all forms of non-Nicene theology with the amorphous "semi-arian." Scholarship now desires more precision.[65] Semi-arian is simply outdated.

The Ignatian Long Recension and the *Macrostichos* Creed

The *Ekthesis Macrostichos* (detailed exposition) is found in Athanasius' *De synodis* 26 and Socrates' *Historia ecclesiastica* 2.19.[66] Sozomen mentions the creed (*Historia ecclesiastica* 3.21) but he does not record the creed. There is a scholarly consensus that the "long-winded" creed was produced in 344. This consensus concludes that, against the church histories of Socrates (*Historia ecclesiastica* 2.19) and Sozomen (*Historia ecclesiastica* 3.11), the council of Antioch that produced the *Macrostichos* took place after the council of Sardica. Thus, according to this

---

[65] This is now also true with pro-Nicene theologies as Lewis Ayres' *Nicaea and its Legacy: An Approach to Fourth-Century Trinitarian Theology* (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2006; first published 2004) demonstrates. Ayres writes on page one of the introduction to his book, "The aim and core of my argument is a paradigm that I offer for exploring the theologies that came to be counted as 'orthodox' at the end of the century. This paradigm attempts to move beyond simplistic east/west divisions and to respect the diversity of 'pro-Nicene' theologies better than available accounts."

[66] There has been relatively little scholarly attention given to the *Macrostichos* creed alone. Most of the discussion is in books or articles dealing with the Arian controversy as a whole. For example, see Henry Melvill Gwatkin, *Studies of Arianism: Chiefly Referring to the Character and Chronology of the Reaction which Followed the Council of Nicaea* (Cambridge: Deighton Bell and Company, 1900), 128-130; Adolf Harnack, *Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschicte* (4th edition; vol. 2; Tübingen: Verlag von J.C.B. Moher [Paul Siebeck], 1909), 247, footnote 4; F. Loofs, "Arianismus," *Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft* (1897): 28; M. Meslin, *Les Ariens d'Occident* (Patristica Sorbonensia 8; Paris: 1967), 264-266; Thomas A. Kopecek, *A History of Neo-Ariansim* (2 vols.; Cambridge, Mass.: The Philadelphia Patristic Foundation, 1979), 1.87-95; Hanson, *The Search for the Christian Doctrine of God*, 309-314; Ayres, *Nicaea and its Legacy*, 126-130. I will interact with some of these sources as this discussion unfolds. I have been unable to locate a single journal article or book chapter devoted specifically to the *Macrostichos* creed.

chronology, the council of Sardica is sandwiched in between Antioch 341 (the dedication council) and Antioch 344 (the *Macrostichos* council). The council of Sardica is generally dated either to 342 or 343; as Timothy Barnes notes the dating of the council of Sardica to 347 by Socrates and Sozomon (and thus placing the *Macrostichos* before Sardica) is "impossible."[67]

We know little about who was responsible for the creed. Athanasius tells us (and Socrates follows him) that Eudoxius (at the time bishop of Germanicia) along with Martyrius and Macedonius (bishop of Mopsuestia) carried the creed to Italy. Eudoxius is an interesting character and affirms the manner in which some personalities changed their theological loyalties throughout the fourth century. In 344 we find Eudoxius carrying a creed that, as I will argue, is potentially compatible with *homoousios*. This creed declares that the Son is like the Father in all things. Yet by the time Eudoxius succeeds Leontius as bishop of Antioch, he will be associated with the extreme Arian movement of Aetius (see Socrates *Historia ecclesiastica* 4.12-14).

Though we know little about the group that produced the creed, there can be no question as to the purpose of the *Macrostichos*. Its purpose was to provide one more attempt, after the failure of Serdica 343, to bring about reconciliation between the churches of the east (the regions governed by Constantius) and the churches of the west (the regions governed by Constans). The east sought to do this via a detailed and lengthy exposition of their Christological views.

I begin with the most obvious evidence for the congruency of the Ignatian long recension with the *Macrostichos*. This evidence does not contain direct word for

---

[67] Timothy D. Barnes, *Athanasius and Constantius: Theology and Politics in the Constantinian Empire* (Cambridge, Mass., and London, England: Harvard University Press, 1993), 259 footnote 2. In this footnote, Barnes provides discussion relevant to the debate amongst scholars over a date of 342 or 343 for the council of Sardica. Barnes favors 343. For the most detailed discussion of the date of the synod of Sardica see Sara Parvis, *Marcellus of Ancyra and the Lost Years of the Arian Controversy 325-345* (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2006), 210-224. She too favors 343. Barnes is also of the opinion that the council spoken of by Theodoret that met in Antioch in 344 to depose its bishop Stephanus, and replace him with Leontius, was the same council that produced the *Macrostichos*. See Barnes, *Athanasius and Constantius*, 87. Finally Barnes provides a helpful brief summary of the church historians – Rufinus, Socrates, Theodoret, Sozomen, and Philostorgius – who provide us with key information for fourth-century ecclesiastical affairs. He concludes that, "The important fact is that the narrative framework which the later ecclesiastical historians share with Rufinus is demonstrably flawed." See Barnes, *Athanasius and Constantius*, 7. For a study devoted specifically to church historians from late antiquity see Glenn F. Chestnut, *The First Christian Histories: Eusebius, Socrates, Sozomen, Theodoret, and Evagrius* (2nd ed., Revised and Enlarged; Macon, Ga.; Mercer University Press, 1986).

word parallels, but there are strong Christological parallels.[68] In the long recension of *Magnesians* 8.24ff we find:

> διὰ τοῦτο καὶ ἐδιώχθησαν, ἐμπνεόμενοι ἀπὸ τῆς χάριτος, εἰς τὸ πληροφορηθῆναι τοὺς ἀπειθοῦντας ὅτι εἷς θεός ἐστιν ὁ παντοκράτωρ ὁ φανερώσας ἑαυτὸν διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ, ὅς ἐστιν αὐτοῦ λόγος οὐ ῥητὸς ἀλλ᾽ οὐσιώδης οὐ γάρ ἐστιν λαλιᾶς ἐνάρθρου φώνημα, ἀλλ᾽ ἐνεργείας θεϊκῆς οὐσία γεννητή . ὃς κατὰ πάντα εὐαρέστησεν τῷ πέμψαντι αὐτόν
>
> for this reason they [the prophets] were persecuted, being inspired by grace, to assure the disobedient that there is one God the Almighty who manifested himself through Jesus Christ his Son, who is his Word not spoken but substantial. For he is not the pronouncement of articulate speech but a begotten substance of divine energy who pleased the one who sent him in all things."[69]

When we turn to the *Macrostichos* creed, we find these words:

> Βδελυσσόμεθα δὲ πρὸς τούτοις καὶ ἀναθεματίζομεν καὶ τοὺς λόγον μὲν μόνον αὐτὸν ψιλὸν τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ ἀνύπαρκτον ἐπιπλάστως καλοῦντας, ἐν ἑτέρῳ τὸ εἶναι ἔχοντα, νῦν μὲν ὡς τὸν προφορικὸν λεγόμενον ὑπό τινων, νῦν δὲ ὡς τὸν ἐνδιάθετον, Χριστὸν δὲ αὐτὸν καὶ υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ μεσίτην καὶ εἰκόνα τοῦ θεοῦ μὴ εἶναι πρὸ αἰώνων θέλοντας, ἀλλ᾽ ἐκ τότε Χριστὸν αὐτὸν γεγονέναι καὶ υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ, ἐξ οὗ τὴν παρθένου σάρκα ἀνείληφε πρὸ τετρακοσίων οὐχ ὅλων ἐτῶν ... ἴσμεν γὰρ αὐτὸν ἡμεῖς οὐκ ἁπλῶς λόγον προφορικὸν ἢ ἐνδιάθετον τοῦ θεοῦ, ἀλλὰ ζῶντα θεὸν λόγον καθ᾽ ἑαυτὸν ὑπάρχοντα καὶ υἱὸν θεοῦ καὶ Χριστὸν καὶ οὐ προγνωστικῶς συνόντα καὶ συνδιατρίβοντα πρὸ αἰώνων τῷ ἑαυτοῦ πατρὶ καὶ πρὸς πᾶσαν διακονησάμενον αὐτῷ τὴν δημιουργίαν εἴτε τῶν ὁρατῶν εἴτε τῶν ἀοράτων (9-10).
>
> And we abhor, moreover, and we anathematize those who falsely call him only a mere word of God and who say he is without independent existence, and who say he exists in another, being described by some now as uttered and now as internal, but [these persons] suppose him to not be before the ages Christ and son of God and mediator and image of God, but that he then

---

[68] For direct word for word parallels between the two documents see Amelungk, *Untersuchungen über Pseudo-Ignatius*, 75-82 and my discussion of Amelungk's work above.

[69] The Greek text of the Ignatian long recension is taken from J.B. Lightfoot, *The Apostolic Fathers* (Part 2, vol. 3; *Ignatius, St. Polycarp*; 2nd ed.; London and New York: Macmillan and Co., 1889). All English translations of the Ignatian long recension are mine. In order to assist the reader in finding the exact passage quickly, I have included Lightfoot's line numbers after the chapter number. The only two English translations in existence are those of William Whiston and Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson, "The Epistles of Ignatius," in *The Apostolic Fathers: Ante-Nicene Christian Library* (vol.1; ed. Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson; Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1867). This translation is the one reprinted in the *Ante-Nicene Fathers*.

> became Christ and son of God, from the day on which he took flesh from the virgin not four hundred years ago … for we know that he is not simply an uttered word or an internal word of God, but he is the living Word God existing according to himself and son of God and Christ being with and living constantly with his own father before the ages, not with foreknowledge only, and having served him in relation to every work whether of things visible or invisible.[70]

In these words from the Ignatian long recension and the *Macrostichos* is found the foundational Christology of both documents.

The concern that develops after the council of Nicaea in 325, even as there is broad agreement on the condemnation of Arius, is that the key word *homoousios* lends credence to Christologies that accord the Son such close proximity to the Father that it is very difficult to see any significant distinction between the two figures. This manner of Christological thinking is reminiscent of both Sabellius and Paul of Samosata – two figures from the past that stand condemned by the fourth-century church. At first, the linking of Sabellius and Paul of Samosata with the same Christology appears paradoxical. In a letter from Dionysius of Rome to Dionysius of Alexandria, preserved by Athanasius in *De decretis* 26, it is reported that Sabellius believed that the Son is the Father and that the Father is the Son. As evidence for the perception of strong parallels between the Nicaean *homoousios* and Sabellius, Socrates informs us that Eustathius, bishop of Antioch and traditionally understood to be a staunch Nicene, was removed from his see because he was accused of Sabellianism (*Historia ecclesiastica* 1.23.8-1.24.1). In contrast with Sabellius, Paul of Samasota, a third-century bishop of Antioch, is generally believed to have promoted an adoptionistic Christology. Athanasius tells us that Paul also employed the word *homoousios*, but in a sense contrary to that of the council of Nicaea (*De synodis* 43-45). Thus, according to Athanasius, the predecessors to the Nicene debates were correct in their condemnation of Paul and his use of *homoousios*. Athanasius reports that Paul used *homoousios* in a physical sense and that Paul believed that Christ became God as a man.

The shared result of the Christological understanding of both Sabellius and Paul of Samasota is to deny a pre-existent status to the Son and to deny that the Son

---

[70] The Greek text of the *Ekthesis Macrostichos* is taken from Brennecke et al., *Athanasius Werke: Dokumente Zur Geschichte Des Arianischen Streites*. All English translations of the *Ekthesis Macrostichos* are mine unless otherwise stated.

is a distinct entity from the Father. Thus, we witness strong opposition to this sort of Christology in both the Ignatian long recension of *Magnesians* 8 and the *Macrostichos*. Within the historical context of the fourth century, the denial of an independent pre-existent status for the Son is manifested in the acrid controversies surrounding Marcellus of Ancyra. He, therefore, becomes the explicit target in the *Macrostichos* and he becomes the implicit target in the Ignatian long recension.

Amelungk is correct that it is most likely that the *Macrostichos* was a source for the interpolator/forger.[71] There is no contradiction in the basic fundamental Christological understanding of these two texts. Both texts argue that the pre-existent Christ is not simply internal to the Father, but the pre-existent Christ, as *logos* or word, has his own distinct subsistence. In *Magnesians* 8 we are told that Jesus is "his Word not spoken but substantial – ὅς ἐστιν αὐτοῦ λόγος οὐ ῥητὸς ἀλλ᾽ οὐσιώδης." Furthermore Jesus "is not the pronouncement of articulate speech but a begotten substance of divine energy who pleased the one who sent him in all things – οὐ γάρ ἐστιν λαλιᾶς ἐνάρθρου φώνημα, ἀλλ᾽ ἐνεργείας θεϊκῆς οὐσία γεννητή . ὃς κατὰ πάντα εὐαρέστησεν τῷ πέμψαντι αὐτόν." The *Macrostichos* declares, "for we know that he is not simply an uttered word or an internal word of God, but he is the living Word God existing according to himself and son of God and Christ being with and living constantly with his own father before the ages, … ἴσμεν γὰρ αὐτὸν ἡμεῖς οὐκ ἁπλῶς λόγον προφορικὸν ἢ ἐνδιάθετον τοῦ θεοῦ, ἀλλὰ ζῶντα θεὸν λόγον καθ᾽ ἑαυτὸν ὑπάρχοντα καὶ υἱὸν θεοῦ καὶ Χριστὸν … συνόντα καὶ συνδιατρίβοντα πρὸ αἰώνων τῷ ἑαυτοῦ πατρὶ …"

These two documents clearly proceed from the same Christological understanding. The same language is used in both – the pre-existent Christ is not as a person's speech, stored up in the mind and then released. Rather, the pre-existent Christ has a real existence outside of the Father.

More Evidence of Christological Congruency

There is much more evidence for the Christological congruency between the Ignatian long recension and the *Macrostichos*. Both documents maintain the common pre-Nicene paradoxical understanding that Jesus is equal with God and that Jesus is subordinate to God. This common pre-Nicene understanding is demonstrated by the

[71] Amelungk, *Untersuchungen über Pseudo-Ignatius*, 71.

metaphors of a torch from a flame (Justin Martyr *Dialogus cum Tryphone* 61), the sun and its rays (e.g., Origen *De principiis* 1.2.11, Tertullian *Adversus Praxean* 8), a river and a fountain (e.g., Tertullian *Adversus Praxean* 8, Gregory Thaumaturgus *Ad Philagrium* 8), and the tree and its root (e.g., Tertullian *Adversus Praxean* 8). The fundamental meaning of these metaphors is best articulated by the words of the late second-century Greek apologist Athenagoras. In his *Legatio pro Christianis* he himself uses the metaphor of a ray from the sun in reference to the Holy Spirit (10.4). He next writes:

> Τίς οὖν οὐκ ἂν ἀπορήσαι <τοὺς> ἄγοντας | θεὸν πατέρα καὶ υἱὸν θεὸν καὶ πνεῦμα ἅγιον, δεικνύντας αὐτῶν καὶ τὴν ἐν τῇ ἑνώσει δύναμιν καὶ τὴν ἐν τῇ τάξει διαίρεσιν, ἀκούσας ἀθέους καλουμένους;
>
> Who therefore would not be confused when they heard those called atheists who admit God the Father and God the Son and the Holy Spirit, who make known their power in unity and their distinction in rank?[72]

After applying the metaphor of the sun and its ray to the Holy Spirit, Athenagoras then articulates a Trinitarian understanding that allows for both unity (ἕνωσις) and subordination (τάξις). Interestingly, it appears that the fundamental meaning of the later fourth-century interpretation of *homoousios* – unity with God – is implied in these prevalent pre-Nicene metaphors and articulated by Athenagoras. Lewis Ayres, in his discussion of Origen, writes:

> Indeed, it is important to note the problematic status of the very term subordinationism. Insofar as it is understood to indicate an intent to present the Son as being inferior to the Father it does not accurately describe the character of many pre-Nicene and early fourth-century theologies. Consider, for example, a third or fourth-century theologian who spends considerable effort showing how the Son can be said to possess some of the Father's attributes or to imagine those attributes because of the manner in which the Son is uniquely generated. In such a case describing the theologian's intent as one of subordinationism directs our attention away from the concern to emphasize continuity between the two.[73]

Ayres is correct. Yet there is also danger from the other end of the spectrum. There is the danger of emphasizing the unity of Father and Son in some of these authors at the

---

[72] The Greek text is from Athenagoras, *Legatio Pro Christianis* (ed. Miroslav Marcovich; Patristische Texte Und Studien; Berlin and New York: Walter De Gruyter, 1990).

[73] Ayres, *Nicaea and its Legacy*, 21. Ayres pointed me to some of the analogies cited previously in this paragraph.

expense of the very clear subordinationism found in these same authors (e.g., Ignatius, Irenaeus, and Tertullian discussed in chapter one).

During the fourth century, persons and theological parties began to gravitate to one side of the paradox – equality or subordination – to the neglect of the other. And herein lies the central cause of the fourth-century debates concerning the relationship between the Father and the Son. The *Macrostichos* and the Ignatian long recension seek to enable the survival of this paradox. As with the commonplace pre-Nicene analogies of a torch from a flame, the sun and its rays, a river and a fountain, and a tree and its root, both the Ignatian long recension and the *Macrostichos* would agree that the Son comes from the Father in such a way that the Son and the Father are one, even as they are also distinct. Therefore it is in the manner described above that the Ignatian long recension and the *Macrostichos* understand the Son to be equal with the Father. I have already argued for this in relation to the Ignatian long recension in the Christological profile found in the previous chapter. Shortly, I will make a similar case in relation to the *Macrostichos.*

However, the Ignatian long recension and the *Macrostichos* also maintain the explicit subordination, found in the pre-Nicene analogies cited above, without the developing fourth-century qualifications attached to Jesus' subordinate status – incarnation and causality. Jesus' subordination to God, understood via incarnation and causality, would become standard characteristics of Nicene Christology. This understanding was in existence early in the debates as Marcellus of Ancyra demonstrates. By the mid fourth century this understanding was cemented. Therefore, the *Macrostichos* and the Ignatian long recension cannot be Nicene productions. Both documents explicitly reject the Nicene understanding of Jesus' subordination.

There are two lucid passages from the *Macrostichos* that demonstrate the Christological understanding of Jesus as both equal with God and subordinate to God. The first is:

> οἴδαμεν γὰρ καὶ αὐτόν, εἰ καὶ ὑποτέτακται τῷ πατρὶ καὶ τῷ θεῷ, ἀλλ' ὅμως πρὸ αἰώνων γεννηθέντα ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ θεὸν κατὰ φύσιν τέλειον εἶναι καὶ ἀληθῆ καὶ μὴ ἐξ ἀνθρώπων μετὰ ταῦτα θεόν, ἀλλ' ἐκ θεοῦ ἐνανθρωπῆσαι δι' ἡμᾶς, καὶ μηδέποτε ἀπολωλεκότα τὸ εἶναι (8).
>
> for we also know him, even if he is subordinate to the Father and God, but nevertheless having been begotten from God before the ages to be God by

> nature perfect and true and not God from among human beings after this, but from God to be man for us, and never losing existence.

The second is:

> Πιστεύοντες οὖν εἰς τὴν παντέλειον τρίαδα τήν ἁγιωτάτην, τουτέστιν εἰς τὸν πατέρα καὶ εἰς τὸν υἱὸν καὶ εἰς τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, καὶ θεὸν μὲν τὸν πατέρα λέγοντες, θεὸν δὲ καὶ τὸν υἱόν, οὐ δύο τούτους θεούς, ἀλλ᾽ ἓν ὁμολογοῦμεν τῆς θεότητος ἀξίωμα καὶ μίαν ἀκριβῆ τῆς βασιλείας τὴν συμφωνίαν, πανταρχοῦντος μὲν καθόλου πάντων καὶ αὐτοῦ τοῦ υἱοῦ μόνου τοῦ πατρός, τοῦ δὲ υἱοῦ ὑποτεταγμένου τῷ πατρί, ἐκτὸς δὲ αὐτοῦ πάντων μετ᾽ αὐτὸν βασιλεύοντος τῶν δι᾽ αὐτοῦ γενομένων καὶ τὴν τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος χάριν ἀφθόνως τοῖς ἁγίοις δωρουμένου πατρικῷ βουλήματι (15).
>
> We believe therefore in the all perfect triad the most holy, that is in the Father and in the Son and in the Holy Spirit, and calling the Father God, and also the Son God, we do not confess two gods but one office of divinity and one exact harmony of dominion, the Father alone as sovereign ruler over everything and sovereign ruler over his Son, and the Son subordinated to the Father, but except him [the Father] ruling after him over all things, having been made through him and plentifully bestowing the grace of the Holy Spirit on the saints by the Father's will.

We find in these two texts an attempt to allow a dominant understanding of pre-Nicene Christology to remain intact. Warring theological camps gravitated to one side of this Christological paradox. Therefore, both camps, the Nicenes and the non-Nicenes, viewed one another as irreverent and impious. Yet, the group that produced this creed in Antioch 344 is, I suggest, asking for a return to an earlier way of thinking, before the Arian crisis erupted.

In the first text, there is no effort to update or correct the earlier understanding of Jesus as subordinate to God. Jesus is said to be ὑποτέτακται τῷ πατρὶ καὶ τῷ θεῷ. Notice that Jesus' subordination to God is in no way restricted to his incarnated status. Just as there is no attempt to soften Jesus' subordinate nature, there is also no effort to deny Jesus' existence πρὸ αἰώνων γεννηθέντα ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ. The text states that Jesus is θεὸν κατὰ φύσιν τέλειον εἶναι καὶ ἀληθῆ… Nicenes such as Athanasius would have found the explicit and unqualified subordinationism of the creed repulsive. If, however, Jesus has been begotten of God before the ages and Jesus is God by nature perfect and true, he must be, in the words of the Philippians 2.6, τὸ εἶναι ἴσα θεῷ – equal with God.

The comments on τέλειος and ἀληθής found in G.W.H. Lampe's *A Patristic Greek Lexicon* are important to the current argument. One definition given for

τέλειος is "divine perfection admitted without assertion of *homoousion*."[74] The texts cited in support of this definition are the above text from the *Macrostichos* as well as the second and third creeds from Antioch 341. In relation to ἀληθής, one definition offered is "*real, genuine*, of God."[75] Once again the above text from the *Macrostichos* is given in support of this definition. Interestingly, however, this text from the *Macrostichos* is accompanied by Athanasius' *De incarnatione* 53.1, "θεὸν κατὰ φύσιν τέλειον ... καὶ ἀ."[76] The phrase θεὸν κατὰ φύσιν τέλειον εἶναι καὶ ἀληθῆ from the *Macrostichos* then means that the Son is, begotten of God, in and of himself God. The Son is God as an independent reality without illusion or deception.

In the second text quoted from the *Macrostichos*, we are exposed once again to this understanding of Jesus as equal with God on the one hand and subordinate to God on the other hand. Once again it is explicitly claimed that Jesus is subordinate to God. He is τοῦ δὲ υἱοῦ ὑποτεταγμένου τῷ πατρί, ἐκτὸς δὲ αὐτοῦ πάντων μετ' αὐτὸν βασιλεύοντος. Furthermore, it is significant that Jesus' subordination is not understood in terms of causality. Later, for example, Gregory of Nazianzus, arguing against the Eunomians, would concede the subordination of the Son to the Father, but only due to causality. He writes in *Oration* 29.15:

> If we say that the Father is *qua* cause superior to the Son, they add the minor premise, *but he is cause by nature* and hence conclude that *he is greater by nature* … We concede, of course, that it belongs to the nature of the cause to be superior, but they infer that the superiority belongs to the nature …"[77]

He also says in *Oration* 30.7 concerning the Eunomian interpretation of John 14.28 and John 20.17:

> Take as third the expression "*greater*"; as fourth, the phrase, "*my God and your God*." Certainly, supposing the Father were called "greater" with no mention of the Son's being "equal," they might have a point here. But if it is clear that we find both, what will the noble fellows say, what strength does their case have? … It is impossible for the same thing to be, in a like respect,

---

[74] G.W.H. Lampe, ed., *A Patristic Greek Lexicon* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2007; first published 1961), 1379. The definition I reference is A.4.b

[75] Ibid., 72 – definition B.

[76] Ibid.

[77] All translations of Gregory are taken from *On God and Christ: St. Gregory of Nazianzus: The Five Theological Orations and the Two Letters to Cledonius* (trans. Frederick Williams and Lionel Wickham; Popular Patristic Series; Crest Wood, NY: 2002). Gregory's colleague, Basil of Caesarea, also argues for causality as an avenue for understanding Jesus' subordination to God in his *Contra Eunomium*. He also appeals to the analogy of numbers in *Contra Eunomium* 1.20. Just because the number two comes after the number one, this does not require two to be subordinate to one.

> greater to and equal to the same thing. Is it not clear that the superiority belongs to the cause and the equality to the nature?[78]

In the *Macrostichos*, however, Jesus is clearly understood to be subordinate to God in such a way that Jesus has a slightly lesser role than God. The Father is sovereign over the Son and the Son is sovereign over everything else except the Father.

Yet the Son is also God in this second text. We are told, καὶ θεὸν μὲν τὸν πατέρα λέγοντες, θεὸν δὲ καὶ τὸν υἱόν, οὐ δύο τούτους θεούς, ἀλλ᾽ ἓν ὁμολογοῦμεν τῆς θεότητος ἀξίωμα καὶ μίαν ἀκριβῆ τῆς βασιλείας τὴν συμφωνίαν. The Father and the Son constitute "one office of divinity" and not two. The Father and the Son constitute "one exact harmony of dominion." This manner of understanding the unity of the Father and the Son cannot be Arian.

When I make the statement that the manner in which the *Macrostichos* refers to God cannot be Arian, I am using the term "Arian" to refer specifically to the teachings of Arius himself and his closest associates such as Eusebius of Nicomedia. I think that, in light of the recent trends in fourth-century scholarship discussed in the introduction to this thesis, this more restrictive understanding of the term "Arian" is the most accurate way to use the term. Clearly, many non-Nicene personalities such as Basil of Ancyra and Eustathius of Sebaste would not have been able to remain in Arius' company for a lengthy period of time when discussion turned theological. The person responsible for the Ignatian long recension and the *Macrostichos* likewise would have little toleration for Arius' theology.[79]

Furthermore, if not for the explicit references to Jesus' subordination, the manner in which Jesus is called God in this second text, as well as the first, is almost Nicene. However, I contend that we do find a complementary theological understanding even as it is presented along with an explicit subordinationism.

---

[78] We see how widely accepted the practice of limiting Jesus' subordination to his incarnation had become by the time of the Cappadocians (last quarter of the fourth century). Gregory goes on to state in *Oration* 30.7, "Of course, the explanation that the Father is greater than the Son considered as man is true, but trivial. Is there anything remarkable about God's being greater than man? Certainly this [causality] must be our answer to those who preen themselves on their 'being greater.'"

[79] While Lightfoot does not deal with the *Macrostichos*, he does say the following about the person responsible for the Ignatian long recension, "With these facts before us, we should find it difficult to convict him of Arianism." "These facts" is a reference to those places in the Ignatian long recension where Lightfoot detects evidence for "the writer as an adherent of the Nicene doctrine." See Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, 2.1.271 and 270.

There is yet more evidence of this paradoxical Christological pattern within the *Macrostichos*. The creed says:

> ..., τὸν δέ υἱὸν γεγεννῆσθαι πρὸ αἰώνων καὶ μηκέτι ὁμοίως τῷ πατρί ἀγέννητον εἶναι καὶ αὐτόν, ἀλλ᾽ ἀρχὴν ἔχειν τὸν γεννήσαντα πατέρα "κεφαλὴ γὰρ Χριστοῦ ὁ θεός (6).
>
> and the son having been begotten before the ages is not like the Father – unbegotten, but he has as a beginning the Father who begat him, "for the head of Christ is God."

Yet, the creed also says:

> οὐδὲν γὰρ πρόσφατον ὁ Χριστὸς προσείληφεν ἀξίωμα, ἀλλ᾽ ἄνωθεν τέλειον αὐτὸν καὶ τῷ πατρὶ κατὰ πάντα ὅμοιον εἶναι πεπιστεύκαμεν.
>
> For Christ by no means received honor recently, but we believe him to be perfect from the beginning and to be like the Father in all things (10).

From these two phrases we observe that the Son is believed to be unlike the Father and also like the Father. The strong implication is that the Son is subordinate to the Father (quoting 1 Corinthians 11.3) and the Son is equal to the Father (like the Father in all things). Here we find additional evidence that this creed cannot simply be labelled *heterousian* or *homoiousian.* Basil of Ancyra, for example, understood "like the Father in all things" to include essence. There seems to be a plea here emerging from some time in the mid fourth century – when it comes to the relationship of the Father to the Son, let the paradox and the mystery remain.[80]

Other Non-Nicene Creeds?

Before concluding this chapter, it is necessary to offer reasons as to why I conclude that the Ignatian long recension is best understood in light of the *Macrostichos* and not any of the other non-Nicene creeds that were produced during

---

[80] Thomas Kopecek puts forth an interesting thesis concerning the *Macrostichos'* insistence that the Son is generated and the Father is ungenerated. He thinks that the *Macrostichos* was produced in part as a response to Athanasius' argument against God's ungenerateness in *Orationes Contra Arianos* 1:30-34. Furthermore, Kopecek argues that Athanasius' *De Decretis* "was clearly intended to be polemical." He goes on to ask, therefore, what Athanasius was polemicizing against. He concludes, "Clearly Athanasius had the Macrostich of A.D. 344 primarily in mind when he wrote these sections [sections three and five], for the Macrostich endorsed 'likeness in all things' and throughout described God as ungenerated, the very two claims which sections three and five rejected. Responding to the Macrostich, Athanasius argued (1) that the formula of 'likeness in all things' had been considered and rejected at Nicaea in favor of homoousion and (2) that God should be termed Father rather than ungenerated." Thus, Kopecek sees a train of development that begins with Athanasius' *Orationes Contra Arianos*, leads to the *Macrostichos*, and then concludes with *De decretis*. See Kopecek, *A History of Neo-Arianism*, 1.87-95; 1.119-120. In a footnote, Hanson states that Kopecek's theory is possible but not definite. See Hanson, *The Search for the Christian Doctrine of God*, 311.

what Hanson refers to as a "period of confusion."[81] These remarks, however, need not be extravagant.

The first point to make is that the lengthy nature of the *Macrostichos* makes it ideal testing ground. This does not mean, of course, that the *Macrostichos* and the Ignatian long recension are an automatic match. Nonetheless, there is abundant material with which to evaluate and, in this case, we are fortunate because, building on the work of Arnold Amelungk, I have demonstrated that there is indeed an affinity between the two documents.

The next question that might be asked is: since the fourth creed of Antioch 341 is reproduced in the beginning of the *Macrostichos*, why not argue for the congruency of the Christologies of the fourth creed of Antioch and the Ignatian long recension?[82] Quite simply, the material that convincingly enables us to argue for the congruency between the *Macrostichos* and the Ignatian long recension is found in the 'long recension' version of the fourth creed of Antioch – the additional anathemas and commentary. In other words, it would be very difficult to argue persuasively for the same fundamental Christological understanding between the Ignatian long recension and the fourth creed of Antioch due to the brief nature of this creed.

There were two interesting non-Nicene creeds produced in Sirmium. The first Sirmian Creed was put forth in 351.[83] This creed can be ruled out as a match for the Ignatian long recension on two fronts: 1) it is obviously dependent on the *Macrostichos* and 2) due to its explicit aim at Nicaea in anathemas 3, 6, 7, 25, and 26 the creed "makes a definite shift towards a more sharply anti-Nicene doctrine, though it cannot quite yet be said to be explicitly pro-Arian."[84]

The most significant contribution made by the 'blasphemy of Sirmium' produced in 357 is that this creed outlawed all forms of *ousia* language.[85] As such, it is difficult to find Jesus equated with God. In this creed, Jesus is clearly a lower divinity alone.

---

[81] Hanson, *The Search for the Christian Doctrine of God*, 181-398.

[82] The fourth creed of Antioch 341 is found in *De synodis* 25 and Socrates *Historia ecclesiastica* 2.18.

[83] Found in *De synodis* 27, Socrates *Historia ecclesiastica* 2.30, and Hilary *De synodis* 37.

[84] Hanson, *The Search for the Christian Doctrine of God*, 328-329.

[85] Found in Hilary *De synodis* 11.

Conclusion

I contend that the *Macrostichos* contains a prominent pre-Nicene understanding of the relationship of Jesus to God. Interestingly, there is considerable agreement with the Nicene position; yet there is not a total embrace. Due to the problematic nature that *homoousios* came to have after the council of Nicaea in 325, the word is absent from the *Macrostichos*. Another reason for the absence of *homoousios* is that the word had already been condemned in the debates surrounding Paul of Samosata. Nonetheless, the fundamental meaning – unity with God – is implied in the creed. My reading of the *Macrostichos* is similar to that of Adolf Harnack. He writes:

> Sie betonen auf's Schärfste die Einheit der einen Gottheit (c.4): οὔτε μήν, τρία ὁμολογοῦντες πράγματα καὶ τρία πρόσωπα (man beachte, dass die Bischöfe den Ausdruck drei „Usien oder Hypostasen" vermeiden und das abendländische πρόσωπον brauchen, welches durch Sabellius discreditiert war) τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ καὶ τοῦ ἁ. πνεύματος κατὰ τὰς γραφάς, τρεῖς διὰ τοῦτο θεοὺς ποιοῦμεν, und sie haben sich in c. 9 so ausgesprochen, dass die Worte als eine tadellose Paraphrase des Homousios gelten müssen.[86]

Yet, Jesus is also explicitly subordinated to God without any of the Nicene qualifications that developed in the fourth century, such as the incarnation or causality. The central observation relevant to the *Macrostichos* is that the pre-Nicene paradox, that would serve to divide the fourth-century church, of Jesus' equality to God as well as his subordination to God, is maintained and even reinstated, in the *Macrostichos*. Scholars are fortunate to have the "long-winded creed" because, as the churches of the east attempt to explain their views to the churches of the west and avoid the label of heretic from the west, we are granted clarity in relation to a non-Nicene solution to the controversy that bears the name of Arius.

It was this same pattern of equality and subordination that emerged from the Christological profile of the Ignatian long recension presented in the previous chapter. Therefore, the evidence suggests that the *Macrostichos* is a Christological match with the Ignatian long recension. Both of these documents call for a return to an earlier, pre-Nicene, paradoxical, even mysterious understanding of the relationship of the Son to the Father.

---

[86] Adolf Harnack, *Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschicte* (4th edition; vol. 2; Tübingen: Verlag von J.C.B. Moher [Paul Siebeck], 1909), 247.

I will give much more attention to the date of the Ignatian long recension in the concluding chapter of this thesis as I argue against the conclusions of James D. Smith III. For now, I simply state that there is no reason that the Ignatian long recension could not have been in circulation by 350. I have demonstrated a remarkably similar Christological pattern within the Ignatian long recension and the *Macrostichos*. If indeed, as Arnold Amelungk contends, the *Macrostichos* was a source for the Ignatian long recension, then it makes sense to date the Ignatian long recension within five years or so of the *Macrostichos*.

We have already had significant exposure to the battle over Ignatius in the fourth-century Arian controversy. Yet the battle has only just begun. After detailed examination of the Ignatian middle recension in the opening chapter and the Ignatian long recension in the next two chapters, we now turn attention to consider the use of Ignatius by prominent fourth-century bishops. In the next chapter, we discuss the use of Ignatius by Athanasius of Alexandria and Eusebius of Caesarea. In the final chapter we consider John Chrysostom's sermon *In sanctum Ignatium martyrem*.

CHAPTER FOUR

EUSEBIUS OF CAESAREA, ATHANASIUS OF ALEXANDRIA, AND IGNATIUS OF ANTIOCH

Introduction

In previous chapters, with the goal of demonstrating a fourth-century controversy over Ignatius of Antioch, this thesis has examined fourth-century textual alterations found within manuscripts of the Ignatian middle recension and the engaging question concerning the identity of the interpolator and forger of the Ignatian long recension as well as this person's motivation. As we continue in our demonstration that Ignatius of Antioch was one of the battlegrounds upon which the Arian controversy was fought, I now direct attention to the intriguing reality that two leading fourth-century bishops with opposing understandings of the relationship of the Son to the Father both quote the writings of Ignatius of Antioch in an affirming manner. Thus, neither of these bishops takes issue with the Christology of Ignatius of Antioch. This is additional evidence that Ignatius was a figure that both Nicene and non-Nicene parties appealed to in order to articulate and/or defend their understanding of orthodox Christological belief.

Since it is indisputable that both Eusebius of Caesarea and Athanasius of Alexandria extol Ignatius of Antioch, the central task of this chapter is to demonstrate how is it possible for both Eusebius and Athanasius to extol the writings of Ignatius when Eusebius and Athanasius hold to fundamentally different Christological understandings. Eusebius mentions Ignatius briefly in his *Chronicon*. He also makes a brief mention of Ignatius on three different occasions in his *Historia ecclesiastica* (3.22, 3.38, and 5.8).[1] In a fourth reference, Eusebius quotes at length from Ignatius' letter to the Roman church (3.36). Finally, Eusebius quotes *Ephesians* 19.1 in his *Questions and Answers on the Genealogy of our Savior Addressed to Stephanus*. Athanasius mentions Ignatius only once in his entire surviving corpus. He quotes *Ephesians* 7.2 in his *De synodis* 47. But he does so, as we shall see, during an important discussion.

[1] As we shall see, these references are significant even though they are brief.

There are three avenues involved in my demonstration of how Eusebius and Athanasius both are able to affirm the writings, and thus the fundamental Christology, of Ignatius of Antioch. 1) Eusebius of Caesarea must have possessed a manuscript of the Ignatian middle recension that contained more authentic readings than those found in the Medicean manuscript. I suggest that the Greek manuscript that Eusebius worked with must have resembled more closely the readings found in the Armenian translation of the Ignatian middle recension. The Armenian translation was discussed in detail in the opening chapter. In other words, Eusebius worked from an Ignatian manuscript in the library of Caesarea that did not merge the figures of Father and Son so closely together that a distinction between the two figures is hard to find as is often found in the Medicean manuscript. 2) Athanasius is a master at reconciling conflicting church authorities from the past to his own point of view. Also we must consider the possibility that Athanasius was quoting from a corrupted Ignatian manuscript found in the library at Alexandria or, as some have thought, Athanasius deliberately changed the manuscript he had before him to suit his own sincerely held theological agenda. 3) Both traditions that Eusebius and Athanasius wish to emphasize – the distinction of Father and Son for Eusebius and the equality of Father and Son for Athanasius – go hand in hand in many pre-Nicene writers such as Ignatius of Antioch. In other words, though these traditions would become divorced from one another in the fourth-century disputes, they are presented side by side, and in the same breath, in many pre-Nicene writers such as Ignatius of Antioch.

Before displaying the evidence that leads me to these conclusions, I need first to discuss foundational issues upon which we will build. They are: 1) a listing of all citations from Ignatius of Antioch during the fourth century. This brief discussion will serve to provide a wider context for the quotations of Ignatius found in Eusebius and Athanasius. 2) The Christologies of Eusebius and Athanasius will be discussed in order to demonstrate that indeed a Christological gulf does exist between these two figures. This will not be new material. Nonetheless, in light of my overall thesis that both Nicene and non-Nicene factions found Ignatius representative of their own Christlogical understandings, an articulation of my own understanding of the Christologies of Eusebius and Athanasius is necessary. 3) The characteristic manner in which Eusebius and Athanasius handle and cite figures from the Christian past will be documented. Before we turn our attention to Eusebius' and Athanasius' handling of Ignatius of Antioch, it is important to gain a sense of the manner in which they generally handle figures from the Christian past.

After a discussion of these issues, I will then demonstrate how Eusebius and Athanasius can both claim Ignatius as a predecessor to their understanding of orthodox belief concerning the relationship of the Son to the Father.[2]

Quotations of Ignatius of Antioch from the Fourth Century

The findings of this thesis contradict the conclusion of James D. Smith III that Ignatius had become an obscure figure until the approach of the last quarter of the fourth century. Recall that Smith is of the opinion that until the Arian party in Antioch found the remains of Ignatius in their cemetery circa 364-373, Ignatius' "persona was a field not yet cultivated."[3] In an earlier discussion I stated that I read the evidence in J.B. Lightfoot's listing of "Quotations and References" in the reverse direction from Smith.[4] The evidence presented by Lightfoot suggests that Ignatius was not an obscure figure by the early fourth century.

Lightfoot lists ten different authors who either directly call Ignatius by name or allude to Ignatius' writings during the fourth century. These are: Peter of Alexandria (306), Eusebius of Caesarea (310-325), Cyril of Jerusalem (347), Athanasius (359), Ephrem Syrus (373), Basil of Caesarea (379), John the Monk (380-390), Jerome (382-415), John Chrysostom (390), and Cyrillonas (396).[5]

We observe that these quotations and references are spread nicely throughout the fourth century. There is not a twenty year period without a quotation from or a

---

[2] There are two works that are particularly important to a scholarly investigation of Eusebius and Athanasius written by Timothy D. Barnes. They are *Constantine and Eusebius* (Cambridge, Mass., and London: Harvard University Press, 1981) and *Athanasius and Constantius: Theology and Politics in the Constantinian Empire* (Cambridge, Mass., and London: 1993). Prior to Barnes' work on Eusebius, the classic treatment in English was J.B. Lightfoot, "Eusebius of Caesarea," in *A Dictionary of Christian Biography* (ed. William Smith and Henry Wace; 4 vols.; London: John Murray, Albermarle Street, 1880), 2.308-348. This chapter length article still repays reading. Lightfoot refers to F.J. Stein, *Eusebius Bischof von Cäsarea* (Würzburg, 1859) as the most complete monograph, written in German, on Eusebius in his day. After this E. Schwartz produced a significant article, "Eusebios von Caesarea," in *Realencylopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft* 6 (ed. F. Pauly and G. Wissowa; Stuttgart, 1909), 1370-1439.

[3] James David Smith III, "The Ignatian Long Recension and Christian Communities in Fourth Century Syrian Antioch" (Th.D. diss., Harvard University, 1986), 13-14.

[4] J.B. Lightfoot, *The Apostolic Fathers* (Part 2, 3 vols.; *Ignatius, St. Polycarp*; 2nd ed.; London and New York: Macmillan and Co., 1889), 2.1.135-232. Ignatian quotations and references is well worn territory. Lightfoot said in 1889, "It is superfluous to acknowledge obligations to predecessors in this case, where the harvest has been already reaped and where at the utmost only the scantiest gleaning is left to the last corner" (p. 135).

[5] Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, 2.2.145-168. Some of these dates have been revised by more recent scholarship as I will point out.

reference to Ignatius in Lightfoot's collection. Furthermore, when we consider the prominent place given to Ignatius by Eusebius of Caesarea in his *Historia ecclesiastica* and that books three and five (the places where Ignatius appears) were composed perhaps before 300, then we can conclude that Ignatius was a well-known and respected figure in the fourth-century church. A similar observation can be made in relation to the *Chronicon* though the references to Ignatius are brief. Whether or not Ignatius was a household name amongst church leaders is hard to discern, but we do know that many people were reading Eusebius' *Historia ecclesiastica* from an early date.[6]

Furthermore, we see that as the fourth century comes to a close the quotations and references to Ignatius become more frequent. This finding will complement nicely that argument of the concluding chapter, devoted to Chrysostom's sermon on Ignatius, that by the end of the fourth century Ignatius had become a contentious figure. In other words, the pro-Nicene camp was struggling to wrestle Ignatius from the earlier non-Nicene personalities like the author of the long recension and Eusebius of Caesarea.

Amongst this evidence of fourth-century interest in Ignatius of Antioch, in this chapter I wish to draw out Eusebius of Caesarea and Athanasius of Alexandria. The reason for this is that from Lightfoot's list Eusebius, Athanasius, John the Monk, Jerome and John Chrysostom mention Ignatius by name; the other references represent places where Lightfoot detects allusions to Ignatius' writings. I will deal with Jerome and Chrysostom in the next chapter. John the Monk, in fact, comes from the sixth century, not the fourth century.[7] Therefore, the focus of this chapter is on Eusebius of Caesarea and Athanasius of Alexandria.

However, before diving right into the different Christological understandings of Eusebius and Athanasius, I want to provide a brief discussion of one of the more

---

[6] Barnes dates the first edition of both the *Chronicon* and the *Historia ecclesiastica* before 300. See Barnes, *Constantine and Eusebius*, 111 and 128 (for discussion), 277 (for his chronological table).

[7] Numerous texts, almost all of which are not edited, are wrongly ascribed to John of Lycopolis. See Ignatius Ortiz de Urbina S.J., *Patrologia Syriaca* (2nd ed.; Rome: Pontifical Institute of Oriental Studies, 1965), 237-238. Among these are works that actually belong to John of Apamea (the Solitary), who was active during the first half of the sixth century and perhaps the end of the fifth century. Ortiz de Urbina says on page 109, "He wrote epistles, a dialogue on the soul, treatises on perfection, on baptism, and on other questions." See also I. Hausherr, "Un grand auteur spirituel retrouvé," *Orientalia Christiana Periodica* 14 (1948): 3-42. This John of Apamea must be the John the Monk of Lightfoot's Ignatius quotations. As Lightfoot notes he wrote, among other things, "On the affections of the mind and body to Eusebius and Eutropius, 2 sermons."

interesting authors, in light of the objective of this thesis, from Lightfoot's proposed Ignatian allusions. This person is Cyril, bishop of Jerusalem from approximately 350 until his death in 386.

Cyril of Jerusalem

Cyril is of particular interest because, if indeed his statements in *Catechesis* 4.9 are allusions to Ignatius' *Trallians* 9 and 10 as well as *Smyrnaeans* 2 and 3, then Cyril may be evidence that Ignatius' writings were being reread sometime in the mid-340s as an authoritative source by the group that Athanasius would look to for common ground in 359. Thus, Cyril may provide even more evidence to support my argument that Ignatius of Antioch was a battleground upon which the Arian controversy was fought. Therefore, we must make a judgment as to whether or not Cyril's words do serve as an allusion to Ignatius' writings. In other words, we shall need to decide if Lightfoot was correct to include Cyril in this listing of people that allude to Ignatius of Antioch. First, however, a few words need to be said about Cyril's Christology.

Cyril's Christology

Cyril's Christology, like that of the Ignatian long recension and the *Macrostichos*, has proven to be a complex puzzle for scholars to assemble. The following remarks from R.P.C. Hanson are illustrative:

> Cyril of Jerusalem, then, deliberately avoided using any language about God which involved employing *ousia* or its cognates. Was he, in spite of this, a disguised Homoousian? The very strong language in which he speaks about the unity of nature between Father and Son, his clear rejection of almost all doctrines peculiar to Arianism and the determination with which he ascribes full divinity to the Son have led some people to think so. In particular Lebon, in a long and carefully written article …, argued that behind Cyril's language which was not explicitly Homoousian one could detect an actual position identical with that expressed finally in the Creed of Constantinople of 381.[8]

Here we encounter Hanson's disagreement with Lebon. Lebon is of the opinion that Cyril's Christology is that of a disguised Homoousian. Hanson thinks otherwise as the rest of his treatment of Cyril makes clear.

---

[8] R.P.C. Hanson, *The Search for the Christian Doctrine of God: The Arian Controversy, 318-381* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Baker Academic, 2005; first published 1988), 409-410. The article he refers to is J. Lebon, "Le sort du 'consubstantiel' Nicéen," *Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique* 48 (1953):632-682.

Interestingly, we find the same sort of scholarly disagreement in the "General Introduction" to Cyril's life and the "Forward" to the translation of Cyril's *Catecheses* found in the "Fathers of the Church" series. Anthony A. Stephenson wrote the introduction and Leo P. McCauley translated the *Catecheses*. McCauley says, "As for Cyril's position on the Trinity, I would here state that I do not accept some of the findings set out in pp.34-60 above."[9] One wishes that McCauley would have elaborated because we do not know exactly what he finds problematic in Stephenson's treatment of Cyril's Trinitarian understanding. However, here is perhaps what McCauley took issue with:

> Cyril's Trinitarian theology is also approximately that of Milton's *Paradise Lost*. It is a masterly achievement; Cyril's superb theological style masks the extraordinary precision and finesse with which he expounds the central orthodoxy, the Royal Road (11.17). His theology is tritheism qualified and redeemed by subordinationism, and a subordinationism qualified and redeemed by tritheism. The two criticisms cancel out. The Eastern party was accused of teaching polytheism (Socrates 1.23) *and* subordinationism.[10]

As with Hanson and Lebon, there is disagreement over Cyril's Christology between McCauley and Stephenson. Lewis Ayres summarizes the situation nicely:

> The difficulty we have in placing Cyril … should help us to recognize that many bishops would have found themselves without direct 'party' commitment and able to shift allegiance as long as they felt their favourite terminologies and principles were upheld … Cyril demonstrates the problematic status even of the flexible categories I have tried to outline.[11]

All of this is reminiscent of the scholarly disagreement, discussed in the opening chapter, over the Christology of Ignatius of Antioch himself. And, of course, this is also reminiscent of the scholarly debate over the Christology of the Ignatian long recension.

Clearly Cyril's Christology offers an invitation for further scholarly investigation. For the purposes of this chapter, I simply want to highlight the possible similarities between Cyril's Christology and the Christology I contend is found in the Ignatian long recension and the *Macrostichos*. If Lebon is correct and Hanson

---

[9] Cyril of Jerusalem, *The Works of Saint Cyril of Jerusalem* (trans. Leo P. McCauley and Anthony A. Stephenson; The Fathers of the Church 61 and 64; 2 vols.; Washington: The Catholic University of America Press, 1969-1970), 1.90.

[10] Ibid., 1.47.

[11] Lewis Ayres, *Nicaea and its Legacy: An Approach to Fourth-Century Trinitarian Theology* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006; first published 2004), 153-154.

incorrect, then here we have a fourth-century Christian writer who is a *homoousian* in disguise. Though I used more reserved terminology in the preceding two chapters, my interpretation of the Ignatian long recension and the *Macrostichos* does find some common ground with Lebon.

When we engage Edward Yarnold's understanding of Cyril's Christology, there is more precision to be found between the terminology he employs and the terminology I used in the discussion of the Christology of the Ignatian long recension and the *Macrostichos*. He contends, as I do with the Ignatian long recension and the *Macrostichos*, that Cyril views the Son as equal to the Father and views the Son as subordinate to the Father.

> However, Cyril has many ways of formulating his understanding of the Trinity without recourse to the controversial *homoousios* … Cyril has various ways of expressing the Son's equality with the Father. 'For the Son is in everything like (*homoios*) the Father' (*Cat.* 11.18; cf. 4.7) The Son is eternally begotten: he has an *arche* in sense of an origin, but not a beginning in time (*Cat.* 11.20). His glory and worship are identical with the Father's; their wills are inseparable. Jesus words: 'I and the Father are one' (Jn 10.30) mean that they are one in dignity of their Godhead, in their reign, in unity of wills and operations; the Father creates through the Son (*Cat.* 11.16). Thus Cyril envisages the Son as in a sense subordinate to the Father, though equal to him. The Father is the principle or beginning (*arche*) of the Son (*Cat.* 11.30). The Son 'honours' the Father, and obeys him. It is by the Father's decree that he rules over the world he has created (*Cat.* 10.5).[12]

These words are reminiscent of my vocabulary in the previous two chapters when discussing the Christlogy of the Ignatian long recension and the *Macrostichos*.

Though Hanson does not think Cyril a *homoousian* in disguise, like Yarnold he does draw attention to Cyril's non-Arian view of the Son. Hanson writes:

> We have already seen that Cyril defined the union of Father and Son as one of 'nature' (φύσις). Cyril recurs to this point often. Christ, he says, must not be thought of as 'appointed' Son, but Son by nature, 'for the rank of deity and birth from the Father does not admit an equal'. He is a Son not 'by being promoted by appointment, but because he is generated by nature.'[13]

Yet, Hanson notices the same paradox in Cyril as Yarnold. Hanson goes on to say, "But with this immensely high estimate of the relation of the Son to the Father we

---

[12] Edward Yarnold, *Cyril of Jerusalem* (Early Church Fathers; London and New York: Routledge, 2000), 61.

[13] Hanson, *The Search for the Christian Doctrine of God*, 405-406. The texts he references here are *Catechesis* 11.4, 11.2, and 10.4.

are startled to find Cyril occasionally expressing a decided belief in the subordination of the Son."[14]

In light of what we have seen of the Christology found in the Ignatian long recension and the *Macrostichos*, I suggest this combination is not startling at all. Based on the results of the research relevant to the Christology of the Ignatian long recension and the *Macrostichos*, I see no reason why Cyril could not also belong to this party which included some who would later accept the fundamental meaning of *homoousios* even as they were for many years reticent towards the actual term due to its controversial nature, and also maintained an explicit subordination of the Son to the Father. It appears then that Cyril too could be in favour of an early pre-Nicene manner of handling the relationship between the Son and the Father in which the paradox of equality and subordination were allowed to remain in place.

Cyril of Jerusalem and Ignatius of Antioch

We now turn our attention to *Catechesis* 4.9 in order to evaluate Lightfoot's judgment that there is here an allusion to *Trallians* 9 and 10 as well as *Smyrnaeans* 2 and 3. After a careful reading of *Trallians* 9 and 10, *Smyrnaeans* 2 and 3, and *Catechesis* 4.9, I agree with Lightfoot that the "resemblance" between these writings is "striking."[15] Though, as is the nature of proposed allusions between writers, the evidence is ambiguous.

A concise summary of Cyril's purpose in *Catechesis* 4 is found in 4.3. He says, "However, before our presentation concerning the Creed, it seems to me a good idea now to provide a concise summary of the necessary dogmas, in case the length of my instructions and the intervening days of holy Lent should lead the simpler-minded among you to forget them."[16]

In *Catechesis* 4.9 then Cyril instructs his catechumens on Jesus' virgin birth. He exhorts:

> You must believe too that his Only-begotten Son of God came down from heaven to earth because of our sins, assumed a humanity subject to the same feelings as ours, and was born of the holy Virgin and the Holy Spirit. The humanity he assumed was not an appearance only or an illusion, but true (οὐ

[14] Ibid., 406. Hanson cites *Catechesis* 11.18 and 15.30 as subordinationists texts.

[15] Lightfoot, *The Apostolic Fathers*, 2.1.149.

[16] The translation is that of Edward Yarnold found in his *Cyril of Jerusalem*.

> δοκήσει καὶ φαντασίᾳ τῆς ἐνανθρωπήσεως γενομένης, ἀλλὰ τῇ ἀληθείᾳ). He did not pass through the virgin as if through a pipe, but truly took flesh from her (ἀλλὰ σαρχωθεὶς ἐξ αὐτῆς ἀληθῶς) and was nourished by her milk. For if the Incarnation was an illusion, so too was our salvation. Christ was twofold: man in appearance and God, but not in appearance. As man he ate truly as we do (ἐσθίων μὲν ὡς ἄνθρωπος ἀληθῶς ὡς ἡμεῖς), for he had the same fleshly feelings as ourselves; but it was as God that he fed the five thousand from five loaves. As man he truly died (ἀποθνήσκων μὲν ὡς ἄνθρωπος ἀληθῶς); but it was as God that he raised the dead body to life after four days. As man he truly slept on the boat (καθεύδων εἰς τὸ πλοῖον ἀληθῶς ὡς ἄνθρωπος); but it was as God that he walked on the waters.[17]

The over-all similarities between this section in Cyril and Ignatius' *Trallians* 9 and 10 as well as *Smyrnaeans* 2 and 3 is the attack that both Ignatius and Cyril direct toward docetic forms of Christianity. Both writers emphasize that Jesus was truly human and not a mere appearance.

I have provided the Greek text to *Catechesis* 4.9 where I see allusions to the Ignatian writings pointed to by Lightfoot. In *Trallians* 10 of the Ignatian middle recension we find these words, which are reminiscent of the first Greek text provided in the quotation form Cyril above, Εἰ δέ, ὥσπερ τινὲς ἄθεοι ὄντες, τουτέστιν ἄπιστοι, λέγουσιν τὸ δοκεῖν πεπονθέναι αὐτόν. When, however, we examine the same text in the long recension we encounter, Εἰ δέ, ὥσπερ τινὲς ἄθεοι ὄντες, τουτέστιν ἄπιστοι, λέγουσι, τὸ δοκήσει γεγενῆσθαι αὐτὸν ἄνθρωπον, οὐκ ἀληθῶς σῶμα. It is significant that Cyril uses δοκήσει as is found in the Ignatian long recension.

In the middle recension of *Trallians* 9.1, Ignatius says that Jesus Christ was from David and Mary ὃς ἀληθῶς ἐγεννήθη, ἔφαγέν τε καὶ ἔπιεν, ἀληθῶς ἐδιώχθη ἐπὶ Ποντίου Πιλάτου, ἀληθῶς ἐσταυρώθη καὶ ἀπέθανεν. The long recension of this text does contain interpolation but once the interpolation is removed the text is fundamentally the same. In a similar manner to *Trallians* 9.1, Ignatius writes in *Smyrnaeans* 2.1, ... καὶ ἀληθῶς ἔπαθεν, ὡς καὶ ἀληθῶς ἀνέστησεν ἑαυτόν. The long recension of *Smyrnaeans* 2.1 contains an interesting variant - καὶ

---

[17] The Greek text that Yarnold uses is Cyril of Jerusalem, *Homily on the Paralytic, Procatechesis, and Catecheses: S. Patris Nostri Cyrilli Hierosolymorum Archiepiscopi Opera quae supersunt Omnia* (ed. W.K. Reischl and J. Rupp; Munich: 1848-1860). However, I have not been able to gain access to this text. Therefore, I quote from *PG* 33.465-468. I see no differences between this text and the translation provided by Yarnold.

ἀληθῶς ἔπαθεν καὶ οὐ δοκήσει, ὡς καὶ ἀληθῶς ἀνέστη. We find here, once again, the use of δοκήσει. These texts then are indeed reminiscent of the remaining Greek texts provided in the quotation above from Cyril. Just as Ignatius repeatedly uses the word ἀληθῶς, so does Cyril repeatedly use ἀληθῶς. Furthermore, we find both Ignatius and Cyril using a form of the word δοκέω. However, we find the same form of δοκέω – δοκήσει – used in *Catechesis* 4.9 and twice in the quotations provided from the Ignatian long recension.

I see no reason why Cyril's *Catechesis* 4.9 could not be influenced by his awareness of the writings of Ignatius of Antioch. The interesting question is: which recension of Ignatius might Cyril be alluding to in *Catechesis* 4.9? The use of δοκήσει by Cyril in *Catechesis* 4.9 and the use of the same form in the Ignatian long recension of *Trallians* 10 and *Smyrnaeans* 2.1 make it tempting to argue for the long recension of Ignatius' letter, especially in light of the findings and proposals set forth in this thesis.

I have argued that the Ignatian long recension and the *Macrostichos* contain the same brand of Christology. The *Macrostichos* was produced in 344. I have embraced the opinion of Arnold Amelungk that the *Macrostichos* was likely a source used by the interpolator/forger of the Ignatian long recension. If indeed Lightfoot is correct to see allusions to Ignatius' writings in *Catechesis* 4, and if Cyril's knowledge of the Ignatian letters is from the long recension, then here is additional evidence for a date of around 350 for the long recension, as Cyril *Catecheses* date to "about 350, either just before or just after Cyril became bishop."[18]

As enticing as all of this is, I concede that it is difficult to decide with certainty if *Catechesis* 4.9 does indeed contain references to Ignatius' letters. And furthermore, there is not enough evidence to conclude which recension of Ignatius' letters Cyril might have been conversant with. Therefore the focus of this chapter must remain on Eusebius of Caesarea and Athanasius of Alexandria.

The Christologies of Eusebius of Caesarea and Athanasius of Alexandria

Due to the voluminous output of both Eusebius and Athanasius, there is a need to rein in our investigation of the Christological understandings of these two bishops within a chapter-length study. Therefore, while I will occasionally refer to

[18] Yarnold, *Cyril of Jerusalem*, 22.

other writings of these two figures, I will primarily focus upon Eusebius' *Historia ecclesiastica, Praeparatio evangelica,* and *Demonstratio evangelica* as well as Athanasius' *De decretis* and *De synodis*. One reason for this selection of texts is because it is within *Historia ecclesiastica* and *De synodis* that Eusebius and Athanasius refer to and quote from Ignatius. Furthermore, in relation to Athanasius' understanding of Jesus' relationship to God, *De synodis* and *De decretis* offer a representative sampling consistent with Athanasius' other writings.[19] Finally, in relation to Eusebius' Christology, though it is not often highlighted by scholars, the beginning of book one, as well as Eusebius' address to Paulinus of Tyre in book ten, offer a succinct and sufficient presentation of Eusebius' Christology consistent with that found in, for example, *Contra Marcellum* and *De ecclesiastica theologia*. And *Praeparatio evangelica* and *Demonstratio evangelica* "reflect basic theological ideas which Eusebius had long held."[20]

Scholarly Views of Eusebius of Caesarea

Scholars differ strongly when attempting to categorize Eusebius' Christology. Timothy Barnes writes:

> Admirers of Eusebius' theology assert fervently that he was no Arian. That was not the opinion of Eusebius' contemporaries, and the *General Elementary Introduction* repeatedly affirms two propositions which the Council of Nicaea condemned as heretical: that God the Son differs in substance from God the Father, and that the Son belongs to the created order. Writing in the earliest years of the fourth century, Eusebius could innocently regard both these opinions as orthodox.[21]

---

[19] There has been considerable scholarly discussion over the contrast between Athanasius' earlier works *Contra gentes* and *De incarnatione* and his later works directed specifically at combating the Arian heresy. Khaled Anatolios concludes that throughout the forty-year span of Athanasius' writing career he "maintains a remarkable consistency in his theological vision and even vocabulary, albeit with some notable developments and variance of emphasis." See Khaled Anatolios, *Athanasius* (The Early Church Fathers; London and New York: Routledge, 2004), 39. Furthermore, there has been considerable argument over the date of *Contra gentes* and *De incarnatione*. See, for example, C. Kannengiesser, "Le Témoignage Des Lettres Festales de Saint Athanase Sur La Date de L'apologie *Contra Le Paiens sue L'incarnation de Verbe*," *Recherches de Science Religieuse'* 52 (1964):91-100; A. Petterson, "A Reconsideration of the Date of the *Contra Gentes – De Incarnation* of Athanasius of Alexandria," *Studia Patristica* 17 (1982):1030-1040. Anatolios treats this issue in his *Athanasius: The Coherence of his Thought* (London and New York: Routledge, 2005, first published 1998), 26-29. Anatolios agrees that the traditional early dating of 318 is wrong due to "maturity of thought and the subtly magisterial tone" found in the work. Therefore, he assigns the work a date of 328-335. The quotation is from page 29.

[20] Barnes, *Constantine and Eusebius*, 186.

[21] Ibid., 174. The *General Elementary Introduction* consists of ten books. The four books of Eusebius' *Eclogae Propheticae* are books six to nine of his *General Elementary Introduction*. Most of book ten survives in fragmentary form found in a chain of patristic observations on Luke's gospel gathered by

Barnes' position here is consistent with that of the scribe who added a note of warning to the table of contents to book one of Eusebius' *Historia ecclesiastica*. In this note, found at the end of manuscript E, the scribe explicitly labels Eusebius an Arian.[22]

> Colm Luibhéid, however, offers a more nuanced view.
>
> But it is proposed here simply to make the point that the verdict offered on Eusebius, whatever this might be, ought certainly to derive from the critical examination of several possible explanations of his position instead of from the uncritical acceptance of one, namely, that he was an Arian.[23]

Nicetas of Heraclea in the eleventh century. For examples of admirers of Eusebius' non-Arian theology, in endnote 69, Barnes points to the works of H. Berkhof, *Die Theologie des Eusebius* (Amsterdam, 1939) and M. Weis, *Die Stellung des Eusebius von Caesarea im arianischen Streit* (Ph.D. diss., Freiburg-im-Breisgau, 1919). Weis makes the comment, on p. 62, that Eusebius was "nicht Arianer, sondern Origenist." The survey of scholarly opinions on Eusebius' Christology could go on and on. I offer succinct statements of the opinions found in some of the more well-known books. Beginning with older opinions, predating Lightfoot, we find this from John Henry Newman, "In his own writings … there is very little which fixes on Eusebius any charge, beyond that of an attachment to Platonic phraseology. Had he not connected himself with the Arian party, it would have been unjust to have suspected him of heresy. But his acts are his confession." In contrast with Newman, Henry Gwatkin thinks there was some but not total theological agreement between Eusebius and Arius. He says that Eusebius, "neither a great man nor a clear thinker," agreed with Arius that God is "entirely separate from a world which cannot bear his touch," but that instead of viewing the Lord as a creature along with Arius, Eusebius "preferred to regard him as the personal copy of the divine attributes …" See John Henry Newman, *The Arians of the Fourth Century: Their Doctrine, Temper and Conduct, Chiefly as Exhibited in the Councils of the Church between 325-381* (London: J.G. & F Rivington, 1833), 282 and Henry Melville Gwatkin, *Studies of Arianism: Chiefly Referring to the Character and Chronology of the Reaction which Followed the Council of Nicea* (2nd ed.; Cambridge: Deighton Bell and Co., 1900), 41. When we turn to more recent works, we find that D.S. Wallace-Hadrill's understanding of Eusebius' Christology is similar to that of Gwatkin. He writes, "Eusebius' merit as a theologian lay in his recognition that theology is a reasoned structure built upon a historical and biblical foundation … This emphasis itself is sufficient to clear Eusebius of the charge of true Arianism, which was in essence unhistorical." Later Wallace-Hadrill says about Eusebius, "From his starting point no really trinitarian theology was possible. He found himself postulating two Gods, a greater and a less, and struggled vainly to unite them, falling inevitably into ambiguities and contradictions." R.P.C. Hanson writes, "Though a supporter of Arius he cannot precisely be classified as an Arian." Rowan Williams writes, "…, Eusebius of Caesarea's adherence to the Arian cause was not a matter peripheral to his general theological style and commitment." See D.S. Wallace-Hadrill, *Eusebius of Caesarea* (London: A.R. Mowbray & Co., 1960), 137-138; R.P.C. Hanson, *The Search for the Christian Doctrine of God*, 46 and Rowan Williams, *Arius: Heresy and Tradition* (Rev. ed.; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2002; first published 1987), 61.

[22] The scribe writes, "Beware! The one reading this should not be deceived and should not respond to the heretical parts as if to the historical parts, for if the coming book is very helpful according to the historical narrative, [and] equally also where it reveals absolute divine teachings about God, [and] it does not appear to hold false beliefs, but where it speaks about the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit, everywhere it reveals the Son as subordinate to the Father and second to the Father and serving the Father, being an Arian he displays in a hidden way the glory of himself." I have translated this from the Greek text found in Eusebius of Caesarea, *Historia ecclesiastica* (ed. Kirsopp Lake; The Loeb Classical Library; vol.1; Cambridge and London: Harvard University Press, 2001; first published 1926), 4.

[23] Colm Luibhéid, *Eusebius of Caesarea and the Arian Crisis* (Dublin: Irish Academic Press, 1978), 26-27.

In contrast with Barnes and Luibhéid, J.B. Lightfoot states that terms found in Eusebius' Christological language, such as "second existence" and "second cause," can be understood in an orthodox manner. Yet, Lightfoot acknowledges that "though his language might pass muster, 'his acts,' it is said, 'are his confession.'"[24] Even though Lightfoot can find room for an orthodox understanding of some of Eusebius' more controversial language, the problem remains that Eusebius befriended staunch supporters of Arians, such as Eusebius of Nicomedia. Even here, however, Lightfoot can find a route of escape for Eusebius of Caesarea. According to Lightfoot, Eusebius aligned himself with his namesake of Nicomedia due to his opposition to Marcellus of Ancyra.[25] This does not mean, however, that Eusebius of Caesarea embraced the views of Arius or Eusebius of Nicomedia. Clearly, he did not.[26]

A reason for the above demonstration of diverse scholarly opinions is summarized by Jon Robertson when he says, "The origin of the Logos and his relationship with both God and the world are complex themes within the theology of Eusebius."[27] It is this complexity that has made Eusebius so elusive for both ancient and modern theologians.

---

[24] Lightfoot, *Eusebius of Caesarea*, 347.

[25] Allen Brent makes a similar argument in relation to Ignatius of Antioch and Polycarp. Though, according to Brent, Polycarp found Ignatius' emphasis on the supremacy of the bishop unacceptable (due to Ignatius' absorption of pagan mystery religions), Polycarp collected Ignatius' letters because he agreed with Ignatius' anti-docetic message. See Allen Brent, "Ignatius and Polycarp: The Transformation of New Testament Traditions in the Context of Mystery Cults," in *Trajectories through the New Testament and the Apostolic Fathers* (ed. Andrew F. Gregory and Christopher M. Tuckett; Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2005), 325-349.

[26] In direct opposition to Barnes, Lightfoot writes, "If we except the works written before the Council of Nicaea, in which there is occasionally much looseness of expression, his language is for the most part strictly orthodox, or at least capable of explanation in the orthodox sense. Against the two main theses of Arius, (1) that the word was a creature (κτίσμα) like other creatures, and (2) that there was a time when He was not, Eusebius is explicit on the orthodox side …" See Lightfoot, *Eusebius of Caesarea*, 347.

[27] Jon M. Robertson, *Christ as Mediator: A Study of the Theologies of Eusebius of Caesarea, Marcellus of Ancyra, and Athanasius of Alexandria* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), 45. On the next page Robertson writes, "The exact relationship between God the Father and his Logos as understood by Eusebius is complex, but follows the profile … of continuity and discontinuity." I will pick up on this theme of continuity and discontinuity later in my own investigation of Eusebian Christology. I will, however, use different terms. Robertson's final analysis of Eusebius' Christology is in agreement with that of Barnes. According to Robertson, Eusebius shares a perspective embraced by Arius, Asterius, and Eusebius of Nicomedia (p.137).

The Great Divide

I suggest the great divide between Eusebius' Christological understanding and that of Athanasius occurs, not concerning the key phrase ὁμοούσιος[28], but around two other main principles. First, Eusebius believes that the Son is needed for the creation of the world because God is too lofty to touch physicality. Athanasius finds this belief repulsive. Second, Athanasius' Christology limits the Son's subordination to the Father to the Son's incarnation. Eusebius knows nothing of a limited or qualified subordination.

We find two clear statements from Eusebius in book one of his *Historia ecclesiastica* that illustrate Eusebius' understanding of the pre-existent Christ as the creator of the physical world. Eusebius informs us that he will begin his *Historia ecclesiastica* with an account of the first dispensation of God – Christ himself. After referencing John 1.1, Eusebius writes:

> The great Moses, as the oldest of all the prophets, describing by the divine spirit the substantiation and adornment of the universe, teaches that the maker of the world and creator of everything allotted to Christ, and to no other than his divine and first born Word, to make subordinate things and conversed with him at the making of man (1.2.4).[29]

In the second occurrence, Eusebius writes:

> And that there is a substance living and subsisting before the world, who served (ὑπηρετησαμένη) the Father and God of everything in the creation of all generate things, bearing the name the Word of God and wisdom … (1.2.14).

The first statement enables us to begin to see Eusebius' understanding of the Son's pre-existent role in the creation of all things. The second statement enables us to begin to see Eusebius' understanding of the Son's role in creation as a subordinate role. The Word is a servant to God in the act of creation. We will give more discussion to Eusebius' explicit subordinationist Christology later. Now, I provide more examples from *Praeparatio evangelica* and *Demonstratio evangelica* that

---

[28] Though initially hesitant, Eusebius of Caesarea did agree to *homoousios* to the extent that he signed up to the Nicene Creed. As for Athanasius, the great defender of *homoousios*, it was several years after Nicaea before he put *homoousios* at the centre of his argument.

[29] My translations of Eusebius' *Historia ecclesiastica* are made from the Greek text of Eduard Schwartz, *Eusebius kirchengeschichte* (Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1922). For chronological issues surrounding the dating of Eusebius' writings see Barnes, *Constantine and Eusebius*. He provides a succinct "Chronological Table" on pp. 277-279.

demonstrate, with even more clarity, Eusebius' understanding that the Father is too lofty and exalted to touch physicality. Therefore, this role is passed on to the Son.

Eusebius opens book seven of his *Praeparatio evangelica* with a demonstration of the superiority of the ethical standards of the Hebrew people to that of the pleasure-seeking pursuits of the rest of humanity. After a review of the history of the Hebrew people taken from biblical accounts, Eusebius moves forward to specifically discuss their theological beliefs. In section eleven, Eusebius relates that Thales of Miletus thought the first principle of all things to be water, Anaximenes thought it was air, Heracleitus thought fire, Pythagoras thought numbers, Epicurus and Democritus thought material atoms, and Empedocles thought the four elements. The Hebrews, however, say:

> Next to the being of the God of everything which is without beginning and unbegotten (ἀγένητον), pure and beyond all comprehension, they introduce a second being (οὐσίαν) and divine power, the beginning and first of all begotten things (γενητῶν ἁπάντων) and a reality having been begotten (γεγενημένην) from the first cause and they call it word and wisdom and power of God (7.12.2).[30]

Eusebius' conviction that this first cause is too exalted for humanity to withstand its contact is confirmed by a quotation from Philo at the beginning of section thirteen. Eusebius quotes from the first book of Philo's *Questions and Answers on Genesis*:

> Why does he speak as if concerning another God [when he says] "I made man in the image of God," and not to himself? This is uttered with great beauty and wisdom. Because nothing mortal is able to be reflected in relation to the Highest One also [called] the Father of everything, but in relation to the second God, who is his Word.

This same theme of a High God in need of a second God in order to interact with the created order is dominant in Eusebius' *Demonstratio evangelica* 4.6. In this chapter, Eusebius argues that just as the earth can only withstand rays of light from the sun and not the force of the entire sun itself, so was it necessary for the High God to send his Word incarnate in Jesus of Nazareth in order to bring about redemption for humanity. He writes:

---

[30] My translations of Eusebius' *Praeparatio evangelica* are made from the Greek text of Karl Mras, *Eusebius Werke* (Die Griechischen Christlichern Schriftsteller der Ersten Jahrhunderte; vol. 8; Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1954). Translations from *Demonstratio Evangelica* will be made from Ivar A. Heikel, *Eusebius Werke* (Die Griechischen Christlichern Schriftsteller der Ersten Drei Jahrhunderte; vol. 6; Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1913).

> If then, as a hypothetical argument, the all-blazing sun came down from heaven and dwelt with men upon the earth, nothing would remain uncorrupted upon the earth, in sum all things sharing life in common and things not alive would be destroyed at once by the force of the light.

Eusebius then articulates the Son's mediating role:

> Why then do you marvel at similar things concerning God … If then none of the things that are except one alone has a share in fellowship with the ineffable and indescribable power and essence, whom the Father, by his providence over all things, made to subsist before all others so that the nature of the things that had come to be might not fall off completely through their own weakness and poverty, separated from the unbegotten and incomprehensible essence of the Father, but [the created beings] might remain and grow and be nourished enjoying the mediating bounty which the only begotten Word of God never ceases granting to all, …

Statements like the above permeate Eusebius' writings.[31] Eusebius accepts the fundamental theological framework of Justin Martyr (e.g. *Apologia* 1.6, 32, 60; *Apologia* 2.13; *Dialogus cum Tryphone* 127.1-5)[32] and Origen of Alexandria (e.g. *De principiis* 2.4; *Contra Celsum* 7.57, 7.70, 8.6) that emphasizes the mediator role of the Son. Eusebius believes, therefore, that the creation could not have withstood a direct touch from the supreme God. The supreme God generated his Word and Wisdom for the initial purpose of creation and then incarnation. "The conceptual universe of Eusebius is not that of contemporary pagan philosophy, but still that of the Middle Platonists of the second and early third centuries, whom Origen had studied closely."[33]

When we turn our investigation to Athanasius we find a very different understanding of the relationship of the Son and the Father to the created order. In *De decretis* 7, Athanasius attacks the understanding of people like Eusebius of

---

[31] Further examples from Eusebius' *Demonstratio evangelica* as well as Eusebius' *De laudibus Constantini* are highlighted by Robertson, *Christ as Mediator*, 37-70. See also Barnes' translation of *Theophania* 1.4 and following in *Constantine and Eusebius*, 188.

[32] It is worth noting that, while no one questions that Justin assigns a mediatorial role to the Son in revelation and activity in the world, there is a debate as to whether or not Justin assigns a mediatorial role to the Son in creation. There is a concise but informative discussion of this debate in Denis Minns and Paul Parvis, ed., *Justin, Philosopher and Martyr: Apologies* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), 61-65. In contrast with Carl Andresen, Minns and Parvis conclude that Justin does not assign the Son a mediatorial role in the creation of the world. A possible reason for this curious omission in Justin is that Justin is concerned that a mediatorial role in creation for the Son "would provide comfort for gnostic heretics who sought to disparage creation and to deny that it was the work of God" (p.65). For the opposing view see Carl Andresen, *Logos und Nomos. Die Polemik des Kelsos wider das Christentum* (Arbeiten zur Kirchegeschichte 30; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1955), 312ff.

[33] Barnes, *Constantine and Eusebius*, 183.

Caesarea. In this section of Athanasius' defense he is challenging the understanding that his theological opponents have of the term "son." There are in scripture, according to Athanasius, two ways in which his opponents may understand the word "son." The first is the sense in which all believers are sons of God. The second is the biological sense in which, for example, Isaac is the son of Abraham. If pressed, however, Athanasius acknowledges that his opponents might argue for a third understanding. They are likely to say, "Thus we hold the Son to have more in comparison with the other things and because of this to be called the Only Begotten (μονογενῆ), because he alone came to be (γέγονε) by God alone, all other things have been created (ἐκτίσθη) by God through his Son."[34] Athanasius interprets this understanding of the role of the Son as that of a ὑπουργός – "assistant."[35] Athanasius will have none of this. He replies:

> And He is the one who made all things, both small and great, through his own Word, and it is not [proper] to divide the creation so as to say this is from the Father and this is from the Son, but there is one God who uses his own Word as a hand and in him makes all things and God himself demonstrates this when he said, "My hand made all these things" (7.3).

Athanasius' metaphor of the relationship of the Son to the Father as resembling that of the hand to the body is first found in Irenaeus. In Irenaeus the argument is more symmetrical as he will propose both the Son and the Holy Spirit are the hands to God (*Adversus haereses* 4.preface.4, 4.20.1, 5.6.1, 5.28.4).[36]

Later in this section, Athanasius further argues that if the Son is a part of the created order, as he accuses his adversaries of teaching, then this means that the Son too would need a mediator in order to withstand the hand of God. Athanasius has all sorts of problems with the non-Nicene understanding of the Son as holding a mediatory role in creation and thus an explicit pre-incarnate subordination to the

---

[34] I make my translations of *De decretis* from the Greek text found in Hans-Georg Opitz, *Athanasius Werke* (Berlin und Leipzig: Walter De Gruyter & Co., 1934).

[35] John Henry Newman translates this word "undertaker" providing a much more explicit subordinationist image.

[36] Khaled Anatolios says that Irenaeus, in his battle against Gnosticism, "emphasizes the convergence of divine transcendence and immanence in the Christian message of salvation." Anatolios sees a direct link between Irenaeus and Athanasius here. He continues, "Throughout this study, my position is that Athanasius' theological vision is markedly Irenaean in this regard." Anatolios' book argues that the relationship between God and creation in Athanasius is the "intrinsic center of coherence in Athanasius' theology." See Anatolios, *Athanasius: The coherence of his thought*, 4 and 3. Chapter three is of particular relevance to my discussion here: "The relation between God and creation in the anti-Arian writings."

Father. My point here, however, is simply to illustrate the unambiguous divide between the Christological foundations of Athanasius of Alexandria and Eusebius of Caesarea.[37]

This divide continues when we consider the manner in which Athanasius and Eusebius understand the subordinate nature of the Son to the Father. Eusebius, in line with a prominent understanding of major Christian writers of the pre-Nicene era, explicitly subordinates the Son to the Father. Eusebius is able to do this even as he was able to find some sort of an acceptable theological understanding for ὁμοούσιος. Eusebius serves as an example of the pre-Nicene Christological paradox that understands the Son to be both from the Father, and thus in a certain sense sharing equality with him, and at the same time from the Father, and thus subordinate to him.

Even though Eusebius eventually signed up to the Nicene Creed, consistent with a prominent ethos of his day, Eusebius unambiguously subordinates Christ – both the pre-existent and incarnate Christ – to God. In relation to the pre-existent Christ, known in the Old Testament as Word and Wisdom, Eusebius repeatedly refers to him with the adjective "second." When commenting on God's words at creation "Let us make man according to our image and likeness," Eusebius says that they "introduce the Father and Maker as the ruler over all, ordering with kingly command, and the divine Word, being second to him, no other than the one being proclaimed by us, taking orders from the Father" (*Historia ecclesiastica* 1.2.5). Additional examples of this kind of rhetoric can also be found at *Historia ecclesiastica* 1.2.8, 1.2.11, 10.2.10, 10.2.23, and 10.2.24. Of course, these examples will multiply greatly throughout the entire Eusebian corpus.

Before moving on to Athanasius' manner of subordinating the Son to the Father, I want to draw additional attention to interesting passages from Eusebius in *Demonstratio evangelica*. In book four, for example, Eusebius gives us his understanding of the well-worn metaphor that the relationship of the Son to the

---

[37] It is also worth noting another significant difference between Athanasius' and Eusebius' Christology that surfaces in *De decretis* 7. Athanasius does not distinguish between God and God's Word when discussing the theophanies found in the Old Testament. Athanasius writes, "but if He disdained as [too] lowly to make with his own hands the things after the Son, then this is impious. For conceit is not in God, who goes down with Jacob into Egypt, and because of Abraham corrects Abimelek for the sake of Sarah, and speaks to the man Moses mouth to mouth, and descends onto Mount Sinai, and fights, by his secret grace, for the people against Amalek." This is very different from Eusebius, as well as other prominent Christian writers such as Justin Martyr and Origen.

Father is like that of a ray to its light. Later in section three, Eusebius will also employ the popular metaphor of fragrance from a sweet-scented substance. The goal of *Demonstratio evangelica* 4.3 is to argue that because the Father is one, it is only possible that the Father have one son. If the Father has more than one son then the problem of otherness (ἑτερότης) and difference (διαφορά) arise. Eusebius says this cannot be because, "… there is one God of one perfect and only begotten Son but the Father does not have many gods nor many sons." It is here that Eusebius draws upon the light and its ray.

> Since also the substance of light being one, it is of complete necessity that the perfect ray having been begotten (γεννωμένην) from it is to be considered one also. For what other thing is it able to think of as begotten (γέννημα) from light? Is it not the ray alone from it, filling and illumining all things? For everything foreign from this would be darkness and not light. So here to the most exalted Father of all things being unspeakable light, nothing could be like Him or a proper comparison, except this thing only, which it is possible to say also about the Son. For he is the radiance of eternal light, and the pure mirror of the activity of God (4.3.2-3).

What makes this passage so interesting is that Eusebius then offers specific qualifiers to this metaphor that otherwise is much employed by other early Christian writers without explanation.

He says that while the ray cannot be separated from the light, the Son has his existence apart from the Father. Furthermore the ray and the light exist simultaneously (συνυφέστηκεν). In contrast the Father precedes (προϋπάρκει) the Son in existence and the Father alone is unbegotten (ἀγέννητος). Another difference between the relationship of a ray to its light and the Son to the Father is that the ray does not choose to shine forth, yet the Son is in existence due to the deliberate choice of the Father.

Eusebius then moves on to employ another common metaphor – that of the fragrance that comes from a sweet odor. He concludes section three of book four with an admission that all illustrations are limited due to their material nature. The theology Eusebius proposes cannot fully be captured with a human metaphor. For example he says that the Son has an existence separate from the Father. Yet this

separate existence is not due to an interval (διάστασιν) or to a cutting off (τομὴν) or to a division (διαίρεσιν).[38]

Eusebius again presents a paradox in the introduction of book five of *Demonstratio evangelica*. This is a clear presentation of his Christology:

> Since two ways have been declared concerning our savior Jesus Christ in the book before this one of the *Demonstration of the Gospel*, the one supernatural and beyond, according to which we determined him to be the only begotten Son of God, or the substantial (οὐσιώδη) Word of God, the second cause of everything, or an intellectual substance (οὐσίαν), and firstborn excellent nature of God, the divine and active power before generate things or the intellectual image of the unbegotten nature (φύσεως), on the other hand …

In this text we find the pre-incarnate Jesus referred to as the "firstborn excellent nature of God" as well as the second cause of everything. Eusebius articulates these two ideas within the same sentence and without apology. Writing in the theological wake left by predecessors such as Ignatius of Antioch, Justin Martyr, Ireneaus of Lyons, Clement of Alexandria, and Origen of Alexandria, Eusebius understands the pre-incarnate Jesus both to share in the supreme God's divinity and to be secondary to the supreme God.

We need not spend as much time with Athanasius' manner of subordinating the Son to the Father as we did with Eusebius. The reason is that Athanasius' understanding of the manner in which Jesus is subordinated to God is less sophisticated than that of Eusebius. I mean this statement in no derogatory manner. Athanasius' understanding is ingenious even as it is simplistic. Though, of course, Athanasius' manner of dealing with biblical texts that are clearly subordinationist does not originate with him. Athanasius' understanding of Jesus' subordination as limited to the incarnation is also found in Marcellus of Ancyra.[39]

---

[38] Frances Young's observation is correct: "Eusebius eventually signed the new creed, with its *homoousion*, presumably in deference to the emperor's wishes and for the sake of peace in the church; but in his letter to his church, his embarrassment is evident. Does this mean that Eusebius sacrificed principle to political expediency? Such a judgment is probably unfair … If we compare the *Demonstratio* with his later dogmatic treatises, it is clear that the signing of the Nicene Creed made no basic change to his Christology." See Frances M. Young with Andrew Teal, *From Nicaea to Chalcedon* (2nd ed.; Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2010), 20.

[39] For Eusebius of Caesarea's criticism of Marcellus' application of Proverbs 8.22 strictly to Jesus' flesh as well as Marcellus' whole system of applying certain texts only to the incarnate Jesus see *Contra Marcellum* 2.3.9 – 2.3.39. Cited from Erich Klostermann, *Eusebius Werke* (Die Griechischen Christlichern Schriftsteller der Ersten Jahrhunderte; vol. 4; Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1972). Though it is unlikely, it is difficult to know if the understanding of Jesus' subordination to God as limited to his incarnation originated with Marcellus. Sara Parvis writes, "Marcellus managed to think his way

De decretis 14 provides a clear example of Athanasius' handling of Biblical texts that are understood by many early Christians to place the Son in a secondary role to the Father. In this text, Athanasius is demonstrating the erroneous nature of the non-Nicene interpretation of Proverbs 8:22 as it is found in the Septuagint. Athanasius says that the word 'created' (ἔκτισεν) does not place the Son with the other things that were created by God. Rather, the ἔκτισεν of Proverbs 8:22 refers to Jesus' manhood. Thus in Athanasius' thought there is a clear demarcation between the pre-incarnate and the incarnate Christ in relation to Jesus' subordination to God. For Athanasius this is the only way to reconcile the Nicene ὁμοούσιος with texts such as Proverbs 8:22 and the plethora of subordinationist texts from the New Testament gospels. Athanasius writes concerning Proverbs 8:22:

> For it says that he was created but [this means] when he became man, for this [creation] is proper to man … For as it is well fitting to the Son of God to be eternal and to be in the bosom of the Father, thus the phrase, "The Lord created me" befits him when he became man. Under these circumstances then it is said concerning him, and he hungered, and he thirsted, and he asked where Lazarus lay, and he suffered, and he arose. And just as upon hearing him called Lord and God and true light we think of him as being from the Father, so it is right when hearing "he created," and "slave," and "suffered," not to reckon these things to his divinity, for it is unreasonable, but to apply them to the flesh, which he bore for us.

The above quote represents a fundamental theme in Athanasius' writings. It arises again, for example, in *De Sententia Dionysii* 9 as he defends one of his predecessors in the bishopric of Alexandria against charges of Arianism. Furthermore, the theme is central to *Orationes contra Arianos* 3.26-41. It is not difficult to comprehend how, by the time of Augustine, Athanasius' understanding of Jesus' subordination to God would be the unquestioned position of orthodox Christology.[40]

---

out of traditional Logos Christology: no mean feat for a Greek-speaker in the fourth century. We cannot tell how original he was in this, because most of the work of the non-Origenist tradition on which he drew has now vanished, including most of the work of his anti-Origenist colleague Eustathius of Antioch … His main strategy is to take all the Scripture passages Asterius and his friends use to demonstrate two lords, kings and so on, one of whom creates or crowns or appoints the other who causes him to come to be, and apply them to the incarnate Christ." See Sara Parvis, "Christology in the Early Arian Controversy: The Exegetical War," in *Christology and Scripture: Interdisciplinary Perspectives* (ed. Andrew T. Lincoln and Angus Paddison; London and New York:T&T Clark International, 2007), 120-137. The quotations are from p. 129.

[40] For example see *De Trinitate* 7. This is a fascinating text because Augustine places John 14.28 and Philippians 2.6-7 side by side in order to demonstrate the seeming contradiction found in the New Testament that describes the Son as both equal to and subordinate to the Father. Augustine, however, reconciles these apparent contradictions by arguing that in John 14:28 Jesus is understood to be in the

Before moving forward to consider the manner in which Eusebius and Athanasius cite and handle figures from their Christian past, two more observations are called for. First, in summary, Eusebius of Caesarea and Athanasius of Alexandria are agreed that Jesus is not to be classified alongside created things. They can both find a place for ὁμοούσιος in their theology, even as their understandings of ὁμοούσιος are remarkably different. The major difference between the manner in which they understand Jesus' subordination to God is that for Athanasius there is a clear and obvious distinction between the pre-incarnate and the incarnate Christ. For Athanasius then only the incarnate Christ is subordinate to God. For Eusebius, as with many earlier Christian writers, both the pre-incarnate and the incarnate Christ are subordinate to God.

Second, I suggest an error that past scholars have made when trying to classify the Christological understanding of Eusebius of Caesarea is that they too take the fourth-century approach of an either/or solution. Scholars propose that either Eusebius was a Nicene or he was Arian. Thus, the scholarly confusion that exists as illustrated earlier by Barnes, Luibhéid, Lightfoot, and others. Yet, the reality is that components of what became Nicene theology as well as components of what became non-Nicene theology went hand in hand in pre-Nicene Christianity. Thus, it is understandable how Eusebius can find a way to accept ὁμοούσιος and maintain an explicitly subordinate Christology. In addition, we can now see that Eusebius will never fit into a strictly orthodox or Arian system. His Christology simply rejects any such post-Nicene alternatives.[41]

---

form of a servant and in Philippians 2.6-7 Jesus is understood in the form of God. We find similar rhetoric in Gregory of Nazianus as well. See *Third Theological Oration* 17.

[41] What Robertson says about Origen applies as well to Eusebius of Caesarea. He writes, "To the contrary, we hope to demonstrate that Athanasius as well could be considered at least as much an heir to the third-century theologian as those whom he opposed. This is not to say that Origen was 'Nicene' before Nicaea. Such a label would be anachronistic at best and would not sufficiently acknowledge his view of the subordination of the Son to the Father. However, it is worthwhile for us to recognize that, for Origen, subordination does not necessarily represent discontinuity of nature." See Robertson, *Christ as Mediator*, 13. We have already heard Lewis Ayres say something similar when discussing Origen. His statements too can be applied to Eusebius: "Indeed, it is important to note the problematic status of the very term subordinationism. Insofar as it is understood to indicate an intent to present the Son as being inferior to the Father it does not accurately describe the character of many pre-Nicene and early fourth-century theologies. Consider, for example, a third- or fourth-century theologian who spends considerable effort showing how the Son can be said to possess some of the Father's attributes or to image those attributes because of the manner in which the Son is uniquely generated. In such a case describing the theologian's intent as one of subordinationism directs our attention away from the concern to emphasize continuity of being between the two." See Ayres, *Nicaea and its Legacy*, 21. Finally, G.C. Stead writes in relation to Eusebius: "His teaching on the Son's origin is complex and not entirely consistent. He does not, like Origen, uphold his eternal generation, but regards him as

Eusebius and Athanasius and Figures from the Christian Past

After demonstrating fundamental differences between Eusebius of Caesarea's and Athanasius of Alexandria's Christology, we are one step closer to engaging their handling of Ignatius of Antioch. First, however, an important observation is in order concerning the general manner in which these two bishops cite figures from the church's past. Athanasius attempts to reconcile everyone from the past that has not already been condemned by the church of his day with his own point of view. Eusebius is more discerning and thus more likely to offer negative criticisms of aspects of a past Christian writer even as he embraces other aspects of the same writer.

Reconciliation of Past Figures

De sententia Dionysii serves as a specific example of Athanasius' characteristic manner of reconciling the writings of figures from the past, that do not stand already condemned by the church of his day, to his own point of view.

In *De sententia Dionysii*, Athanasius is engaged in the arduous but, from his perspective, essential task of defending one of his predecessors in the Alexandrian see from Arianism.[42] Dionysius was bishop of Alexandria circa 245-265.[43] Thus, he

---

having originated by an act of the Father's will, so that the Father is in existence before the Son …; on the other hand he places the Son's generation 'before the ages', and admits – quite shortly after the passage just quoted – that he was *not* 'at some times non-existent, and originating later, but existing and pre-existing before eternal times' … He constantly emphasizes that the *manner* of the Son's generation surpasses our comprehension …" See G.C. Stead, "'Eusebius' and the Council of Nicaea," *Journal of Theological Studies* 24.1 (1973): 85-100. The quotation is taken from pp. 90-91. My contention is that this perplexity and seeming Christological contradiction was part and parcel of pre-Nicene Christianity.

[42] Archibald Robertson discusses the opinion of Montfaucon that both *De decretis* and *De sententia Dionysii* were written to same person. If this is so, the date of *De sententia Dionysii* would be around 350. Yet, Robertson is not persuaded by this argument and says, "However, slender as such grounds are, the tract furnishes no more decisive indication of date." See Archibald Robertson, introduction to "*De Sententia Dionysii*," in *Athanasius: Select Works and Letters* (ed. Philip Schaff and Henry Wace; Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers 2.4; Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson Publishers, 2004; originally published 1891), 173. Uta Heil dates the *De sententia Dionysii* to 359/360 and views it as a supplement to *De decretis*. See Uta Heil, *Athanasius von Alexandrien: De Sententia Dionysii* (Berlin and New York: Walter De Gruyter, 1999), 22-35. We will see soon that Barnes dates *De sententia Dionysii* to around 350, though he does not indicate if he thinks *De decretis* and *De sententia Dionysii* were addressed to the same person.

[43] For critical Greek texts of the fragments that remain of Dionysius of Alexandria's many writings, as preserved by ancient authors, see Charles Lett Feltoe, *The Letters of Dionysius of Alexandria* (Cambridge Patristic Texts; Cambridge: The University Press, 1904). He provides an English translation of these texts in C. Lett Feltoe, *St. Dionysius of Alexandria* (Translations of Christian Literature; London and New York: The Macmillan Company, 1918). For a more recent introduction to Dionysius of Alexandria as well as a German translation of his works see Wolfgang A. Bienert,

was bishop during the Decian and Valerian persecutions. As a result, he was engaged in the debates that emerged in the wake of these persecutions over the issue of whether or not to readmit the lapsed into the church.[44] Like Ignatius of Antioch, Dionysius of Alexandria is a character that interests both Athanasius and Eusebius. Dionysius is central to books six and seven of Eusebius' *Historia ecclesiastica*. Dionysius is also prominent in Eusebius' *Praeparatio Evangelica* books seven and fourteen. As we shall see, Eusebius is not shy about offering negative critiques concerning past Christian writers even if they had not been condemned by the larger church. In relation to Dionysius, however, he has nothing negative to offer. Thus, we better understand Athanasius' desire to claim Dionysius for his theological camp against the claims that Nicene Christology cannot be supported with the writings of Dionysius of Alexandria.

Dionysius had written statements that Athanasius' Arians referred to in order to claim ancestral support for their Christological convictions. Athanasius freely admits that Dionysius wrote the following:

> that the Son of God is made (ποίημα) and generate (γενητὸν) and not proper by nature, but that he is alien according to his essence (οὐσίαν) from the Father, just as the gardener is in reference to the vine and the shipbuilder to the boat, for also as one that was made he was not before he came to be (καὶ γὰρ ὡς ποίημα ὢν οὐκ ἦν πρὶν γένηται – 4.2-3).[45]

As is characteristic of Athanasius' argumentative style in general, his response to the Arian appropriation of this writing from Dionysius of Alexandria is simplistic yet also cogent. Athanasius argues that Dionysius used language like this because Dionysius was combating Sabellianism in the regions above Libya. The words quoted above are found in Dionysius' letters to Euphranor and Ammonius.[46] We gain

---

Dionysius von Alexandrien: Das erhaltene Werk (Bibliothek Der Griechischen Literatur; Stuttgart: Anton Hiersemann, 1972).

[44] Dionysius was also much involved with the debate over the author of Revelation. See Eusebius' *Historia ecclesiastica* 7.24-25. According to Eusebius, Dionysius discusses this issue in the second book of his *On Promises*. Dionysius concludes that Revelation is a book inspired by God but that it was written by a John different from the apostle John, who was the son of Zebedee and brother of James. It was the apostle John then who wrote the Gospel of John as well as the epistle, 1 John. However, a different John penned Revelation.

[45] My translations of *De sententia Dionysii* are taken from the Greek text found in Opitz, *Athanasius Werke*, volume 2.

[46] Athanasius presents this as one letter to two people. Eusebius' words affirm Athanasius' portrayal because he mentions a single letter from Dionysius to Ammonius and then he references another letter to Euphranor and Ammonius. According to Eusebius, however, this second letter was also addressed

insight into Athanasius' perception concerning the severity of this heresy in these regions, during Dionysius' lifetime, when Athanasius says that "the Son of God was hardly preached any longer in the churches" (5.1). In addition to excusing Dionysius' strong Arian-like statements due to his effort to combat Sabellianism, Athanasius says that Dionysius' orthodoxy must be judged on everything that he wrote and not on simply a few words divorced from all else that he said. Creatively playing on Dionysius' analogy of a shipbuilder, Athanasius writes, "for also the art of the shipbuilder who has constructed many gallies with three rows of oars is not judged from one but from all of them" (4.3-4).

From here Athanasius builds on his argument from Dionysius' defense of himself to his namesake in Rome. Dionysius' strong language had created such a controversy that he was complained about to the Roman bishop (see section 13). In response to this complaint, Dionysius addressed a *Refutation and Defense* (ἔλεγχος καὶ ἀπολογία) to Dionysius bishop of Rome. According to Athanasius, Dionysius of Alexandria presented himself as perfectly orthodox in this work. Athanasius quotes at length from this work in his *De sententia Dionysii*.[47] Thus, Dionysius' controversial words about the Son are to be understood strictly in relation to his desire to defeat Sabellianism.

Other critics have not been as convinced of Dionysius of Alexandria's orthodoxy as Athanasius. For example, Barnes says:

> Direct quotations from Dionysius' *Refutation and Defense*, however, which must be accepted as authentic, establish his profound indebtedness to Origen: Dionysius refused to use the word *homoousios*, since he believed that the three persons of the Trinity had three substances, and though he denied that the Son was created, he justified his use of the word "maker" in describing the relationship of the Father to the Word. It was not implausible, therefore,

---

to Euporus. Eusebius also agrees with Athanasius that the purpose of this letter was to combat Sabellius. See Eusebius, *Historia ecclesiastica*, 7.26.1.

[47] Athanasius also includes a selection from a letter from Dionysius of Rome in which he condemns Sabellianism in *De decretis* 26. Feltoe suggests that this could be from the letter written by Dionysius of Rome to the church of Alexandria with the goal of suggesting an adequate manner of correcting Sabellian doctrines. This was needed after the complaints about Dionysius of Alexandria's attempt at combating Sabellianism in his letter to Euphranor and Ammonius. In addition to this letter to the Alexandrian church, Dionysius of Rome also sent a private letter to Dionysius of Alexandria seeking an explanation from him (*De sentential Dionysii* 13). It was this letter that in turn inspired Dionysius of Alexandria's *Refutation and Defense*. See Feltoe, *The Letters of Dionysius of Alexandria*, 168.

> that the Arians of the fourth century should claim Dionysius as one who shared their fundamental views.[48]

Though Barnes thinks Athanasius' quotations of Dionysius' *Refutation and Defense* are authentic, Uta Heil argues that an unknown author composed the *Refutation and Defense* and credited it to Dionysius with the purpose of defending Eusebius of Nicomedia against charges of Arianism. In addition, Heil suggests that someone later inserted the word ὁμοούσιος. According to Heil, this person could have been Athanasius.[49]

There are indeed problems with Athanasius' arguments for Dionysius as representative of pre-Nicene Nicene theology. One problem is that Athanasius' contention that Dionysius' manner of emphasizing the human characteristics of Jesus is parallel to the apostle's own words cannot stand up in the face of even mild scrutiny. Athanasius says:

> In truth then in the letters of the defense he speaks freely in the faith and in piety towards Christ when he says such things. Therefore just as the apostles are not to be accused because of human words concerning the Lord (for the Lord also became man), but are all the more worthy of marvel for their prudent handling of affairs and teaching in due season, thus Dionysius is not an Arian because of the letter to Euphranor and Ammonius against Sabellius (9.2).

Athanasius is correct that the apostles speak to the human nature of Christ. And it is certain that Dionysius quoted some of those passages straight from the New Testament gospels. However, the problem is that the apostles nowhere speak of Christ with the coarseness of language that Dionysius does in his letter to Euphranor

---

[48] Barnes, *Constantine and Eusebius*, 197-198. Barnes can say that Dionysius (assuming as Barnes does that Dionysius wrote this) "refused to use the word *homoousios*" because in a quotation from the *Refutation and Defense,* preserved by Athanasius, Dionysius acknowledges that he did not use the term because it is not found in scripture. In the passage from *Refutation and Defense*, Dionysius goes on to say that though he did not use *homoousios* because it is not found in scripture, he did use analogies that do not deny the meaning of *homoousios*. The analogies he employs are human birth, a plant from a seed, and a stream from a well. Furthermore, Dionysius says that he does not have access to the actual letter he wrote or a copy if it. Therefore, he is relying on his memory as to what he actually wrote. See Athanasius, *De sententia Dionysii*, 18.

[49] Heil, *Athanasius von Alexandrien: De Sententia Dionysii*, 70-71. Her argument is of a similar nature to that of Luise Abramowski. Abramowski contends that the quotations from Dionysius of Alexandria and Dionysius of Rome, found in the writings of Athanasius, were written sometime in the mid fourth-century by someone trying to make peace between Marcellus of Ancyra and Eusebius of Caesarea. See Luise Abramowski, "Dionys von Rom (268) und Dionys von Alexandrien (264/5) in der arianischen Streitigkeiten des 4 Jahrhunderts," *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte* 93 (1982): 240-272. Abramowski's opinion, however, has not been greeted with significant agreement. For a list of the few scholars who agree and the many who disagree with Abramowski see Khaled Anatolios, *Athanasius*, 244-245 footnote 37.

and Ammonius. The apostles did not, for example, say that the Son is foreign in essence from the Father. In other words, Athanasius gives the impression that he is comparing oranges to oranges when this clearly is not the case.[50]

Another major problem with Athanasius' defense of Dionysius of Alexandria against charges of an Arian-like Christology is that he explicitly imposes a fourth-century interpretative grid onto Dionysius' writings in order to make Dionysius orthodox. Athanasius provides this explanation to Dionysius' controversial words concerning the Son being of a different essence than the Father and, apparently, Dionysius' emphasis on subordinationist texts from the New Testament:

> For even if he used humble words and examples, yet these things too are from the gospels, and he has a reason for these things the coming of the Savior in the flesh (ἔνσαρκον), on account of which these and other such things are written. (9.2)

We have already observed Athanasius' understanding of the subordination of Jesus to God. Athanasius limits Jesus' subordination to the incarnation. Here we find him relying on this understanding, also found in Marcellus of Ancyra, in order to save one of his prominent predecessors from heresy. Athanasius imposes his fourth-century understanding on Dionysius' Arian-friendly writings repeatedly throughout this work (e.g. 9.3-4, 10.2-5, 20.2, 26.3). In the most recent quote, for example, Athanasius implies that the restriction of Jesus' subordinate status to the flesh is Dionysius' own understanding. Yet, there is nothing in the writings of Dionysius to suggest this. Barnes is on track when he says in a rather veiled manner about Dionysius' *Refutation and Defense*: "The work, unfortunately, is known mainly from a pamphlet written about 350 to prove Dionysius orthodox in fourth-century terms, which *perhaps* adds anachronistic coloring to the third-century controversy."[51] Archibald Robertson, however, is more precise. He says, "The defence of Athanasius, that Dionysius referred to the Human Nature of Christ, is scarcely

---

[50] There are two possibilities in relation to the contrast between the earlier Arian-like language of Dionysius of Alexandria and what he later wrote in his *Refutation and Defense* (if indeed he wrote it). 1) Dionysius' Christology was representative of a mainline pre-Nicene Christology that upheld the ambiguity of the Son's closeness in relation to the Father as well as the Son's distinction from the Father. If this is the case then we can see, as we will with Ignatius of Antioch, how both Nicene and non-Nicene representatives were drawn to Dionysius in order to defend their own understanding. 2) It is also possible that, under pressure from the Roman bishop and others, Dionysius simply changed his course and wrote in the opposite Christological direction.

[51] Ibid., 197. I say "veiled" because Barnes does not mention Athanasius as the author of this pamphlet. Italics mine.

tenable. It is not supported by what Dionysius himself says, rather the contrary: and if his language did not refer to the Trinity, where would be its relevancy against Sabellianism?"[52]

The goal of this discussion so far is to demonstrate the manner in which Athanasius goes about reconciling figures from the Christian past who have not been condemned by the fourth-century church to his own theological agenda. We have seen, on the one hand, that his manner of accomplishing this task is simplistic. Indeed, as Frances Young observes, "Athanasius had a tendency to see things in black and white; you were either for him or against him."[53] On the other hand, we have also seen that Athanasius' argument ultimately fails in the face of scrutiny. The results of our investigation find agreement once again with the conclusions of Young. After a discussion of Athanasius' *Festal Letters*, she says, "His letters are full of scriptural quotations, traditional typology and simple piety, consistent with the lack of philosophical subtlety and the forceful argument which are hallmarks of his writing."[54] The above demonstration will serve us well when we come to Athanasius' handling of Ignatius of Antioch.

We now turn our attention to Eusebius of Caesarea's handling of Christian figures from the past. The main point to demonstrate is that, in contrast with Athanasius, Eusebius is more discerning. In other words, Eusebius will characteristically censor qualities in an ancient writer and laud other qualities in the same writer. Athanasius is less likely to do this.[55] Eusebius is characteristically less rigid than Athanasius.

Eusebius mentions Papias, the bishop of Hierapolis, once in book two of his *Historia ecclesiastica* (2.15.2) and on two different occasions in book three (3.36.2, 3.39). In book two, Eusebius draws on Papias for information about the circumstances surrounding the writing of Mark's gospel. Eusebius states that Papias confirms information found in Clement's *Hypotyposes* which states that Mark

---

[52] Archibald Robertson, introduction to "*De Sententia Dionysii*," 174.

[53] Young, *From Nicaea to Chalcedon*, 69.

[54] Ibid., 70.

[55] I say Athanasius is "much less likely" because there are times when he does show shades of gray when evaluating past writers. Examples include Athanasius' treatment of Origen in *De decretis* 27.1 and his treatment of Eusebius of Caesarea's decision to sign the Nicene Creed. On the whole, as we shall see momentarily, Eusebius more characteristically offers both condemnation and praise of past Christian writers.

recorded Peter's teaching in his gospel. Furthermore, Eusebius says that Papias adds that Peter mentions Mark in his first epistle and that Peter composed this epistle in Rome, as the metaphorical use of "Babylon" indicates. In the second reference, from book three, the focus of the section is on Ignatius. We will return to this section again when discussing Eusebius and Ignatius. For now, I simply observe that Eusebius makes brief mention of Papias in the same breath with Polycarp, Ignatius and Peter. He writes:

> Polycarp, a hearer of the apostles, was truly distinguished among those in Asia, having been entrusted as bishop of the church in Smyrna by eyewitnesses and ministers of the Lord. At that time Papias was recognized, himself a bishop too, of the church in Hierapolis, and also Ignatius, still now acclaimed by many, having been chosen bishop, second from Peter in succession to the church in Antioch (3.36.1-2).

Eusebius draws on Papias as a source of accurate information about Mark's gospel and then he allows Papias to rest comfortably in the company of Polycarp, Ignatius, and Peter. So far so good – when we come to Eusebius' last mention of Papias, however, things will change.

Eusebius concludes book three with another engagement with Papias (3.39). Having discussed the writings of Clement, Ignatius, and Polycarp, Eusebius now discusses in detail the five books (συγγράμματα) of Papias contained in his work *Interpretation of the Oracles of the Lord*. Eusebius states that these five treatises are also mentioned by Irenaeus. Irenaeus, however, is mistaken when he refers to Papias as a "hearer of John" who was "a companion of Polycarp" (ταῦτα δὲ καί Παπίας ὁ Ἰωάννου μὲν ἀκουστής, Πολυκάρπου δὲ ἑταῖρος γεγονώς – 3.39.1). Irenaeus is mistaken because Papias himself, in the preface to his writings, says that he did not personally know the disciples of Jesus. Rather, Papias received his information from those who had known the apostles such as Aristion and the presbyter John. Eusebius continues his discussion with other information found in Papias' *Interpretation of the Oracles of the Lord* such as an account of a resurrection from the dead in Philip's time as well as the miracle of Justus Barsabas drinking poison and surviving.

Eusebius, however, was not pleased with everything he read in Papias' writings. He says that Papias records "some strange parables of the Savior and his teachings and some mythical accounts" (3.39.11). Among these strange teachings is one concerning the millennium reign of Christ. I quote Eusebius' description of this teaching in full because this is where he directs harsh words at Papias, who earlier

was reckoned to be worthy of great distinction along with three martyrs – Ignatius, Polycarp, and Peter.

> In which also he says that there will be a certain thousand-year period after the resurrection from the dead, when the kingdom of Christ will be set up bodily upon this earth. I suppose he took up these interpretations having misunderstood the apostolic accounts, not comprehending the things that were said by them mystically and with symbols. For he appears to have had a very small intellect, as it is possible to conclude from the things he said, apart from the fact that he was also responsible for so many of those after him who belonged to the church being of the same opinion with him, alleging the antiquity of the man, such as Irenaeus and any other who appeared to think similar things. (3.39.12-13).

Eusebius first relies on Papias for accurate information concerning the composition of Mark's gospel. He then refers to Papias as distinguished along with Polycarp and Ignatius. Here, however, Eusebius' language is so strong that he appears to turn on Papias. Papias is a man of "very small intellect," who misunderstands the book of Revelation.[56]

We find here a distinct contrast with Athanasius' handling of Dionysius of Alexandria. Athanasius is not willing to acknowledge some error in Dionysius along with some good. For Athanasius it is all or nothing. Eusebius, on the other hand, can refer to Papias as "distinguished" and "recognized" as well as of "very small intellect."[57]

Eusebius' willingness to pick and choose from ancient authors is not a one time occurrence in relation to Papias. He does this as well with Tatian.

---

[56] For an example of the scholarly interests and debates surrounding Papias see A.C. Perumalil, "Are not Papias and Irenaeus Competent to Report on the Gospels?," *The Expository Times* 91.11 (1980): 332-337. Perumalil concludes that when Irenaeus says that Papias had been a follower of John, Irenaeus does not mean the apostle John but the presbyter John who can be identified as one of the seventy-two sent out by Jesus (Luke 10.1). On p. 333, Perumalil says that Eusebius did not accuse Irenaeus of confusion. His article leaves unclear, however, what Eusebius did do in relation to Irenaeus' statement. Perhaps, Perumalil is of the opinion that Eusebius simply gets it wrong. On the other hand, Perumalil is clear that he thinks Eusebius is mistaken when Eusebius refers to Papias as a man of "little intelligence." Perumalil understands Eusebius words here as "a moment of irritation" because Papias had never read Origen on Christ's millennium rule. The quotation is from p. 335.

[57] It is also worth observing that in addition to finding fault with Papias and still embracing some of what Papias contributed to the church, Eusebius also finds fault with the great heresy hunter himself – Irenaeus. First Irenaeus wrongly identifies Papias as "a hearer of John." Then Irenaeus misunderstands Christ's thousand-year reign. Of course, ultimately, Eusebius blames Papias for Irenaeus' mishandling of the teaching concerning Christ's thousand-year reign.

Eusebius first mentions Tatian as a means of confirming that Justin's martyrdom had been brought about by Crescens (*Historia ecclesiastica* 4.16.7-9). At the end of book four, Eusebius again discusses Tatian. He credits Tatian with the invention of the Encratite heresy. As evidence for this, Eusebius quotes from Irenaeus' *Adversus haereses* 1.28.1. Irenaeus indicates that Tatian was perfectly orthodox until the death of his teacher Justin. After Justin's death, Tatian went astray and composed his own beliefs whereby he embraced Gnostic notions, rejected marriage, and denied Adam's salvation. Eusebius accepts all of this and then says:

> But he has left behind a great number of writings, of which his celebrated book *To the Greeks* is especially remembered by many, in which he also mentioned ancient times, and he has shown that Moses and the Hebrew prophets were older than all the approved men among the Greeks. It appears then that of all of his books this one is the best and most useful (4.29.7).

Even though Eusebius approves of Irenaeus' appraisal of Tatian, he nonetheless does not write Tatian off all together nor does he attempt to defend Tatian in order to acknowledge the value of *To the Greeks*. Rather, Eusebius demonstrates a consistent pattern when he both admits Tatian to be a heretic and approves some of what he did. Furthermore, it is also significant that Eusebius does not seem to need the qualification of Tatian as orthodox before Justin's death and then heretical after Justin's death. Eusebius does not tell us when he thinks Tatian composed *To the Greeks*. A strong case, however, for a date well after Justin's death has been made in modern scholarship.[58] Thus it is possible that, according to Eusebius, the greatest of all of Tatian's works was written after he had fallen into heresy.[59]

---

[58] Robert Grant is convinced that *To the Greeks* was written after Tatian had entered into heresy. He says, "It may be said at once that the *Oration* was not written while Tatian was still Justin's disciple. Clear chronological notices make plain the fact that it was written after the year 176." See Robert M. Grant, "The Heresy of Tatian," *Journal of Theological Studies* 5 (1954):62-68. The quotation is from p. 63. While Grant finds *To the Greeks* to contain much evidence of heresy that would naturally accompany the date he assigns to the work, in a lengthy article Gerald Hawthorne says about the date of *To the Greeks*, "The only certain statement that can be made is that it was composed sometime during the second half of the second century." He then gives the opinion of Adolf Harnack that the work is to be dated to 155 and the opinion of A. Puech that the work is to be dated to 172. Hawthorne refers to Grant's argument about the date as "convincing." Yet, Hawthorne never suggests a specific date and goes on to write, "Taking all these things into consideration, one should be more tolerant and sympathetic with Tatian, and study him less as a heretic and more as one who made a great contribution to the Church – especially to the Eastern Church." See Gerald F. Hawthorne, "Tatian and His Discourse to the Greeks," *The Harvard Theological Review* 57 (1964):161-188. Quotations are from pp. 162 and 166-167.

[59] I must bring this part of my discussion to an end. It is worth noting, however, that in the brief concluding chapter of book four, Eusebius provides yet another example of his willingness to accept the good in the heretic. In this case, the subject is Bardesanes. Though he was not completely cleansed of the Valentinian heresy, Eusebius praises his work *Concerning Fate* (4.30). Thus, I have drawn

Ignatius of Antioch in Eusebius of Caesarea

The first place to begin in this discussion of Ignatius of Antioch in the writings of Eusebius of Caesarea is simply to list and to describe the places where Eusebius mentions Ignatius. After this, I will reveal the differences between Eusebius' text of the Ignatian letters and that of the Greek Medicean and Colbertine manuscripts.[60] Finally, I will propose significant conclusions that can be reached based on the previous discussion of Eusebius' Christology and his manner of quoting Christian writers from his past coupled with his direct quotations from Ignatius of Antioch.

There are many complex issues surrounding Eusebius' *Chronicon*.[61] In relation to Ignatius, however, the issues are not so complex because Eusebius makes infrequent mention of Ignatius in his *Chronicon*. Eusebius states that Ignatius was the second bishop of Antioch (2). Furthermore, he places Ignatius' martyrdom in the ninth or tenth year of the reign of Trajan (2).[62]

Ignatius has a more prominent place in Eusebius' *Historia ecclesiastica*. Eusebius first mentions Ignatius in *Historia ecclesiastica* 3.22. Here again Eusebius states that Ignatius was the second bishop of Antioch during the reign of the emperor Trajan. Eusebius identifies Evodius as the first bishop of Antioch. Interestingly,

---

attention to four examples where Eusebius censors a past Christian and also praises that same person: Papias, Irenaeus, Tatian, and Bardesanes.

[60] It is to be remembered that the middle recension of *Romans* has a different textual history from the other six middle recension letters. *Romans* is not found in the Medicean manuscript. Rather it is found embedded in the Antiochene version of the martyrdom account of Ignatius found in the Colbertine manuscript. In addition to the Colbertine there are two additional Greek manuscripts that contain the Antiochene martyrdom and thus the Roman letter in its middle form. Lightfoot, however, says "Unfortunately these MSS, like *Paris*. 1451, are comparatively late and belong to the same family; but it is a distinct gain to have a threefold cord of evidence for the Greek text, which has hitherto hung on a single thread." See Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, 2.2.589.

[61] For a discussion of these complex issues see Barnes, *Constantine and Eusebius*, 111-120. See also Alden A. Mosshammer, *The "Chronicle" of Eusebius and the Greek Chronographic Tradition* (Lewisburg, Pa. and London: Bucknell University Press, 1979). For a treatment of Jerome's Latin version of the canons see J.N.D. Kelly, *Jerome: His Life, Writings and Controversies* (Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson Publishers, 1998; originally published 1975), 72 ff.

[62] For issues surrounding the date of Ignatius' martyrdom and Eusebius' *Chronicon* see the thorough discussion in Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, 2.2.435-475. Lightfoot's discussion significantly prefigures the current debate, discussed briefly in the introduction, in Ignatian scholarship surrounding the date of Ignatius' death and continues to have relevance to that debate. Lightfoot argues that in the *Chronicon* and *Historia ecclesiastica* Eusebius does not present a specific year in which Ignatius died. Rather, he presents an approximate year.

Eusebius adds to the information found in the *Chronicon* that Ignatius was well known during his time as bishop of Antioch (ἐγνωρίζετο).

Ignatius' next appearance in the *Historia ecclesiastica* also marks his most prominent appearance. After a lengthy diversion into topics such as the tradition concerning the long duration of John the apostle's life (*Historia ecclesiastica* 3.23) and the origins of the New Testament gospels (*Historia ecclesiastica* 3.24) as well as other New Testament documents (*Historia ecclesiastica* 3.25), Eusebius resumes his discussion of the events that transpired during the time of the emperor Trajan.

In *Historia ecclesiastica* 3.36, Eusebius turns his attention once again to Ignatius. After mentioning Polycarp and Papias, Eusebius repeats the earlier statements about Ignatius. We are told that Ignatius was the second bishop of Antioch but this time Eusebius adds "the second after Peter." In *Historia ecclesiastica* 3.22 Eusebius identified Ignatius as "well known" during his own lifetime. Here Ignatius is said to be well known also in Eusebius' time (ὅ τε παρὰ πλείστοις εἰς ἔτι νῦν διαβόητος Ἰγνάτιος).[63]

Eusebius proceeds to give an account of Ignatius' journey from Syria to Rome in order to be martyred. He says that as Ignatius was en route he offered encouragement to each of the churches in the places where he stayed. It becomes clear that Eusebius is not only interested in Ignatius as a martyr, but also as a heresiologist. One manner of encouragement offered by Ignatius was that Ignatius exhorted the churches he interacted with to guard themselves against false teachings (αἱρέσεις) and to remain loyal to the apostle's teachings (ἀπρὶξ ἔχεσθαι τῆς τῶν ἀποστόλων παραδόσεως). I say that it is clear that Eusebius is interested in Ignatius not only as a martyr but also as a heresiologist because the heresies that had begun to arise during Trajan's reign are a focal point of discussion preceding Eusebius' lengthy treatment of Ignatius in *Historia ecclesiastica* 3.36 (see 3.26-3.30).

Eusebius lists the letters that Ignatius wrote from Smyra (*Eph.*, *Magn.*, *Trall.*, and *Rom.*). Eusebius finds the Roman letter impressive enough to quote all of *Romans* 5. After identifying the letters written by Ignatius from Smyrna, Eusebius

[63] Again, the assertion by James D. Smith III that Ignatius had become an obscure figure until the last twenty years or so of the fourth century simply is not supported by the evidence.

then names the letters Ignatius wrote from Troas (*Phld.*, *Smyrn.*, and *Pol.*). From this selection of letters, Eusebius quotes from *Smyrnaeans* 3.[64]

Eusebius concludes this discussion of Ignatius of Antioch with additional testimony to Ignatius' life and martyrdom. He quotes references to Ignatius from Irenaeus' *Adversus haereses* 5.28.4 and Polycarp's letter to the Philippians (ch. 9 and 13). Finally, Eusebius states that Hero was the successor in Antioch to Ignatius.

Ignatius' name resurfaces in *Historia ecclesiastica* 3.38 and 3.39. In these two places Eusebius simply refers back to his lengthy discussion in *Historia ecclesiastica* 3.36.

The final mention of Ignatius in Eusebius' *Historia ecclesiastica* is not as detailed as we encountered with *Historia ecclesiastica* 3.36 but it is as significant. In *Historia ecclesiastica* 5.8, Eusebius recalls a promise he made at the beginning of his history to deliver traditions, found in the earliest Christian writers, concerning the canonical Scriptures (ἐνδιαθήκων γραφῶν). Thus, in a similar fashion to *Historia ecclesiastica* 3.23-3.25, he provides information containing traditions surrounding the composition of New Testament books. The difference is that in 3.36 he quotes exclusively from Irenaeus. In 3.23-3.25, Eusebius mentions Irenaeus briefly as a reliable testimony to the long duration of John the apostle's life. He also records the story from Clement of Alexandria's *Quis dives salvetur* concerning the prodigal

---

[64] In the past heated debates concerning the quest for the historical Ignatius, much discussion centred around the reality that Eusebius only lists seven letters and not the additional forgeries linked to the Ignatian long recension. Furthermore the quotations from Ignatius in *Historia ecclesiastica* 3.22 differ from the text found in the long recension. Lightfoot says in relation to the long recension, "Yet the very suspicious character of the epistles caused uneasiness to the critical spirit. The divergence of the text from the quotations in early Christian writers, such as Eusebius and Theodoret, were in some instances so great that in Ussher's language (p.xvii) it was difficult for one to imagine 'eundem legere se Ignatium qui veterum aetate legebatur.' It appeared clear moreover that Eusebius was only acquainted with seven epistles, and that none besides the seven mentioned by him were quoted for many generations after his time." See Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, 2.1.237-238. These arguments are now widely accepted and so often repeated that I need say no more. It is worth noting, however, one response to these arguments put forth initially by James Ussher and then developed and cemented by J.B. Lightfoot. William Whiston, in his defence of the authenticity of the Ignatian long recension of the Eusebian seven letters as well as *Tarsians*, *Antiochenes*, and *Hero*, concedes that the absence of these three Ignatian letters in Eusebius and Jerome "makes it not reasonable to pretend to the same Degree of Evidence for those Three, that we have for the other Seven." Nonetheless, "since there is Reason to believe, that *Ignatius* did write more Epistles than those Seven commonly ascribed to him; since the Stile, Genius, Doctrines, and Nature of these Three, are so very much the same with those of the other Seven; since the Notes of Chronology, with the Ancient Quotations and References agree to them, as well as to the other; since *Eusebius's* Silence only shews, that he had met with no other than those Seven which *Polycarp* collected, and sent to *Philippi* … : We have no sufficient Reason to reject these Epistles." See William Whiston, *Primitive Christianity Reviv'd* (5 vols.; London: Booksellers of London and Westminster, 1711 – 1712), 1.2-3.

young man the apostle John had singled out for service to the church. In this earlier section, however, Eusebius cites traditions about the New Testament writings without a reference to where he found these traditions.

In *Historia ecclesiastica* 5.8, Eusebius records the words of Irenaeus found in *Adversus haereses* 3.1.1, 5.30.1, 5.30.3. These quotations concern the New Testament gospels and Revelation. Eusebius also refers to *Adversus haereses* 3.16.5 where Irenaeus quotes I John and *Adversus haereses* 4.9.2; 5.7.2; 4.16.5 where Irenaeus quotes from 1 Peter. The plot thickens as Eusebius next acknowledges quotations in *Adversus haereses* from the *Shepherd of Hermas* and the *Wisdom of Solomon*. These references are found in *Adversus haereses* 4.20.2 and 4.38.3 respectively. Before including Ignatius in this group of early Christian writers quoted by Irenaeus, Eusebius refers to Irenaeus' use of a quotation from a certain unnamed "apostolic presbyter" (ἀποστολικοῦ τινος πρεσβυτέρου). This is a reference to *Adversus haereses* 4.27.1. Finally Eusebius writes, "Moreover he made mention of Justin Martyr and Ignatius, having again used in this manner quotations (μαρτυρίαις) from their writings, and he promised to speak against Marcion through his own works [Marcion's works] in his own work [Irenaeus' work]" (5.8.9).

Eusebius' last mention of Ignatius in his *Historia ecclesiastica* raises numerous worthy questions that go beyond the scope of this study. For example, did Eusebius know of more than one reference to Ignatius in the writings of Irenaeus?[65]

The final place where Eusebius of Caesarea mentions Ignatius of Antioch is found in his *Questions and Answers on the Genealogy of our Savior Addressed to Stephanus*.[66] Here Eusebius repeats the information found earlier that Ignatius was the second bishop of Antioch after the apostles. In addition, however, Eusebius also quotes directly from *Ephesians* 19.1. I will return to this quotation shortly.

Eusebius of Caesarea's Text of the Ignatian Letters and the Middle Recension

After listing all the places where Eusebius mentions Ignatius of Antioch it is now imperative to revisit those places where Eusebius quotes directly from his

---

[65] In addition to the well-known quotation from *Romans* 4 found in *Adversus haereses* 5.28.4, Lightfoot offers a twelve line paragraph filled with allusions to Ignatius' writings in *Adversus haereses*. Perhaps Eusebius picked up on these allusions as well. See Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, 2.1.143.

[66] For a helpful discussion of *Questions and Answers on the Genealogy of our Savior Addressed to Stephanus* see Barnes, *Constantine and Eusebius*, 122-124.

Ignatian manuscript and give the variants between Eusebius' Ignatian text and the text of the Greek middle recension known to scholars today. This listing will provide significant evidence that 1) Eusebius does quote Ignatius' writings from a manuscript he has at hand and not from his own memory and 2) Eusebius' text is considerably different from that found in the Medicean and Colbertine manuscripts.

Eusebius quotes from Ignatius' writings directly on four occasions. Eusebius quotes all of *Romans* 5 in *Historia ecclesiastica* 3.36. He quotes *Smyrnaeans* 3.1 in *Historia ecclesiastica* 3.36. In addition, Eusebius quotes Irenaeus' *Adversus haereses* 5.28.4 in *Historia ecclesiastica* 3.36. This quotation of Irenaeus contains an Ignatian quotation from *Romans* 4.1. The fourth direct quotation comes from *Questions and Answers on the Genealogy of our Savior Addressed to Stephanus*. Here Eusebius quotes *Ephesians* 19.1. From these four places where Eusebius directly quotes Ignatian letters, there are twenty-two divergences from the Greek Medicean (for six of the seven Ignatian middle recension letters) and the Colbertine (for the middle recension of *Romans*) manuscripts. Fifteen differences are found in Eusebius' quotation of *Romans* 5. There are two differences in the Eusebian version of *Smyrneans* 3.1. Two differences are found in the quotation of *Romans* 4.1 that Eusebius gives from Irenaeus' *Adversus haereses* 5.28.4. Finally there are three divergences between the Medicean manuscript and Eusebius' quotation of *Ephesians* 19.1 found in *Questions and Answers on the Genealogy of our Savior Addressed to Stephanus*.

In *Romans* 5.1 the Greek Colbertine manuscript contains the word δεδεμένος – a perfect passive participle meaning "to be bound." Eusebius' quotation of this text, in agreement with the Greek long recension, contains the word ἐνδεδεμένος. In the same sentence, the Colbertine manuscript contains the word χείρους, which is found in the phrase οἳ καὶ εὐεργετούμενοι χείρους γίνονται – "and they become worse when shown kindness." The manuscript Eusebius works from has a different spelling for the nominative plural form. In place of the contracted form χείρους, Eusebius has the fuller χείρονες.

Moving on to *Romans* 5.2, Ignatius speaks of his desire for the wild beasts that await him in the Roman arena. The Colbertine manuscript contains the reading ἡτοιμασμένων – "having been prepared." Eusebius has the word ἑτοίμων. His text employs the adjective instead of the perfect passive participle. In the second part of the same sentence, Eusebius' text contains the relative ἃ and the Colbertine

manuscript does not. There is yet another difference in this one sentence. Eusebius, as well as the Greek long recension, contain the word σύντομά - "prompt." The Greek of the middle recension has ἕτοιμα – "prepared." Notice that we have here a second occasion where the Ignatian text of Eusebius agrees with that of the Greek long recension. The last sentence of *Romans* 5.2 provides us with a sixth difference between the Greek middle recension and that of the Ignatian text Eusebius has access to. The Greek middle recension reads, κἂν αὐτὰ δὲ ἄκοντα μὴ θελήσῃ - "and if they, being unwilling, should not wish to ..." Eusebius' text reads, ... ἄκοντα μὴ θέλῃ. Eusebius' text contains the present active subjunctive θέλῃ in place of the first aorist active subjunctive θελήσῃ.

In *Romans* 5.3 there are nine differences between Eusebius of Caesarea's Ignatian text and that of the Colbertine manuscript. The Greek Colbertine manuscript contains the sentence μηθέν με ζηλώση τῶν ὁρατῶν καὶ ἀοράτων, ἵνα Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐπιτύχω – "May nothing of things visible and invisible envy me, in order that I may attain Jesus Christ." Eusebius' text diverges twice from this text. Eusebius has μηδέν for μηθέν and the first aorist optative ζηλώσαι for the first aorist active subjunctive ζηλώσῃ. The last sentence of *Romans* 5.3 is a lengthy sentence where Ignatius asks for the tortures that accompany an encounter with the wild beasts in the arena to be cast upon him. In this sentence the Greek of the Colbertine manuscript contains the two words ἀνατομαὶ and διαιρέσεις – "cutting up" and "divisions." Eusebius omits these words altogether. Furthermore, the Colbertine manuscript has the reading ὠστέων – "bones." Eusebius writes ὀστέων. The word that procedes ὠστέων in the Colbertine manuscript is συγκοπή - "cutting into small pieces." Eusebius, however, uses the plural form – συγκοπαὶ. The next word in the Colbertine manuscript is μελλῶν – "limbs." Eusebius spells this word with one lambda – μελῶν. Once again there is a difference in spelling in relation to the next word. The Greek of the middle recension reads ἀλησμοί - "crushings." Eusebius spells the word ἀλεσμοὶ.[67] This lengthy sentence in the Colbertine manuscript concludes with the phrase κακαὶ κολάσεις τοῦ διαβόλου ἐπ᾽ ἐμὲ ἐρχέσθωσαν μόνον ἵνα Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐπιτύχω – "Let the evil punishments of the devil come upon me, only that I may attain to Jesus Christ." In Eusebius' Ignatian text the κακαὶ is omitted and εἰς is in the place of ἐπ᾽.

[67] ὠστέων, μελλῶν, and ἀλησμοί are likely no more than orthographical variants.

Before moving forward to list the differences between the middle recension of *Smyrneans* 3.1, *Romans* 4.1 via the quotations from Irenaeus, *Ephesians* 19.1, and that of the Eusebian Ignatian text, I provide a brief recap. In relation to the text of *Romans* 5 found in Eusebius' *Historia ecclesiastica* 3.36, we identified fifteen places where Eusebius' text of Ignatius differs from that of the Colbertine manuscript. Of these fifteen, there are six small spelling differences, five examples of a different grammatical construction, three examples of omissions, and one case where a different word is employed. In addition, on two occasions the readings from *Romans* 5 found in Eusebius' text concurs with that of the Greek long recension.

After providing all of *Romans* 5 for his readers, Eusebius next quotes from *Smyrneans* 3.1 in *Historia ecclesiastica* 3.36.11. I provide a translation from the text found in Eusebius. "And I know and I believe that he was also in the flesh after the resurrection. And when he had come to those around Peter, he said to them, 'Take, touch me and see that I am not a bodiless daimon.' And immediately they touched him and they believed." From this short quotation, which Eusebius finds so appealing, we find two divergences from the Medicean manuscript. The text in the Medicean manuscript opens with the words Ἐγὼ γὰρ καὶ μετὰ τὴν ἀνάστασιν ἐν σαρκὶ αὐτὸν οἶδα καὶ πιστεύω ὄντα καὶ ὅτε πρὸς τοὺς περὶ Πέτρον ἦλθεν, ἔφη αὐτοῖς ... In place of the γὰρ Eusebius has δὲ. More significantly, in place of the second aorist ἦλθεν Eusebius has the perfect ἐλήλυθεν.

We now come to the quotation of *Romans* 4.1 embedded in Eusebius' quotation of Irenaeus' *Adversus haereses* 5.28.4. The phrase, as found in Eusebius, is σῖτός εἰμι θεοῦ καὶ δι' ὀδόντων θηρίων ἀλήθομαι ἵνα καθαρὸς ἄρτος εὑρεθῶ – "I am the wheat of God and I am ground by the teeth of the wild beasts in order that I might be found pure bread." Here we encounter one trivial and one major divergence from the Colbertine manuscript. First, the Colbertine contains ἀλέθομαι for Eusebius' ἀλήθομαι. Next, the Greek of the middle recension adds τοῦ Χριστοῦ so that it reads, "in order that I might be found the pure bread of Christ." Eusebius' Greek text of Irenaeus' *Adversus haereses* does not know this reading.[68]

We have seen that Eusebius quotes *Romans* 5, *Smyrneans* 3.1, and *Romans* 4.1 via Irenaeus. Eusebius' final quotation from an Ignatian letter comes from

[68] This is a particularly interesting variant because while the Greek fragment that Eusebius provides us with of *Adversus haereses* 5.28.4 does not contain the reading "of Christ" as does the Colbertine manuscript, the Latin of *Adversus haereses* 5.28.4 contains the reading *dei* – of God.

Ephesians 19.1 and is found in his *Questions and Answers on the Genealogy of our Savior Addressed to Stephanus*.[69] Eusebius' text of *Ephesians* 19.1 states, "And the virginity of Mary escaped the ruler of this age, also her giving birth, and likewise the death of Christ, three mysteries with a cry, which were accomplished in the silence of God." The Medicean manuscript, as well as the Paris fragment to the middle recension of *Ephesians*, differ from the Eusebian Ignatian text in two places of significance.[70] Eusebius' text contains the word "likewise" – ὁμοίως – and the Medicean along with the Paris fragment omit it. Finally, where Eusebius has "the death of Christ," the Medicean and Paris fragment have θάνατος τοῦ Κυρίου – "the death of the Lord."

Eusebius of Caesarea and Ignatius of Antioch: Conclusions

Our investigation of Eusebius' Christology and his manner of citing figures from his Christian past coupled with his direct engagement with and quotations from Ignatius of Antioch reveal two significant facts.

First, it is now safe to conclude that if Eusebius had anything negative to say about Ignatius of Antioch he would have said so. Based on our earlier discussion, we now better understand that Ignatius' status as a martyr does not make him immune from Eusebius' criticism.

Because Eusebius offers no criticism of Ignatius we can conclude that Eusebius found Ignatius' Christology acceptable by his standards. In other words, Eusebius' Christology must have meshed with that found in the edition of Ignatius' letters that he had access to in the library of Caesarea.[71] Furthermore, the evidence presented above demonstrates that Eusebius is working from a manuscript of the Ignatian letters and not quoting them from memory.

Second, the Ignatian letters Eusebius had must have been more in line with the Greek text behind the Syriac translation that lies behind the Armenian translation, investigated in detail in the opening chapter of this thesis, than the later Greek

---

[69] I cite and translate from *PG* 22.81B

[70] There is also an insignificant variation. The Medicean and the Paris fragment have ἔλαθεν with the moveable nu. Eusebius' text omits the moveable nu and reads ἔλαθε.

[71] For a discussion of the library in Caesarea see Harry Y. Gamble, *Books and Readers in the Early Church: A History of Early Christian Texts* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1995, 155-160. Gamble labels the library at Caesarea a "research library" in contrast with "a congregational library of liturgical and archival material" (p.159).

Medicean and Colbertine manuscripts known to scholars today.[72] Furthermore, when we compare the text of Ignatius found in Eusebius' quotations with that found in the Medicean and Colbertine manuscripts, we uncover numerous and occasionally significant differences that provide strong evidence that Eusebius worked with an Ignatian text much different from that found in the Medicean and Colbertine manuscripts. It is obvious that Eusebius has some form of the middle rencension of the Ignatian letters. However, we did notice a couple of parallels in Eusebius' text to that of the Ignatian long recension. This allows for the possibility that the Ignatian text that Eusebius knew may have been closer to the text the interpolator of the Ignatian long recension worked from than that of the Medicean and Colbertine manuscripts.

Ignatius of Antioch in Athanasius of Alexandria

In contrast with Eusebius of Caesarea's substantial attention to Ignatius of Antioch, Athanasius of Alexandria mentions Ignatius and quotes from Ignatius only once. Athanasius does so in *De synodis* 47. In our investigation of this text, there is one important observation to make and one important question to attempt to answer.

We observe: the reason for Athanasius' engagement with Ignatius at this juncture in *De synodis* is in order to demonstrate that it is not problematic that the council that condemned Paul of Samosota rejected the term ὁμοούσιος and the Nicene council embraced the same term as an essential component of orthodox Christology. This observation enables us to see again that for Athanasius, this time illustrated by his use of Ignatius' writings, seemingly contradictory voices from orthodox writers of the church's past can and should be reconciled with one another.

We ask: where does Athanasius find the reading γενητός καὶ ἀγένητος in his quotation of *Ephesians* 7.2? As we shall see Theodoret's quotation of *Ephesians* 7.2 is significantly different from that offered by Athanasius. Which person has the quotation correct? Furthermore, if indeed Athanasius has it right, is the reading he knows γενητός καὶ ἀγένητος or is it γέννητος καὶ ἀγέννητος?

[72] For my discussion of the Armenian translation see the opening chapter. William Whiston was on the right track when he saw that the Christology found in the Medicean manuscript is not compatible with the Christology of Eusebius as demonstrated in his many writings. See Whiston, *Primitive Christianity Reviv'd*, 1.6. Whiston simply did not have the benefit enjoyed by modern scholars of the Syriac and Armenian translations of the Greek middle recension.

The pattern of reconciliation that we observed in *De sententia Dionysii* is reduplicated in *De synodis* 47. Of course this occasion is of even greater interest because this time Athanasius draws upon the writings of Ignatius in order to demonstrate the necessity of agreement with earlier church fathers that have not been condemned for heresy.

After detailing the numerous councils that had been convened by Athanasius' enemies after the Council of Nicaea, with the goal of either altering or overturning completely the fundamental Christological rulings of Nicaea, Athanasius then turns attention to defending the theological veracity of the terms ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας and ὁμοούσιος.[73] As a part of this defense, Athanasius confronts the argument of his opponents that the term ὁμοούσιος had already been ruled out of bounds when Paul of Samosata was condemned by an earlier council.[74] Athanasius argues that it is perfectly understandable how the same word can be condemned in one context and agreed upon in another. As we saw earlier, Athanasius draws upon the example of the exchange between Dionysius of Alexandria and Dionysius of Rome as he makes this argument. After pointing to another occasion, in addition to that of the condemnation of Paul of Samosata, where it was appropriate to not use the term ὁμοούσιος, Athanasius then ups the ante by drawing additional evidence from the apostle Paul (*De synodis* 45.3). Athanasius points to seemingly contradictory statements in the apostle's writings. He observes that in Romans 7.14 and in Romans 7.12, Paul says that the law is good. When he addresses the Hebrews and the Galatians, however, Paul says that the law made no one perfect (Hebrews 7.19) and that the law has justified no one (Galatians 3.11).[75] Finally, in 1 Timothy 1.8, Paul

---

[73] For a discussion of ὁμοούσιος and ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς in Athanasius see Lewis Ayres, "Athanasius' Initial Defense of the Term Ὁμοούσιος: Rereading the De Decretis," *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 12.3 (2004): 337-359. Ayres writes on p. 348, "Athanasius presents ὁμοούσιος as only a necessary consequence of ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας τοῦ πατρὸς, and thus as introducing nothing that should not be obvious to one who understands the phrase correctly; ὁμοούσιος is only necessary to secure that which should be obvious to one who understands key scriptural terms in the light of scripture's διάνοια."

[74] Athanasius' tone in this section of *De synodis* is of a milder nature than that heard earlier in the work. Athanasius says that he is addressing those who agree with everything decided upon at the Council of Nicaea except the phrase ὁμοούσιος. These types of people are not far from the truth and they are to be considered brothers (*De synodis* 41).

[75] Athanasius' treatment of Paul here provides another example of the stark contrast between Athanasius' mindset and that of Eusebius. While Athanasius is concerned to demonstrate complete unity in these possibly contradictory statements from Paul about the law, Eusebius would have offered more discernment in relation to these Pauline texts. As evidence I point to the issue of the authorship

seems to offer a middle ground – the law is good if it is used correctly. Athanasius concludes:

> And someone would not accuse the saint as writing things that are contradictory and oppositional, but would rather marvel all the more at his writing fittingly to each, in order that on the one hand the Romans and the others might learn from what was written to turn to the spirit, and the Hebrews and the Galatians might be instructed not to have their hopes in the law but in the Lord who gave the law; so that if the fathers from both of the assemblies (ἀμφοτέρων τῶν συνόδων) spoke differently concerning the term "the same substance" (ὁμοουσίου), it is not at all necessary that we quarrel with them, but search out their meaning, and we will assuredly find the harmony of both assemblies (*De synodis* 45.3).

Athanasius then explicitly states that the council that condemned Paul concluded that Christ was not ὁμοούσιος with the Father because they understood ὁμοούσιος in a bodily sense. The context, however, for the Council of Nicaea was the opposite of that that condemned Paul. It is completely orthodox then to speak of Christ as ὁμοούσιος to the Father in an immaterial sense and with the goal of solidifying the understanding that the Word is not a creature.

After Athanasius' defense that the council that condemned Paul of Samosata and the Nicene council were both correct in their handling of the term ὁμοούσιος, Athanasius then proceeds to build on this argument with a discussion of the word ἀγέννητος as applied to the Son (*De synodis* 46).[76] This word, like ὁμοούσιος, is not found in Scripture. Yet, the Scriptures support it. Another similarity that ἀγέννητος has with ὁμοούσιος is that it can be understood correctly in opposing directions. First, the term can apply to that which was never begotten nor had any other method of causation (... μήτε δὲ γεννηθὲν μήτε ὅλως ἔχον τὸν αἴτιον

---

of Hebrews. Eusebius does conclude that Paul wrote this document but not without making his readers aware of the fact that the Roman church had not accepted Hebrews as written by Paul as well as the fact that Origen had decided that only God knows who the author was (*Historia ecclesiastica* 3.3.4; 6.20.3; 6.25.11-14). In the end, though Eusebius does side with Pauline authorship of Hebrews, he thinks it is likely that Paul wrote the document in the Hebrew language and that it was translated into Greek by Luke or Clement. This is how Eusebius accounts for the similarity of style between Hebrews and Clement's letter from Rome to the Corinthians (*Historia ecclesiastica* 2.28.2-3). We see again more complexity in Eusebius' thinking than we do in Athanasius' thinking. My reading of the evidence leads me to liken Eusebius to the university scholar and Athanasius to the preacher boy. This comparison is not meant to be taken in a pejorative sense, as both the university scholar and preacher boy images leave in their wake positive and negative impressions.

[76] Following Opitz's text I use ἀγέννητος here and not ἀγένητος. As is well known, the manuscripts to *De synodis* are not consistent. Some have ἀγέννητος and others have ἀγένητος. I will discuss this further when our attention turns to Athanasius' text of *Ephesians* 7.2.

λέγουσιν ἀγέννητον ...). Furthermore, the term can be applied to something that is not a work or a creature but is an eternal offspring (μὴ εἶναι ποίημα μηδὲ κτίσμα, ἀλλ᾽ ἀίδιον γέννημα ...). Because there are two different manners in which ἀγέννητος can be interpreted, some people can claim the Son is not ἀγέννητος and other people can claim that the Son is ἀγέννητος, and both groups are orthodox as long as they have the correct intended meaning to the term when they use it.

It is in the midst of the discussion of ἀγέννητος that Athansius draws Ignatius into his overall argument that it is not problematic that the council that condemned Paul of Samosata and the Nicene council made contradictory decisions in relation to the term ὁμοούσιος (*De synodis* 47.1). Athanasius introduces Ignatius as a bishop of Antioch after the apostles (μετὰ τοὺς ἀποστόλους).[77] He then identifies Ignatius as a martyr of Christ (μάρτυς τοῦ Χριστοῦ). After this basic introduction, Athanasius quotes *Ephesians* 7.2. When the focus of our attention turns towards Athanasius' Greek text of *Ephesians* 7.2, I will give the Greek text in full. For now, I simply provide a translation of Athanasius' quotation of *Ephesians* 7.2 – "There is one physician, of flesh and of spirit, generate and ingenerate, God in man, in death true life, both from Mary and from God."

Athanasius concedes that some writers that come after Ignatius appear to contradict what Ignatius says in *Ephesians* 7.2. These writers reserve the term ingenerate (ἀγένητος) for God alone. In fact Athanasius provides just such a quote

---

[77] Athanasius does not say that Ignatius was the second bishop after Peter, only that he was bishop after the apostles. There is considerable inconsistency as to what, if any, apostle Ignatius had contact with. Origen says that Ignatius was the second bishop of Antioch after Peter (*Homiliae in Lucam* 6). Eusebius also informs us that Ignatius was the second bishop of Antioch after Peter (*Chronicon; Historia ecclesiastica* 3.22, 36; in the *Chronicon* Eusebius makes no mention of Peter). Eusebius adds to the information from Origen that Evodius had been the first bishop of Antioch before Ignatius (*Historia ecclesiastica* 3.22). Jerome and Socrates indicate that Ignatius was the third bishop of Antioch but they count Peter as the first (*De viris illustribus* 16; *Historia ecclesiastica* 6.8) The *Apostolic Constitutions* contains another tradition that Evodius was ordained as the first bishop of Antioch by Peter and then Ignatius was ordained by Paul (8.46). In his Latin translation of Eusebius' *Chronicon*, Jerome adds Ignatius to the company of people who had been disciples of the apostle John. In the Greek version of the *Chronicon* only Papias of Hierapolis and Polycarp of Smyrna are said to be disciples of the apostle John. Jerome adds *et Ignatius Antiochenus* (276 F – line 2; cited from R. Helm, *Eusebius Werke* (Die Griechischen Christlichern Schriftsteller der Ersten Jahrhunderte; vol. 7; Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1956). From here we can trace the development of the forged letters (only found in Latin) between Ignatius and Saint John (as well as the Virgin Mary). There is yet another tradition that associates Ignatius with Jesus himself. Due to Ignatius' use of the title θεοφόρος a tradition developed, found in Symeon the Metaphrast as well as other places, that Ignatius was the child that Jesus took in his arms (Mark 9.36-37). See Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, 2.1.27-30 for his discussion of the various attempts to link Ignatius with an apostle. Due to the inconsistency that developed, one can question if Ignatius had any contact at all with an apostle.

from an unnamed writer. This writer says, "There is one ingenerate (ἓν τὸ ἀγένητον) – the Father – and one genuine (γνήσιος) Son from him, true offspring, word and wisdom of the Father."[78] Athanasius says that if someone can find fault with Ignatius and the writers, such as the one quoted above, that come after Ignatius, then fault can be found with the Nicene council for contradicting the council that condemned Paul of Samosata. Yet it is clear that both Ignatius and those writers who prefer to call only God ingenerate are in the right. Interpreting Ignatius via the issues of his own day, Athanasius says that Ignatius is correct to speak of the Son as generate because of the flesh (διὰ τὴν σάρκα ... ὁ γὰρ Χριστὸς σὰρχ ἐγένετο) and Ignatius is correct to say that the Son is ingenerate because the Son is not to classified among other generated things (ὅτι μὴ τῶν ποιημάτων καὶ γενητῶν ἐστιν). And those who wrote that only the Father is ingenerate are correct too because they did not intend to claim that the Word is among generate things. These persons simply wish to emphasize that the Father himself has no cause and that the Father is the Father of wisdom (ὅτι μὴ ἔχει τὸν αἴτιον καὶ μᾶλλον αὐτὸς πατὴρ μέν ἐστι τῆς σοφίας). After this handling of Ignatius, Athanasius concludes his overall argument that the council that condemned Paul of Samosata and the Nicene council were both orthodox:

> For why do we not unite into piety the fathers who deposed (καθελόντας) the Samosatene and the ones who exposed (στηλιτεύσαντας) the Arian heresy, but differentiate between them (ἀλλὰ διαστέλλομεν ἀνὰ μέσον αὐτῶν) and not rather think rightly about them (*De synodis* 47.2)?
>
> For it is necessary and it is fitting for us to think such things and to preserve (σώζειν) such a good conscience towards the fathers, if we are not illegitimate, but rather have traditions from them and pious teaching from them (*De synodis* 47.4).

In his handling of Ignatius we see then that Athanasius repeats the same pattern we observed in relation to Dionysius of Alexandria. Athanasius reconciles conflicting voices that do not stand condemned by the church of his day via his own fourth-century theological understanding.

[78] Lightfoot suggests that Athanasius may be quoting Clement of Alexandria's *Stromata* 6.7. See Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, 2.2.91.

The Reading γενητός καὶ ἀγένητος

We come now to the actual text of *Ephesians* 7.2 that Athanasius records in *De synodis* 47.1. It is:

> εἷς ἰατρός ἐστι, σαρκικὸς καὶ πνευματικός, γενητὸς καὶ ἀγένητος, ἐν ἀνθρώπῳ θεός, ἐν θανάτῳ ζωὴ ἀληθινή, καὶ ἐκ Μαρίας καὶ ἐκ θεοῦ.
>
> There is one physician, of flesh and of spirit, generate and ingenerate, God in man, in death true life, both from Mary and from God.

As we did with Eusebius, we notice the differences between Athanasius' text of *Ephesians* 7.2 and that found in the Medicean manuscript. There are four differences between Athanasius' version of *Ephesians* 7.2 and that of the Medicean manuscript. The first is that the Medicean manuscript adds τε after σαρκικὸς. The second will call for more discussion shortly. It is that the Medicean manuscript contains the reading γεννητὸς καὶ ἀγέννητος and Athanasius has γενητὸς καὶ ἀγένητος. This is an intriguing reading because, while the manuscript tradition behind *De synodis* is not at all clear as to whether or not Athansasius uses γεννητὸς / ἀγέννητος or γενητὸς / ἀγένητος in his discussion leading up to his quotation of *Ephesians* 7.2, there are no variants in the manuscript tradition behind *De synodis* in relation to the γενητὸς καὶ ἀγένητος of *Ephesians* 7.2. The third difference between Athanasius' quotations of *Ephesians* 7.2 and that of the Medicean manuscript was already discussed in chapter one. Athanasius has the reading ἐν ἀνθρώπῳ θεός and the Medicean has the reading ἐν σαρκὶ γενόμενος θεός. The final difference between the two witnesses is that in place of Athanasius' ἐν θανάτῳ ζωὴ ἀληθινή the Medicean has ἐν ἀθανάτω ζωῆ ἀληθινῆ. The significant difference here is θανάτῳ / ἀθανάτω.

We can draw a similar conclusion with Athanasius' text of *Ephesians* 7.2 to the one we did with Eusebius' text of *Romans* 5. The differences are numerous and significant enough to argue that the text of Ephesians that Athanasius knows is significantly different from that found in the Medicean manuscript. Furthermore, there are enough similarities between Athanasius' quotations and *Ephesians* 7.2 from the Medicean manuscript, as well as the other versions of Ignatius' writings, to conclude that Athanasius is not quoting this text from memory. An interesting question that arises is: what was the relationship between the Ignatian text that Eusebius knows in Caesarea and that of the Ignatian text that Athanasius knows in Alexandria? Unfortunately there is not enough evidence to draw any kind of

satisfactory conclusion. Based on our previous discussion of the manner in which Athanasius and Eusebius handle figures from their Christian past, there is no reason why the manuscripts in the two libraries could not have been similar. However, scribal habits would make it unlikely that they were identical.

Early in the eighteenth century, when the only textual evidence available was that of the Greek Medicean manuscript and the Latin translation, William Whiston raised concerns over the authenticity of the version of *Ephesians* 7.2 found in the middle recension. Whiston writes:

> In the Smaller Epistle to the *Ephesians*, in all our present Copies, our Saviour is expressly affirm'd to be ἀγένητος, *ingenitus*, *unbegotten*. Now since 'tis the known Fundamental Doctrine of Christianity, that the Father alone is ἀγένητος, and the Son is, in this very Respect, I mean as to the Original of his Divine Nature before the World, γενητὸς, & μονογενὴς, the *begotten*, and *only begotten* Son of the Father, 'tis impossible that *Ignatius* should say what is here ascribed to him: And yet we shall see anon, that this Doctrine runs through these smaller epistles, that our Saviour was really so much One with the Father, as to be truly *unbegotten*.[79]

There is evidence to support Whiston's concerns. As we saw in chapter one there are significant variants between *Ephesians* 7.2 in the Medicean manuscript and *Ephesians* 7.2 in the Armenian translation. Even though these variants are not overly significant for the γεννητὸς καὶ ἀγέννητος reading, they do indicate that the Medicean version of *Ephesians* 7.2 shows significant variants when compared with other evidence from the manuscript tradition. In addition to this evidence, there is another quotation of *Ephesians* 7.2 that is strikingly different from that of Athanasius. Theodoret quotes *Ephesians* 7.2 in his *Dialogus* I, *Immutabilis* like this:

> εἷς ἰατρός ἐστι σαρκικὸς καὶ πνευματικός, γεννητὸς ἐξ ἀγεννήτου, ἐν ἀνθρώπῳ θεός, ἐν θανάτῳ ζωὴ ἀληθινή, καὶ ἐκ Μαρίας καὶ ἐκ θεοῦ, πρῶτον παθητὸς καὶ τότε ἀπαθής, Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς ὁ κύριος ἡμῶν.

[79] Whiston, *Primitive Christianity Reviv'd*, 1.14. There was no known Syriac short recension in Whiston's day. Thus, for him, our middle recension is referred to as the "smaller epistles." It appears that Whiston made an editoral change from γεννητὸς καὶ ἀγέννητος to γενητὸς καὶ ἀγένητος. Lightfoot says, "There can be little doubt however that Ignatius wrote γεννητὸς καὶ ἀγέννητος, though his editors frequently alter it into γενητὸς καὶ ἀγένητος." I will discuss this shortly. See Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, 2.2.90.

> There is one physician, of the flesh and of the spirit, *begotten out of the unbegotten*, God in man, true life in death, both from Mary and from God, first subject to suffering and then not suffering, Jesus Christ our Lord.[80]

This quotation is exactly like the one found in Athanasius' *De synodis* except for two major differences. First, and most importantly, we find the reading γεννητὸς ἐξ ἀγεννήτου – "begotten out of the unbegotten." Second, we find the concluding sentence in Theodoret. He has πρῶτον παθητὸς καὶ τότε ἀπαθής, Ἰησοῦς ὁ Κύριος ἡμῶν.

Which quotation of *Ephesians* 7.2 is closer to what Ignatius of Antioch actually wrote? Is it the one found in Athanasius or Theodoret?

Throughout the history of scholarship there have been concerns over Athanasius' character. Whiston himself drew up a list of seventeen suspicions he had concerning Athanasius' character.[81] In more recent days, Duane Arnold has provided an outline that compares scholarly views on Athanasius' character amongst modern scholars and those of the nineteenth century. His point is to demonstrate that there has been a shift of suspicion in regard to Athanasius. Nineteenth-century scholars, such as J.A. Moehler, John Henry Newman, John Mason Neale, and Henry Melvill Gwatkin, hold a positive (sometimes even glowing) view of Athanasius' character. Scholars of the more modern era, such as Otto Seeck, Eduard Schwartz, and Hans-Georg Opitz, hold a negative (sometimes even despairing) view of Athanasius' character. Arnold himself concludes, "…, it must be admitted that the more vituperative critics of Athanasius have failed to provide clear and convincing evidence for a revisionist portrait of the bishop of Alexandria."[82]

---

[80] I cite and translate from Theodoret of Cyrus, *Eranistes* (Critical Text and Prolegomena by Gerard H. Ettlinger; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1975), 96.

[81] See "Suspicions Concerning Athanasius" in Whiston, *Primitive Christianity Reviv'd*, 1. cxvi-cxxviii. Whiston also wrote, "Athanasius Convicted of Forgery," in his letter to Mr Thirlby of Jesus-College in Cambridge (London : A. Baldwin, 1712) and "The Council of Nice Vindicated from the Athanasian Heresy," in his *Three Essays* (London: Cross-Street Hattongarden, 1713).

[82] Duane Wade-Hampton Arnold, *The Early Episcopal Career of Athanasius of Alexandria* (Notre Dame and London: University of Notre Dame Press, 1991), 9-23. On p. 11 Arnold lists three general accusations that have been brought against Athanasius: 1) that Athanasius deliberately forged documents, 2) Athanasius' ordination as bishop was not valid or at least not properly carried out, and 3) Athanasius used violence in order to reign in the Meletian controversy in Egypt. Arnold goes on to say that the charge of forgery was first made in 1896 by Otto Seeck. As we have seen, however, William Whiston thought this so as early as the beginning of the eighteenth century. The manner in which Arnold tells the story, German scholarship is to be credited with the development of a negative appraisal of Athanasius that carries into today's scholarly debates. With Whiston, however, we find the concern over Athanasius' character not to be traced back to Germany but to England. Arnold also

While Arnold aligns himself with the earlier dominant nineteenth-century appraisal of Athanasius, Timothy Barnes follows in the more pejorative spirit. He concludes that although Athanasius "cuts an impressive historical figure," "he could not have cut such an impressive figure had he not been conspicuously lacking in the Christian virtues of meekness and humility."[83] Furthermore, it is worth recalling here that Uta Heil thinks it possible that Athansius later inserted ὁμοούσιος into the work of the unknown author of *Refutation and Defense* that was credited to Dionysius of Alexandria.[84]

Though I have sympathies with the revisionist picture of Athanasius, in the case of *Ephesians* 7.2 the textual evidence indicates that Athanasius is guilty of no sleight of hand. I see no evidence that Athanasius interpolated this text in the Ephesian letter. The evidence suggests that if any one is guilty of interpolation it is Theodoret. Due to the very similar text of *Ephesians* 7.2 found in Athanasius' *De synodis*, I suggest two possibilities.

First, Theodoret copied this text from Athanasius and changed the γενητὸς καὶ ἀγένητος to γεννητὸς ἐξ ἀγεννήτου due to concerns emerging from an orthodoxy considerably later than Athanasius' day. Though I do think it is possible that Theodoret copied *Ephesians* 7.2 from Athanasius, it is clear that Theodoret had access to Ignatius through sources other than Athanasius. Ignatius is cited seven times (including this one) in the *florilegium* appended to Theodoret's *Eranistes* dialogue one.[85] In the *florilegium* appended to dialogue two, Ignatius is quoted twice.[86] And in the *florilegium* appended to dialogue three, Ignatius is quoted once.[87]

---

discusses more middle of the road scholarly opinions concerning Athanasius' character such as those held by Frances Young and William Rusch.

[83] Barnes, *Athanasius and Constantius*, 1. On the next page, Barnes states, "This study starts from the presumption that Athanasius consistently misrepresented central facts about his ecclesiastical career, …" In his earlier book, *Constantine and Eusebius*, Barnes concludes that, "Athanasius possessed a power independent of the emperor which he built up and perpetuated by violence … Like a modern gangster, he evoked widespread mistrust, proclaimed total innocence – and usually succeeded in evading conviction on specific charges" (230).

[84] Heil, *Athanasius von Alexandrien: De Sententia Dionysii*, 70-71.

[85] Theodoret quotes *Smyrn.* 1.1-2 (95.26-31), 5.2 (96.1-4), 4.2-5.1 (96.5-11); *Eph.* 18.2 (96.12-15), 20.2 (96.16-19), 7.2 (96.20-24); *Trall.* 9.1 (96.25-29). The references to the Ignatian quotations as found in *Eranistes* are taken from Theodoret of Cyrus, *Eranistes*. The first number in parenthesis is the page number and the numbers following are line numbers.

[86] *Smyrn.* 3.1-2 (153.13-17), 3.3 (153.18-20).

[87] *Smyrn.* 7.1

Since Athanasius only mentions Ignatius once, Theodoret must have access to Ignaitus via sources other than Athanasius.

Second, therefore, it also possible and more likely that the manuscript of *Ephesians* 7.2 that Theodoret possessed contained a similar reading to that of Athanasius. Additional evidence for this conclusion is that there is no reading other than γενητὸς καὶ ἀγένητος for *Ephesians* 7.2 found in the other witnesses to the Ignatian middle recension. Furthermore, after a careful analysis of the *Eranistes*, Gerard Ettlinger concludes that "the bulk of the material which Theodoret quotes came to him through his own personal reading and research, and was employed by him to suit his own purpose."[88] Whether Theodoret gets *Ephesians* 7.2 from Athanasius' *De synodis* or from some other source, he is clearly using it "to suit his own purpose."

The above discussion does not mean, however, that Athanasius' rendering of *Ephesians* 7.2 is without question. On the contrary, there is considerable debate over *Ephesians* 7.2. The complicated issue surrounding Athanasius' quotation of *Ephesians* 7.2 is not whether or not he forged the text. Rather, the difficult issue is whether or not the correct reading of *Ephesians* 7.2 is γεννητὸς καὶ ἀγέννητος or γενητὸς καὶ ἀγένητος. Furthermore, which reading did Athanasius have and what did he mean by the quotation he used?

In relation to whether the second-century martyr Ignatius of Antioch wrote γεννητὸς καὶ ἀγέννητος or γενητὸς καὶ ἀγένητος Lightfoot is of the opinion that he wrote γεννητὸς καὶ ἀγέννητος because this is the reading in the Medicean manuscript "though the claims of orthodoxy would be a temptation to scribes to substitute the single ν."[89] Lightfoot acknowledges that the reading in the Medicean manuscript with the double ν "is not in accordance with later theological definitions."[90] The difference between ἀγένητος and ἀγέννητος is that ἀγένητος denies the generateness and ἀγέννητος denies the begottenness. The difference between γενητός and γεννητός is that γενητός means that something has come into being and γεννητός refers to something that has been begotten. Lightfoot argues that

[88] Ettlinger, *Eranistes*, 30.

[89] Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, 2.2.90.

[90] Ibid.

this distinction was maintained by classical writers of the pre-Nicene period.[91] In relation to Christian writers of the pre-Nicene period, Lightfoot argues that the distinction was never lost, "though in certain connexions the words might be used convertibly."[92] In the fourth century, after the inclusion of the phrases γεννητὸν ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας τοῦ πατρὸς τὸν υἱὸν ὁμοούσιον and γεννηθέντα, οὐ ποιηθέντα in the Nicene Creed, it was no longer possible to overlook the differences. "The Son was thus declared to be γεννητός, but not γενητός."[93] In relation to Ignatius, then, Lightfoot concludes that Ignatius clearly means that the Son is γεννητός as man and ἀγέννητος as God. Therefore:

> Whenever, as here in Ignatius, we have ἀγέννητος where we should expect ἀγένητος, we must ascribe the fact to the indistinctness or incorrectness of the writer's theological conceptions, not to any obliteration of the meaning of the terms themselves.[94]

In relation to Athanasius' quotation of *Ephesians* 7.2, Lightfoot grants the difficulty in deciding whether Athanasius had γεννητὸς καὶ ἀγέννητος or γενητὸς καὶ ἀγένητος before him in his manuscript of *Ephesians* 7.2. It is difficult to decide because the extant manuscripts of *De synodis* elsewhere contain examples of both readings. To illustrate the confusion caused by the different readings in the manuscripts, Lightfoot points to Theodor Zahn.[95] Zahn, at first, decided in favor of the single ν readings but then later decided that he was unable to choose between the two.[96] Even so, Lightfoot is convinced that Athanasius indeed uses γεννητὸς and ἀγέννητος throughout this section because elsewhere he "insists repeatedly on the

---

[91] Leonard Prestige is convinced that Lightfoot was wrong and that other scholars have been led astray by Lightfoot's conclusion that there was a pre-Nicene distinction between the two spellings. See Leonard Prestige, "ἀγέν[ν]ητος and γεν[ν]ητός, and Kindred Words, in Eusebius and the Early Arians," *Journal of Theological Studies* 24 (1923): 486-496.

[92] Lightfoot, *Apostolic* Fathers, 2.2.92.

[93] Ibid., 94.

[94] Ibid., 92. William Schoedel comes to the same conclusions as Lightfoot. Schoedel says concerning the reading γεννητὸς καὶ ἀγέννητος, "…, it should be noted that orthodox Christology and theology later confined the adjective "begotten" to the Son and the adjective "unbegotten" to the Father. But there it is a question of the internal relations of the godhead. Ignatius thinks only of the incarnation and is restating the spirit/flesh antithesis in these terms." See William R. Schoedel, *Ignatius of Antioch: A Commentary of the Letters of Ignatius of Antioch* (Hermeneia; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1985), 61.

[95] Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, 2.2.90-91.

[96] Theodor Zahn, *Ignatius von Antiochien* (Gotha: Friedrich Andreas Perthes, 1873), 564-566. Zahn's change of mind is found in the second edition of this book on p. 338.

distinction between κτίζειν and γεννᾶν, justifying the use of the latter term as applied to the divinity of the Son ..."[97]

Lightfoot's reasoning is characteristically cogent. Nonetheless, there is evidence to suggest that Zahn's initial instincts were correct. It is true that the manuscripts of *De synodis* contain examples of both readings through section 46. It is in section 46 that Athanasius provides a discussion that leads into his quotation, in section 47, of *Ephesians* 7.2. What is interesting is that, according to Opitz's apparatus, there are no manuscript variants in relation to the γενητὸς καὶ ἀγένητος. Since, as Lightfoot contends, the context of *Ephesians* 7.2 clearly indicates that Ignatius meant γενητὸς καὶ ἀγένητος, I suggest that this is what he actually wrote. In addition, it is worth remembering that the Armenian translation of the middle recension contains the reading *factus et non factus*. The opening chapter of this thesis demonstrated that the Greek text behind the Armenian translation contains readings that are more likely to have come from a second-century Christian than many of the readings found in the Medicean manuscript.

I conclude that not only did Ignatius intend the meanings associated with γενητὸς καὶ ἀγένητος but that these are the words that he wrote.[98] Athanasius then, far from interpolating Ignatius' words, copied them correctly. If this is correct, then it was γενητὸς καὶ ἀγένητος that Athanasius used in *De synodis* 46 in order to set the stage for his use of Ignatius. Even with this reading of the evidence, it still remains clear that the confusion amongst pre-Nicene writers and scribes over the words γεννητὸς / ἀγέννητος and γενητὸς / ἀγένητος combined with the clear cut fourth-century orthodox understanding of these words caused the scribes who copied Ignatius' letter to the Ephesians all sorts of headaches.

Conclusion

This chapter has brought attention to the reality that two fourth-century bishops, Eusebius of Caesarea and Athanasius of Alexandria, with opposing Christological understandings both affirm the Christology of Ignatius of Antioch. More importantly, I have demonstrated the manner in which they are both able to

---

[97] Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, 2.2.91.

[98] Prestige writes, "Lightfoot is certainly wrong in arguing for the reading ἀγέννητον here, which would make absolute nonsense of the whole passage …" See Prestige "ἀγέν[ν]ητος and γεν[ν]ητός," 487, footnote 1.

claim Ignatius as an orthodox figure and thus a precursor to their own differing beliefs. The evidence presented in this chapter has been cumulative in nature and when taken together as a whole has led to significant finds.

I began with an examination of the different Christological understandings contained in the writings of Eusebius and Athanasius. Though much ink has been devoted to this topic in the past, it was necessary to give my own understanding of the manner in which the Christologies of Eusebius and Athanasius differ. I argued that the major difference between the two bishops is not over the key Nicene term ὁμοούσιος. Both figures can find an acceptable place for the term in their Christological understandings. In fact Athanasius approves of the fact that Eusebius signed the Nicene Creed containing the key word ὁμοούσιος (*De decretis* 3; *Epistula ad Afros episcopos* 6). Rather the great divide between the Christologies of the two figures is twofold. 1) Eusebius is convinced that the Son is needed as a mediator figure in the creation of the world because God is too lofty to touch the physical world. Athanasius will have none of this. 2) Athanasius can only speak of the subordination of the Son to the Father if the Son's subordination is limited to the incarnation. Eusebius will have none of this.

After demonstrating the great divide between the Christologies of Eusebius of Caesarea and Athanasius of Alexandria, I then demonstrated the characteristic manner in which the two bishops handle and cite figures from their Christian past. We saw that Eusebius is able to laud some qualities of past Christian figures who have not been condemned by the fourth-century church as well as some past Christian figures who do stand condemned by the fourth-century church. Likewise, Eusebius is able to criticize both heterodox and orthodox writers from the church's past.

Athanasius, on the other hand, handles figures from the past in a different manner from that of Eusebius. Athanasius must reconcile all past points of view to his own understanding of orthodox Christian belief in the fourth century. Furthermore, there is no negative appraisal in Athanasius of orthodox figures in his writings. Nor is there any room to praise past Christian teachers who stand condemned by the fourth-century church.

After an investigation of the Christological understandings of Eusebius of Caesarea and Athanasius of Alexandria as well as their manner of handling figures from their Christian past, we then turned our investigation upon the actual places in

their writings where Eusebius and Athanasius refer to and quote from Ignatius of Antioch. After listing and describing each place where Eusebius mentions and/or quotes from the writings of Ignatius of Antioch, I then directed attention to the twenty-two places where Eusebius' text of the Ignatian letters differs from that of the Medicean and Colbertine manuscripts. This demonstration led to the conclusion that 1) Eusebius does not quote Ignatius' writings from memory, but rather there was a manuscript of the Ignatian letters in the Caesarean library and 2) Eusebius' manuscript is markedly different from that of the Medicean and Colbertine manuscripts of the middle recension known to scholars today. A further conclusion was that, because our investigation revealed that Eusebius has no qualms about censoring what he perceives to be the errors in earlier Christian writers and praising what he considers to be good in these same writers, the Christology found in the Ignatian manuscript of Eusebius must have been in fundamental agreement with his own Christology. The reason is that Eusebius has nothing negative to say about Ignatius. Therefore, Eusebius' manuscript of Ignatius' letters would not have enabled the distinction between Father and Son to be difficult to discern as often occurs in the Medicean and Colbertine manuscripts.

In relation to Athanasius' one quotation of *Ephesians* 7.2 in his *De synodis* 47, we observed that the reason for Athanasius' engagement with Ignatius is in order to demonstrate his conviction that there are no problems because the council that condemned Paul of Samosota rejected the term ὁμοούσιος and the Nicene council insisted upon its usage as a marker of orthodox belief. In light of our previous discussion of Athanasius' *De sententia Dionysii* this came as no surprise. We then decided that it was Athanasius who correctly quoted *Ephesians* 7.2 and not Theodoret. Finally, we examined the complication over the readings γεννητὸς καὶ ἀγέννητος and γενητὸς καὶ ἀγένητος. I concluded that Ignatius wrote γενητὸς καὶ ἀγένητος and that Athanasius' quotation of *Ephesians* 7.2, along with the Armenian translation, preserves the authentic reading.

After this lengthy investigation of the battle between two fourth-century bishops over Ignatius, we now turn to a further fourth-century bishop in order to examine John Chrysostom's defense of Ignatius in his *In sanctum Ignatium martyrem*.

CHAPTER FIVE

JOHN CHRYSOSTOM: IN DEFENSE OF IGNATIUS

The results of the previous chapters have paved the way for what otherwise might be the perplexing results of this chapter. In light of what has gone before the fundamental goals of this chapter should not be too jarring. They are 1) to demonstrate that John Chrysostom's sermon on Ignatius – *In sanctum Ignatium martyrem* – serves as an apology for the second-century martyr Ignatius of Antioch and 2) building upon earlier results found in this thesis to put forth likely reasons Chrysostom finds it necessary to offer a defense of Ignatius of Antioch.

A Sermon in Defense of Ignatius

It is clear that John Chrysostom delivered his defense of Ignatius while he was a presbyter in Antioch sometime during the years 386-397. As Wendy Mayer states, the phrase, "He governed the church in our community …" clearly indicates the provenance of this sermon.[1] Furthermore, Chrysostom's "thrice-repeated invitation to 'come hither' seems to show that in this case the orator was speaking in the presence of the real or supposed reliques on the saint, and therefore in the *martyrium* built over the grave in the cemetery near the Daphnitic gate."[2] Ignatius' tomb was "within walking distance of the city."[3] In relation to a more precise date than 386-397 for this sermon, Lightfoot remarks, "We have no means of ascertaining the date of this homily."[4] As we shall see, however, other scholars find evidence for a more precise date for this homily from within Chrysostom's years of service as priest in Antioch.

---

[1] John Chrysostom, *The Cult of the Saints* (introduced, translated, and annotated by Wendy Mayer with Bronwen Neil; Popular Patristics Series; Crestwood, N.Y.: St Vladimir's Seminary Press, 2006), 101. Unless otherwise stated, all translations of Chrysostom's sermon on Ignatius are those of Mayer. The Greek text she translates from and I refer to is found in J.-P. Migne's *Patrologia Graeca* 50.587-596. It is the text of Montfaucon. Most of Montfaucon's Greek text is also found in J.B. Lightfoot, *The Apostolic Fathers* (Part 2, 3 vols.; *Ignatius, St. Polycarp*; 2nd ed.: London and New York: Macmillan and Co., 1889) 2.1.157-165. I will reference the text with the section numbers found in Mayer's translation and the corresponding reference in *PG*.

[2] Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, 2.1.47.

[3] Mayer, *The Cult of the Saints*, 101. For a map of ancient Antioch that shows the location of the cemetery just outside the city gate see Glanville Downey, *A History of Antioch in Syria from Seleucus to the Arab Conquest* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1961), figure 11.

[4] Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, 2.1.165.

James D. Smith III and the Date of *In sanctum Ignatium martyrem*

Throughout this thesis we have interacted on numerous occasions with the doctoral thesis of James D. Smith III.[5] Before moving forward to discuss the rhetoric of defense found in Chrysostom's *In sanctum Ignatium martyrem*, it is necessary to point out additional problems with Smith's interesting thesis that the discovery of the Ignatian relics and the redaction of the long recension belong together. We recall that this thesis requires Ignatius to have been an obscure figure until the discovery of his relics circa 364-373. In relation to Chrysostom's sermon Smith agrees with Lightfoot when Smith says that the sermon is "impossible to date with certainty."[6] Yet in order to add strength to his argument he dates Chrysostom's sermon to a year after Jerome's mention of Ignatius' remains lying in Antioch outside the Daphnitic gate in the cemetery. Smith dates Jerome's *De viris illustribus*, the document in which Jerome mentions the location of Ignatius' remains, to 392.[7] Therefore, Chrysostom's *In sanctum Ignatium martyrem*, while impossible to date with certainty, "most likely belongs (with its sudden profusion of detail) to a later year."[8] According to Smith then Chrysostom's *In sanctum Ignatium martyrem* would have to be dated to the period 393-397. This date complements nicely Smith's overall thesis because the "sudden profusion of detail" found in Chrysostom's sermon indicates both that Ignatius was a well-known figure by this time and that the whereabouts of Ignatius' remains were known by many. The later the evidence for a cult of Ignatius can be dated then the stronger likelihood that Ignatius was an obscure figure for much of the fourth century. This reading of the evidence does indeed support Smith's thesis.

Since everything in the current thesis supports the contrary reading to Smith's work – that instead of an obscure figure, Ignatius of Antioch was actually a battleground upon which the Arian controversy was fought – I offer an alternate interpretation of the dating of John Chrysostom's *In sanctum Ignatium martyrem*.

---

[5] James David Smith III, "The Ignatian Long Recension and Christian Communities in Fourth Century Syrian Antioch" (Th.D. diss., Harvard University, 1986).

[6] Ibid., 10.

[7] For arguments in favor of 392 for Jerome's *De viris illustribus* see J.N.D. Kelly, *Jerome: His Life, Writings, and Controversies* (London: Duckworth Publishers, 1975), 174 and Timothy Barnes, *Tertullian: A Historical and Literary Study* (2nd ed.; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1985), 235ff. For an argument in favor of 393 for Jerome's *De viris illustribus* see P. Nautin, "La date du *De viris inlustribus* de Jérôme, de la mort de Cyrille de Jérusalem et de celle de Grégoire de Nazianze," *Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique* 56 (1961): 33-35.

[8] Smith, "The Ignatian Long Recension," 10.

Instead of a date towards the later part of Chrysostom's service as a priest in Antioch (393-397), I draw attention to Eduard Schwartz's argument that Chrysostom's *In sanctum Ignatium martyrem* dates to the first year of Chrysostom's service as priest in Antioch (386).[9] In light of the arguments found in the previous chapters of this thesis I find Schwartz's argument cogent. I will discuss Schwartz's work momentarily.

According to my alternate reading then the first mention of Ignatius' burial place would not be from Jerome in 392, rather it would be from Chrysostom in 386. Smith is correct when he observes that the detail in Chrysotom's *In sanctum Ignatium martyrem* indicates a great familiarity with Ignatius and his burial place. Therefore, when Chrysostom preaches his sermon in 386 the evidence clearly demonstrates that Ignatius and his place of burial were well known by Chrysostom and Antiochene Christians before 386. A date of circa 386 for the popularity of Ignatius does not necessarily damage Smith's contention that Ignatius was rediscovered sometime between 364-373. The looming question, however, is how many years before 386 was the burial place of Ignatius known? I suggest that when complemented with my contention that the Nicene textual variants demonstrated in the first chapter of this thesis likely date to the first half of the fourth century, my contention that there is no reason why the Ignatian long recension could not have been composed very soon after the *Ekthesis Macrostichos* of Antioch 344, and the reality that Eusebius of Caesarea and Athanasius of Alexandria demonstrate intimate familiarity with Ignatius during the first half of the fourth century, the dating of Chrysostom's *In sanctum Ignatium martyrem* to the first year of his service as priest in Antioch rather than the later half of his time in Antioch makes it impossible that Ignatius was an obscure figure until the later part of the fourth century. And the dating of *In sanctum Ignatium martyrem* to 386 adds more persuasive evidence towards the support of my interpretation that Ignatius was a fourth-century battleground.

Smith says that Jerome's "matter-of-fact account stems from a time before the growth of a cult and the elaborations of Chrysostom."[10] But this need not be the

---

[9] Eduard Schwartz, *Christliche und Judische Ostertafeln* (Der Königlichen Gesellschaft Der Wissenschaften Zur Göttingen Philologisch-Historische Klasse; Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, 1905).

[10] Smith, "The Ignatian Long Recension," 12.

case. The nature of Jerome's *De viris illustribus* calls for brevity for each entry. Therefore, it is sufficient to simply state the place of Ignatius' remains. Smith also highlights the reality that Eusebius of Caesarea does not say anything about the location of Ignatius' remains (*Historia ecclesiastica* 3.36). However, this is an argument from silence, as is Smith's treatment of Babylas.[11] Just because Eusebius does not mention Ignatius' remains does not mean that he was ignorant about them. And even if he was, Eusebius' ignorance is no indication as to the state of things in Antioch. Viewed in light of the evidence presented in the previous chapters of this thesis, there is no reason that the placement of Chrysostom's *In sanctum Ignatium martyrem* could not be before Jerome's *De viris illustribus*. Now I turn attention to a discussion of Eduard Schwartz' dating of *In sanctum Ignatium martyrem* to Chrysostom's first year as a priest. More specifically he dates it to 17 October 386.

Schwartz observes that at the close of *British Museum Add.* 12,150, a well-known Syriac manuscript dating from the fifth century, there is a martyrology which gives the names of martyrs with the dates on which their lives are celebrated.[12] According to this manuscript, the remembrance of the martyr Pelagia occurs on 8 October. This is followed nine days later with the remembrance of Ignatius of Antioch on 17 October. Schwartz thinks these dates, found in this Syriac manuscript, correspond to the opening of Chrysostom's *In sanctum Ignatium martyrem*. In his opening words, Chrysostom refers to the recent celebration of the life of Pelagia.[13] Schwartz says this about Pelagia and Ignatius:

> Predigt auf die h. Pelagia. Ihr Andenken wurde nach dem s. g. syrischen, in Wahrheit constantinopler Martyrologium [Journ. of sacred litt. 8,45ff.] in Antiochien am 8. October [im Jahr 386 ein Donnerstag] gefeiert. Das Jahresdatum ergiebt sich aus dem was zu 14 und 15 bemerkt wird.[14]
>
> Predigt auf den h. Ignatius. Sein Tag war in Antiochien nach dem eben angeführten Martyrologium der 17. October [im Jahr 386 ein Samstag]; damit stimmen die Worte am Anfang der Predigt überein …[15]

---

[11] Ibid., 12 and 18-19. I will discuss Smith's treatment of Babylas below. In this reference from p. 19, Smith says, "Whatever prominence Ignatius had enjoyed earlier in his native city was, by AD 362, clearly eclipsed by that of Babylas." The discussion below concerning Schwartz's and Lightfoot's treatment of the Syriac manuscript makes this statement most unlikely.

[12] For a discussion of this manuscript in English see Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, 2.2.419-420. I will come to Lightfoot's discussion shortly.

[13] I will discuss this text briefly later in this chapter.

[14] Schwartz, *Christliche und Judische Ostertafeln*, 173.

[15] Ibid.

After determining the day that Chrysostom's church in Antioch recognized Ignatius' martyrdom, Schwartz then turns to the issue of the year. Just as Schwartz sees a good fit between Chrysostom's mention on the feast of Pelagia in his *In sanctum Ignatium martyrem* and the mention of the feast days of Pelagia and Ignatius in *British Museum Add.* 12,150, so does Schwartz argue for a close relationship between the date of Chrysostom's *De incomprehensibili* and the mention of a chain of martyr's anniversaries in the second of Chrysostom's sermons on the incomprehensible nature of God.[16] Schwartz writes:

> Ist die Stelle am Anfang der 2. Anhomoeerpredigt richtig auf die Enkomien der Pelagia und des Ignatius bezogen, so ist die Herbstsynode des antiochenischen Metropolitansprengels damals, sei es nur in jenem Jahr sei es überhaupt, früher gelegt, als die Kanones angeben, was um so eher glaublich ist als die Ueberlieferung jener schwankt: wer trotzdem Bedenken trägt das anzunehmen, muss die Datirung von 13 und 14 auf das Jahr 386 ablehnen.[17]

Schwartz's highly plausible argument would suggest that, in addition to the already discussed issue of placing *In sanctum Ignatium martyrem* during the first year of Chrysostom's service as priest in Antioch instead of his later years in Antioch, Smith encounters additional difficulty for his thesis that Ignatius was an obscure figure until sometime between 364 and 373.

Lightfoot refers to *British Museum Add.* 12,150, the manuscript that contains the dates of 8 October and 17 October as the dates for the remembrance of Pelagia and Ignatius, as "probably the oldest dated MS in existence, having been written in 411."[18] Lightfoot goes on to detail the contents of the manuscript – parts of the *Clementine Homilies* and *Recognitions*, the *Books against the Manicheans* by Titus of Bostra, and Eusebius of Caesarea's *Theophania* and *Palestinian Martyrs*. In addition to these writings in Syriac, there is also then our Syriac martyrology which contains "the names of Western martyrs … arranged in the order of the Syrian months."[19] Lightfoot observes that though the manuscript itself dates to the early fifth century, "the Martyrology itself, even in its Syriac dress, must be much older."[20] The Syriac was translated from the Greek and "we shall probably therefore be correct

---

[16] I will treat Chrysostom's *De incomprehensibili* in considerable detail later in this chapter.

[17] Schwartz, *Christliche Und Judische Ostertafeln*, 174.

[18] Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, 2.2.419.

[19] Ibid.

[20] Ibid.

in assigning the work to a date not later than about the middle of the fourth century."[21] "At all events it will be older than S. Chrysostom's panegyric; and it seems to have emanated from Antioch or the neighbourhood."[22]

Here then lies additional evidence that the whereabouts of Ignatius were not obscure before the years 364-373. We shall probably be correct to conclude that Ignatius, along with Pelagia, was on the church liturgical calendar by the middle of the fourth-century, perhaps earlier.

Additional Problems with Smith's Thesis

There is yet another significant problem with Smith's thesis that Ignatius of Antioch was an obscure figure before the rediscovery of his relics in Antioch sometime between 364 and 373. In addition to the problem, already mentioned, concerning Eusebius of Caesarea's supposed lack of knowledge of the whereabouts of Ignatius' relics, Smith draws attention to the fact that Julian makes no mention of Ignatius when he commands the remains of Babylas be removed from Daphne. Yet both Socrates (*Ecclesiastical History* 3.18) and Sozomen (*Ecclesiastical History* 5.19) inform us that Julian chose to have Babylas' remains exhumed because he believed that it was Babylas' remains alone that were hindering the Apollo of Daphne from giving oracles. Sozomen states that there were many burials of Christian martyrs in Daphne due to Julian's Christian brother Gallus' earlier efforts to rid Antioch of pagan religion. Sozomen does not identify any of the many other burials - Ignatius or anyone else. This is not necessary because the point is that Julian was only concerned about Babylas. Later, however, Socrates reports that Julian did command that other shrines to Christian martyrs be destroyed after the temple of Apollo at Daphne itself was destroyed by fire (*Ecclesiastical History* 4.20). Therefore the fact that the "emperor Julian … evidences no knowledge whatsoever of Ignatius" is no indication that Ignatius' whereabouts outside the Daphnitic gate were unknown during the reign of Julian or before.[23]

Since there are a number of significant problems with Smith's argument, I conclude that there is no reason that Ignatius' remains could not have been known before the demise of Julian. In fact, it appears that the eastern church was celebrating

---

[21] Ibid.

[22] Ibid.

[23] Smith, "The Ignatian Long Recension," 12.

the life of Ignatius as early as the mid fourth century, probably earlier. In light of the evidence presented in earlier chapters of this thesis, I suggest that Ignatius' remains near Daphne were known prior to 364. Of course, even if I am wrong on this point, I reiterate an earlier point. A lack of awareness regarding Ignatius' place of burial does not also mean a lack of awareness regarding Ignatius himself. Smith connects the rediscovery of Ignatius' relics with the resurrection of Ignatius himself. In order for his thesis to work Ignatius has to have been an obscure figure until at least the mid 360s. I see no way that this can be the case. The amount of ink Eusebius of Caesarea alone devotes to Ignatius of Antioch makes it most difficult to believe Smith's take on Ignatius during the fourth century. Once we add to Eusebius of Caesarea the arguments of Eduard Schwartz concerning the date of Chrysostom's *In sanctum Ignatium martyrem*, Lightfoot's discussion of the Syriac manuscript *British Museum Add*. 12,150, and the interpretation of the data presented in the first four chapters of this thesis, Smith's thesis looks increasingly suspect.[24]

The Rhetoric of Defense in the Sermon

When Chrysostom's *In sanctum Ignatium martyrem* is read, there is a strong sense that Chrysostom feels the need to defend Ignatius' Christian virtue to his congregation. This tone of defense, however, is implicit. As we shall see, Chrysostom's tone in *In sanctum Ignatium martyrem* differs from other sermons where Chrysostom is clearly defending a person or a particular point. Later in the sermon Chrysostom will leave his defense of Ignatius behind in order to focus upon Ignatius' actual martyrdom. For the purposes of this chapter, however, it is necessary to demonstrate that indeed the initial suspicion of defense is, in fact, what Chrysostom is about in relation to Ignatius of Antioch. We will also consider why Chrysostom's defense of Ignatius is implicit and not explicit.

Chrysostom's sermon begins with an offer of thanksgiving to God for the provision of the martyrs' tables. Recently the church in Antioch had hosted the martyr Pelagia. Now the church turns their attention to Ignatius. Chrysostom finds in the juxtaposition of the female martyr Pelagia and the male martyr Ignatius the opportunity to highlight Galatians 3.28, "in Christ Jesus there is no male, no female" (1/PG 50.593).

---

[24] Smith's own rhetoric lacks confidence. He says, for instance, "It is not possible to determine the exact date of the discovery of Ignatius' remains in Antioch, …" and "It is most likely, however, that Jerome knew the burial place first-hand …" See Smith, "The Ignatian Long Recension," 12.

Chrysostom finds himself in a difficult situation. There are so many good qualities about Ignatius of Antioch to comment on that he cannot decide where to begin. He likens his dilemma to entering a meadow and seeing many roses, irises, lilies, and other spring flowers. Just as a person struggles to know which flower to focus upon first, so does Chrysostom struggle to know with which admirable quality of Ignatius to begin his examination. After this vivid metaphor[25], Chrysostom says, "For consider!" (Σκοπεῖτε γάρ – 2/PG 50.593). Here we find Chrysostom going out of his way to demonstrate the worthiness of Ignatius to his congregation. Chrysostom then invites his audience to consider that Ignatius carried out his duties as bishop in accordance with Christ's command. Jesus says in John 10.11 that "The good shepherd lays down his life for the sheep." When we look to the example of Ignatius we find that, "he gave it up for his sheep with every ounce of courage" (2/PG 50.593).

Not only did Ignatius lay down his life as an act of obedience to Christ, but Chrysostom also stresses that Ignatius knew firsthand the apostles. "He was genuinely in the company of the apostles and enjoyed their spiritual streams" (3/PG 50.593). At this point in his sermon, Chrysostom's dilemma is still not resolved. He is perplexed, "Whom shall we praise in song first? The martyr, or the bishop, or the apostle?" (3/PG 50.593). Chrysostom refers to these three roles as a triple crown (Τριπλοῦν γὰρ στέφανον – 3/PG 50.593) upon Ignatius' holy head (τὴν ἁγίαν ... κεφαλήν – 3/PG 50.593). Yet even the metaphor of a triple crown is not majestic enough to describe the Christian virtues of this saint. This triple crown, Chrysostom says, is multi-layered: "For if a person were to unwind each of the crowns precisely, they would discover that they were shooting forth crowns for us too" (3/PG 50.593). Next he lists the qualifications for a bishop found in Paul's letter to Titus (1.7-9) and Paul's first letter to Timothy (3.1-3). In his letter to Titus, Paul says that a bishop is to be above reproach, not stubborn, not quick tempered, not prone to too much drink, not given to fights, and not greedy. Rather, the bishop is to be hospitable, attracted to goodness, sober, upright, pious, disciplined, and able to instruct others from the

[25] Robert Wilken says, "Of all the devices at the rhetor's disposal, the one that stands out is hyperbole, exaggeration. The rhetors overstate, they magnify, they use poetical and grandiloquent words for the simplest actions; everything is writ larger than life ... Besides hyperbole, the rhetors used metaphors and similes, sometimes of genuine originality, but more often hack figures repeated over and over in different contexts." See Robert L. Wilken, *John Chrysostom and the Jews: Rhetoric and Reality in the Late 4th Century* (Eugene, Oreg.: Wipf & Stock Publishers, 2004; originally published 1983), 107.

Scriptures. In 1 Timothy Paul adds to this list of qualifications that the bishop is to be the husband of one wife. Though, of course, Chrysostom does not discuss this qualification.[26]

Chrysostom finds it necessary to explicitly state that Ignatius' character was in accord with these Pauline descriptions of the well-suited bishop. He says:

> With confidence, therefore, I would say that with precision blessed Ignatius impressed every aspect of this image on his own soul, and was blameless and without reproach and neither stubborn nor quick-tempered, nor an excessive drinker, nor given to brawling, but peace-loving, uninterested in money, upright, devout, disciplined, a person who stuck close to the trustworthy word in accord with what was taught, a teetotaler, of sober character, well-behaved, and the rest that Paul required (5/PG 50.594).

In the very next sentence Chrysostom says to his congregation, "'What's the proof of this?,' you ask" (Καὶ τίς τούτων ἀπόδειξις; – 5/ PG 50.594). With this sentence, Chrysostom's defense of Ignatius reaches a climax. We have already heard Chrysostom's dilemma over where to start in his praise of Ignatius, Ignatius' obedience to Christ via his martyrdom, Ignatius' intimate association with the apostles, and Ignatius' multi-layered triple crown. Now, Chrysostom lays out the Pauline qualifications for the bishop and argues that Ignatius' character ticks off every one of them. After all of this praise Chrysostom then asks a rhetorical question, "What's the proof of this?"

Chrysostom anticipates persons in his congregation objecting to the portrayal of Ignatius as a scripturally qualified bishop. This rhetorical question can be taken as evidence that there were varying opinions – positive and negative – about Ignatius in Antioch during the last fifteen years of the fourth century. The rhetoric of the opening of *In sanctum Ignatium martyrem* gives it more the feel of an apology than a panegyric preached to like-minded people.

In answer to his own question, concerning proof for Ignatius' satisfactory fulfillment of the Pauline requirements for a bishop, Chrysostom once again emphasizes that the apostles were the ones who approved of Ignatius. He contends:

> The same men who made these statements ordained him, and those who were advising others so precisely to subject to scrutiny those about to ascend to the throne of this office would themselves not have done this cursorily. On the

---

[26] For a discussion of Chrysostom's views on sexuality see J.N.D. Kelly, *Golden Mouth: The Story of John Chrysostom Ascetic, Preacher, Bishop* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1995), 45-48.

> contrary, if they hadn't seen all of this virtue in this martyr's soul, they wouldn't have entrusted this office to him (5/PG 50.595).

While the defensive tone of John Chrysostom's sermon on Ignatius will recede later in the sermon, it is still some time before this occurs.

By the time Chrysostom's defense recedes into the background of his sermon, in addition to the triple crown of martyr, bishop, and apostle, Chrysostom offers five additional crowns that shoot forth from the triple crown that rests upon Ignatius' head. Chrysostom specifically lists these five crowns so that his audience has no doubts as to what he intends to communicate (11/PG 50.597). We have already observed two of these additional five crowns: 1) those apostles who ordained Ignatius and 2) the responsibility of the office of bishop.[27] In addition to these crowns, Chrysostom names and discusses 3) the persecution and heresies of Ignatius' day, 4) the size of the city Ignatius oversaw, and 5) the virtue of Peter – the apostle who actually ordained Ignatius.

Chrysostom observes the different experiences between the late fourth-century bishops of his day and the second-century bishops of Ignatius' day. There is no danger for the bishop in Chrysostom's time. There is safety all around. For Ignatius, by contrast, there were:

> cliffs and pits and wars and battles and dangers; and governors and emperors and peoples and cities and races – both domestic and foreign – were plotting against the believers. And it wasn't just this that was terrible, but that many of the believers themselves too, in that they had just for the first time tasted strange teachings, were in need of considerable accommodation, and were still rather weak and were often caught out (7/PG 50.595).

Chrysostom draws attention to the number of people who lived in Antioch when Ignatius was bishop. He does not mean to belittle those who have charge over smaller cities but he does say of Ignatius:

---

[27] Chrysostom argues that all the apostles ordained Ignatius because of Paul's words in 1 Cor 15.11, "Whether it is they, then, or it is I, so we proclaim [the gospel]" (4/PG 50.594). It appears also that Chrysostom alludes to Ignatius' letters to the Ephesians (4.1) and to the Philadelphians (1.2) when he says, "For just as in a single lyre the strings are different, but they make a single harmonious sound, so too in the company of the apostles the persons were different, but they make a single harmonious sound …" (4/PG 50.594). For a discussion of whether or not Chrysostom actually has access to any of Ignatius' writings see Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, 2.1.165-166. Lightfoot is of the opinion that Chrysostom is acquainted with the actual letters of Ignatius. For the contrary view see Theodor Zahn, *Ignatius von Antiochien* (Gotha: Friedrich Andreas Perthes, 1873), 33. I will return to this issue momentarily.

> But to be entrusted with so large a city and a population stretching into the 200,000s, of how much virtue and wisdom do you imagine that to be proof? For truly, just as in the case of armies the more experienced generals are entrusted with the praetorian legions with their larger body count, so too in the case of cities the more capable magistrates are assigned the larger, heavily populated ones ... (10/PG 50.597).

The fifth crown, for Chrysostom, is Ignatius' competency as successor to the Apostle Peter in Antioch. He says:

> When I recalled Peter, I saw a fifth crown being woven from it too. It was he (sc. Ignatius) who succeeded to this office after him …; so too, when Peter was about to move away from there, the grace of the Spirit inserted in his place a second teacher equivalent to Peter, so that the construction that was already there wouldn't become less sound through the poor quality of his successor (10/PG 50.597).

Chrysostom's defense of Ignatius now recedes into the background of his sermon as he moves forward to focus on Ignatius' actual martyrdom and the fact that Ignatius was willing to give up his earthly life freely because of Ignatius' overriding belief in eternal life with God.[28] However, before he does so, Chrysostom says, "And so we have counted up five crowns … After weaving all of these I could have mentioned a sixth or a seventh or more than these" (11/PG 50.597).

The rhetoric in the opening half of John Chrysostom's *In sanctum Ignatium martyrem* points to an underlying need for a strong defense of Ignatius before the focus of the sermon can turn to Ignatius' actual martyrdom. Yet, this defense is implicit when viewed in light of the sermon as a whole. Chrysostom's sermon consists of two fundamental genres – first an apology and then a more traditional panegyric. Later I will put forward conclusions as to why Chrysostom must defend Ignatius before he can offer Ignatius as a worthy example to emulate. First, however, I want to bring forth more evidence, due to the implicit nature of Chrysostom's defense of Ignatius, in order to demonstrate that Chrysostom's sermon on Ignatius is indeed a defense.

Comparisons with Other Sermons

When we look to other sermons produced by John Chrysostom we find that the rhetoric of defense that is more implicit in his *In sanctum Ignatium martyrem* is

[28] Chrysostom emphasizes over and over again, throughout his sermon, Ignatius' willingness to lay aside his physical life due to his sincere belief in eternal life with God. This appears to be what impresses Chrysostom most about Ignatius.

more explicit in other sermons. When we intersect *In sanctum Ignatium martyrem* with other sermons we can be further assured that indeed the initial goal of *In sanctum Ignatium martyrem* is to defend the Christian virtue of Ignatius of Antioch.

There is no shift in tone in John Chrysostom's *Against the Games and Theatres* as there is in his *In sanctum Ignatium martyrem*. From beginning to end, the now bishop is on the defensive against his congregation in Constantinople (specifically the male members) attending the games and the theatres; especially at the expense of worship attendance. John is angry because after a year of his preaching and teaching, participants in the Constantinopolitan congregation are still attending the horse races. Their attendance at these events led to their inappropriate behavior in the streets after the competition was complete; frenzied behavior which Chrysostom heard from his own house (PG 56.263).

Furthermore, Chrysostom castigates the men of his church for going to the theater after they had attended the games. By doing this, they were "running from smoke into fire" (PG 56.266).[29] The major problem with the theatre is that prostitutes are brought onto stage. Therefore, Chrysostom quotes Matthew 5.28, "The one who looks at a woman to desire her has already committed adultery with her." Furthermore, once the image of the seductive prostitute is in the mind of a man, she goes with him back to his home and accompanies him as he tends to his wife and children (PG 56.267). The problem with all of this behavior, in addition to disobedience to Christ, is that the pagan and Jewish population of the city find reason to ridicule the Christian church (PG 56.264; 269).

The problem of attending the games and the theatres is so severe that Chrysostom refuses to allow such people into the church building in Constantinople if they continue with this type of behavior. He concludes, "If in the olden days the leper was ordered to sit outside the camp, and even if he was a king was thrown out with his crown ..., how much more shall we throw out of this sacred camp the man who has leprosy of the soul" (PG 56.268).

In the midst of this sermon we find that Chrysostom asks rhetorical questions that anticipate some form of objection from his congregation. After Chrysostom

---

[29] Translations from *Against the Games and Theatres* are from Wendy Mayer and Pauline Allen, *John Chrysostom* (The Early Church Fathers; London and New York: Routledge, 2000). The Greek text their translation is from is *PG* 56:263-270. They retain the reference system found in *PG* 56:263-270.

passionately puts forth his opinion of the evil atmosphere found at the theatres, he says, "'What evil?' someone asks" (PG 56.266). He then quotes Jesus' words in Matthew 5.28 and further says, "'What then,' you say, 'if I don't look at her to desire her?'" (PG 56.266). Though they are not questions, Chrysostom also twice uses the phrase "Don't say to me" when he is arguing that the Devil can be defeated if those that leave the church are reconciled to the church. He anticipates participants of his congregation responding that the number who fled is small. Chrysostom references the shepherd who left ninety-nine sheep for the one that strayed (Matt 8.12-13) and concludes that even if the number is small, the repentance of these back sliders is still of great importance.

The point of this discussion is to demonstrate that Chrysostom uses the technique of a rhetorical question in order to address what he perceives to be possible objections to his argument. He does this in both *In sanctum Ignatium martyrem* and *Against the Games and Theatres*. In *Against the Games and Theatres* there is no question that Chrysostom is on the defensive as he argues against the Christians of Constantinople attending the games and the theatres. In *In sanctum Ignatium martyrem*, the tone of defense is more implicit. The common manner employed by Chrysostom of answering an objection that he anticipates from his congregation, however, helps us to see that indeed the first part of *In sanctum Ignatium martyrem* is intended as a defense of Ignatius of Antioch.[30]

When we turn back to one of Chrysostom's martyr sermons, which also contain within it an explicit defense, we find more evidence of Chrysostom's characteristic manner of answering objections that he anticipates from his listeners.[31] In *On Eleazar and the Seven Boys* Chrysostom spends more time defending Eleazer and the seven boys as *Christian* martyrs than he does discussing their actual martyrdom as found in *4 Maccabees*. These events occurred during the reign of Antiochus IV, two centuries before the birth of Christ. Therefore, Chrysostom's

---

[30] Mayer and Allen write, "In *Against the games and theatres* we also see him anticipate the objection of the audience …, another favorite technique, which allows him to create the effect of a dialogue and enliven the delivery." See Mayer and Allen, *John Chrysostom*, 27. Wilken offers a similar assessment, "He raises questions and provides answers, giving the semblance of a dialogue. He raises objections to his argument only to refute them in the next line." See Wilken, *John Chrysostom and the Jews*, 111.

[31] For an argument that this sermon took place in Constantinople, see Wendy Mayer, "The Provenance of the Homilies of St John Chrysostom: Towards a New Assessment of Where he preached What" (Ph.D. diss., University of Queensland, 1996): 498-504.

congregation struggles to understand how they can be venerated as Christian martyrs. Chrysostom states:

> I say this since many of the more naïve, due to mental incapacity, are being swept along by the Church's enemies [and] do not hold the appropriate opinion of these saints, nor in the same way, do they number them in the rest of the chorus of the martyrs, saying that they didn't shed their blood for Christ but for the law and the edicts that were in the law, in that they were killed over pig's flesh … Come then, let us correct their way of thinking (3/PG 63.525).[32]

Chrysostom's major strategy for correcting what he perceives to be faulty thinking is to argue that Christ himself was the giver of the law. Therefore, the Maccabean martyrs died for Christ. As he makes this argument, Chrysostom employs again a rhetorical question. This time he provides the congregation's likely answer. He says:

> That they received their wounds for Christ's sake, I will now attempt to demonstrate. Tell me, for what reason did they suffer? "Because of the law," you say, "and the edicts that lie within the law." If, then, it is apparent that it was Christ who gave the law, is it not clear that, by suffering for the law, they displayed all the boldness for the lawgiver? (6/PG 63:526)

In comparison with *Against the Games and Theatres* and *On Eleazar and the Seven Boys*, Chrysostom's defense of Ignatius in *In sanctum Ignatium martyrem* is more veiled. There is, however, additional evidence that points to Chrysostom's defense of Ignatius.

Additional Evidence for John Chrysostom's Defense of Ignatius

We find additional evidence for John Chrysostom's defense of Ignatius when we compare the contents of Chrysostom's information about Ignatius found in his *In sanctum Ignatium martyrem* with the information about Ignatius found in Eusebius of Caesarea's *Historia ecclesiastica* and Jerome's *De viris illustribus*.

As has already been discussed in detail, Eusebius states twice that Ignatius was the second bishop of Antioch (*Chronicon*, *Historia ecclesiastica* 3.22). Furthermore in *Historia ecclesiastica* 3.22, Eusebius names Evodius as the first bishop of Antioch. Jerome, in *De viris illustribus* 16 says that Ignatius was the third

---

[32] Translation of *On Eleazer and the Seven Boys* is taken from Mayer, *The Cult of the Saints*, 119-134. The Greek text is PG 63.523-530 and A. Wenger, "Restauration de l'*Homélie* de Chrysostome sur Eléazar et les sept frères Macchabées (PG 63.523-530)," in *Texte und Textkritik. Eine Aufsatzsammlung* (ed. J. Drummer, J. Irmscher, F. Paschke, and K. Treu; Texte and Untersuchungen 133; Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1987), 599-604. For a brief discussion on the complexities behind this Greek text see Mayer, *The Cult of the Saints*, 120.

bishop of Antioch but he counts Peter as the first. Chrysostom, however, makes no mention of a bishop between Peter and Ignatius existing. I draw attention, once again, to a previously noted text:

> When I recalled Peter, I saw a fifth crown being woven from it too. It was he (sc. Ignatius) who succeeded to this office after him …; so too, when Peter was about to move away from there, the grace of the Spirit inserted in his place a second teacher equivalent to Peter, so that the construction that was already there wouldn't become less sound through the poor quality of his successor (10/PG 50.597).

In Chrysostom's defense then the closest possible contact between Ignatius and Peter is imperative. There is no gap between Jesus' apostle Peter (as well as the other apostles) and Ignatius of Antioch. There is no room therefore for anything other than a completely orthodox Ignatian character.

In the example above we discovered information about Ignatius found in Eusebius and Jerome that is not found in Chrysostom's defense of Ignatius. We now discover that as Chrysostom defends Ignatius he *includes* information that is absent from Eusebius and Jerome. In his *In sanctum Ignatium martyrem*, Chrysostom speaks in considerable detail about the transfer of Ignatius' relics from Rome to Antioch. He says:

> For while she (sc. Rome) received his dripping blood, you were honored with his relics. You enjoyed his episcopacy; they enjoyed his martyrdom. They saw him competing and winning and being crowned; you have him perpetually. God removed him from you for a short time and happily gave him [back] to you with greater joy … My point is that you sent him away a bishop, and received a martyr. You sent [him] away with prayers, and received [him] with crowns. And not just you, but also all the cities in between. For how do you think they felt when they saw the remains being escorted back? How much pleasure did they reap (17/PG 50.594)?

In the process of commenting in detail on the transfer of Ignatius' relics back from Rome, Chrysostom also emphasizes Ignatius' connection to Rome. The fact that Ignatius died in Rome connects him directly to the Roman church which was very important for bishops of John's day.

> Earlier in his sermon Chrysostom said:
> My point is that, while by God's grace you are no longer in need of any proof, since you were firmly rooted in the faith, the inhabitants of Rome, in that at the time there was a great deal of impiety there, needed greater assistance. It's for this reason that both Peter and Paul and this man after them were all sacrificed there (15/PG 50:593).

Chrysostom interprets the meaning of the deaths of Peter, Paul, and Ignatius in Rome within his understanding of the context of their lifetimes. However, there were additional implications for the Christians of John's day. By strongly connecting Ignatius with Rome, Chrysostom is disconnecting Ignatius from the non-Nicene expressions of Christian faith. Rome was not in communion with any form of Arian beliefs after 360.

Now that we have identified Chrysostom's *In sanctum Ignatium martyrem* as an apologetic, we turn to address the question: why does John Chrysostom feel the need to offer a defense of Ignatius of Antioch before he concentrates specifically on Ignatius' willingness to surrender his life in service to Christ?

Why the Need to Defend Ignatius

Before directly answering this question, I first draw attention to the divided state of Christians in fourth-century Antioch. Furthermore, I highlight the interesting fact that when Chrysostom defends Ignatius, he offers a defense of Ignatius' character and not Ignatius' understanding of the relationship of the Son to the Father.

A Divided Antioch

The Christian community in fourth-century Antioch was severely divided. It is well known among scholars that by the mid 360s Antioch had three competing parties with three different bishops.[33] There was the Arian party with its own bishop Euzoius (bishop from 361-376). There were two Nicene parties each with their own bishop; one Nicene group was loyal to Meletius (to whom Chrysostom was an assistant for a time) and the other Nicene group was loyal to Paulinus (leader of the Eustathian community and recognized leader by the Roman church). These groups continued into John Chrysostom's own day. Furthermore, in 375 there was a fourth Christian group in Antioch for a brief time. This group was loyal to Apollinaris. Apollinaris was opposed to the Arians but had views about Christ different from that of the two Nicene factions. Apollinaris would ordain Vitalis as bishop of this group of Christians. In addition to internal divisions, Antioch was characterized by broader

[33] For detailed treatments of the division amongst Christians in fourth-century Antioch see Thomas A. Kopecek, *A History of Neo-Ariansim* (2 vols.; Cambridge, Mass.; The Philadelphia Patristic Foundation, 1979), 361-543; Smith, "The Ignatian Long Recension," 35-93. Smith's treatment is especially helpful and is relied on in some detail below. For a more condensed version see Wilken, *John Chrysostom and the Jews*, 10-16 and Kelly, *Golden Mouth*, 10-13. See also Kelley Spoerl, "The Schism in Antioch since Cavallera," in *Arianism after Arius: Essays on the Development of the Fourth Century Trinitarian Conflicts* (ed. Michel R. Barnes and Daniel H. Williams; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1993), 101-126.

religious division, as Christians, Jews, and pagans competed for the loyalty of Antiochene citizens.

It is not difficult then to imagine how controversy surrounding Antioch's premiere martyr – the one who knew first hand the apostles of Jesus – could develop in an atmosphere as contentious as the one found in fourth-century Antioch. As Robert Wilken points out, by John's day the general religious disposition of Antioch (e.g., Christian, Jew, pagan) was not yet decided. [34] Furthermore, the flavor of Christianity in Antioch and in the empire (Nicene or non-Nicene) was dependent on the emperor in power. There was no guarantee that the empire would remain Nicene after Theodosius' reign ended. Wilken says:

> Eventually John's party would become *the* Christian Church in the city, but in the years when he was being educated as a Christian, the years of his diaconate, and his first years as presbyter, the victory of the Nicene party was imperfect … John's homilies reflect an atmosphere in which he is striving to maintain the unity and cohesion of the followers of Flavian, to prevent attrition, and win the backsliders. His sermons have a defensive tone; he seems besieged by his foes.[35]

There was much still at stake in John's Antioch and Ignatius became a foundational figure in the midst of the division between Antiochene Christians. Therefore, John is at pains to claim Ignatius for his Nicene camp against the claims of his non-Nicene opponents.

While the divided state of fourth-century Antiochene Christians is well known, what is less discussed amongst scholars is that the presence of orthodox martyrs buried alongside heterodox martyrs was a major cause of concern for Flavian, John's bishop in Antioch. In *In ascensionem* (PG 50:443, 22-37), Chrysostom reports that Flavian, due to embarrassment over Nicene martyrs having been buried alongside Arian martyrs, raised the coffins of the Nicene representatives from beneath the floor of the martyrium. Thus the orthodox were now separated from the heretics.

Ignatius, the friend of the apostles, is a pivotal figure in the battle for the yet to be settled question of orthodox Christology. Just as Flavian raised the coffins of the orthodox martyrs from beneath the floor of the martyrium because they were in

---

[34] For a discussion of this issue see Wilken, *John Chrysostom and the Jews*, 16-26.

[35] Wilken, *John Chrysostom and the Jews*, 16.

the close company of defenders of non-Nicene Christology, so John finds it necessary to raise Ignatius' name from non-Nicene expressins of Christinaity.

This thesis sheds light on yet another aspect of the divided state of Antioch. I draw attention to the reality of two recensions of Ignatius' letters in competition with one another by the time of John Chrysostom. I noted in an above footnote Lightfoot thinks Chrysostom evidences knowledge of the Ignatian letters in his *In sanctum Ignatium martyrem*. My own reading of Chrysostom's sermon as well as Lightfoot's defense of his position leads me to agree with Lightfoot.[36] Due to the fact that Lightfoot is of the opinion that the Ignatian long recension is not quoted by other writers "till a much later period," he understands Chrysostom to be familiar with the Ignatian middle recension. [37]

In light of the historical reconstruction argued for in this thesis, it is important to test Lightfoot's conclusions to see if indeed it is the Ignatian middle recension that Chrysostom evidences knowledge of in his *In sanctum Ignatium martyrem*. After comparing the Ignatian texts, from both the middle and long recension, with those places in *In sanctum Ignatium martyrem* where Lightfoot sees evidence of Chrysostom's knowledge of the Ignatian letters, I conclude that Lightfoot is correct. It is indeed highly probable that Chrysostom refers to the Ignatian middle recension in his *In sanctum Ignatium martyrem*. As we shall see, however, I also think it highly likely that Chrysostom is also aware of the Ignatian long recension.

From Lightfoot's list of texts, I draw attention to three places where there is a clear allusion in Chrysostom's *In sanctum Ignatium martyrem* to a place in the Ignatian letters. I then draw attention to three places where there are verbal agreements between Chrysostom's *In sanctum Ignatium martyrem* and the Ignatian letters.

First, Lightfoot notes the presence of the metaphor of strings to a musical instrument found in *In sanctum Ignatium martyrem* and in *Ephesians* 4 as well as *Philadelphians* 1. *Ephesians* 4.1 of the middle recension is οὕτως συνήρμοσται τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ ὡς χορδαὶ κιθάρᾳ. In the long recension the text is exactly the same,

---

[36] Lightfoot points to eleven places in Chrysostom's *In sanctum Ignatium martyrem* where he sees evidence for Chrysostom's knowledge of Ignatius' letters. See Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, 2.1.165-166.

[37] Ibid., 274.

οὕτως συνήρμοσται τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ ὡς χορδαὶ κιθάρᾳ. In a similar fashion *Philadelphians* 1.2 reads, συνευρύθμισται γὰρ ταῖς ἐντολαῖς, ὡς χορδαῖς κιθάρα. The same text in the long recension is not exact but it is similar, συνήρμοσται γὰρ ταῖς ἐντολαῖς Κυρίου καὶ τοῖς δικαιώμασαν, ὡς χορδαὶ τῇ κιθάρᾳ. The text Lightfoot sees an allusion to in *In sanctum Ignatium martyrem* is καθάπερ γὰρ ἐν λύρᾳ μιᾷ διάφοροι μὲν αἱ νευραὶ μία δὲ ἡ ἁρμονία (4/PG.50.588).

Second, Lightfoot draws attention to another metaphor found in both *In sanctum Ignatium martyrem* and in *Polycarp* 2. This time the metaphor is that of a pilot guiding a ship during a storm. In *Polycarp* 2.3 of the middle recension we find, ὁ καιρὸς ἀπαιτεῖ σε, ὡς κυβερνῆται ἀνέμους καὶ ὡς χειμαζόμενος λιμένα, εἰς τὸ θεοῦ ἐπιτυχεῖν. There is an expansion of this text in the long recension, ὁ καιρὸς ἀπαιτεῖ σε εὔχεσθαι ὥσπερ γὰρ κυβερνήτῃ ἄνεμος συμβάλλεται, καὶ ὡς νηὶ χειμαζομένῃ λιμένες εὔθετοι εἰς σωτηρίαν, οὕτω καὶ σοὶ τὸ ἐπιτυχεῖν θεοῦ. Lightfoot thinks the following text then from *In sanctum Ignatium martyrem* is evidence of Chrysostom's knowledge of the Ignatian letters:

> ὥσπερ οὖν κυβερνήτην θαυμάζομεν, οὐκ ὅταν ἡσυχαζούσης τῆς θαλάττης καὶ ἐξ οὐρίων τῆς νηὸς φερομένης δυνηθῇ τοὺς ἐμπλέοντας διασῶσαι, ἀλλ' ὅταν μαινομένου τοῦ πελάγους, διανισταμένων τῶν κυμάτων, αὐτῶν τῶν ἔνδον ἐπιβατῶν στασιαζόντων, πολλοῦ χειμῶνος ἔσωθεν ἔξωθεν τοὺς ἐμπλέοντας πολιορκοῦντος, δυνηθῇ κατευθῦναι τὸ σκάφος μετὰ ἀσφαλείας ἁπάσης … (8/50.590)

Due to the lengthy nature of this text I provide Mayer's translation:

> And so, just as we marvel at the captain not when he is able to save the passengers when the sea is calm and the ship is being carried along by a fair wind, but when he is able to set the vessel to rights with complete safety when the sea is raging, the waves are towering, the marines on board are mutinying, a great storm is besieging the passengers from without and within …

The final allusion I provide from Lightfoot's list is Chrysostom's mention of the different churches that came out to meet Ignatius as he journeyed to martyrdom in Rome. In the middle recension of *Romans* 9.3 Ignatius writes, ἀσπάζεται ὑμᾶς τὸ ἐμὸν πνεῦμα καὶ ἡ ἀγάπη τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν τῶν δεξαμένων με εἰς ὄνομα Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, οὐκ ὡς παροδεύοντα καὶ γὰρ αἱ μὴ προσήκουσαί μοι τῇ ὁδῷ τῇ κατὰ σάρκα κατὰ πόλιν με προῆγον. The text is most similar in the long recension, ἀσπάζεται ὑμᾶς τὸ ἐμὸν πνεῦμα καὶ ἡ ἀγάπη τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν τῶν

δεξαμένων με εἰς ὄνομα Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, οὐκ ὡς παροδεύοντα καὶ γὰρ αἱ μὴ προσήκουσαί μοι τῇ ὁδῷ κατὰ σάρκα κατὰ πόλιν με προήγαγον. In *In sanctum Ignatium martyrem*, Chrysostom also makes reference to the cities coming out to assist Ignatius. He writes, αἱ γὰρ κατὰ τὴν ὁδὸν πόλεις συντρέχουσαι πάντοθεν ἤλειφον τὸν ἀθλητὴν καὶ μετὰ πολλῶν ἐξέπεμπον τῶν ἐφοδίων, εὐχαῖς καὶ πρεσβείαις αὐτῷ συναγωνιζόμεναι (13/50.592).

Now we turn to a sampling of places where Lightfoot points to the same or similar words in Chrysostom's *In sanctum Ignatium martyrem* and the Ignatian letters. The first example concerns Ignatius' words in *Romans* 2.2 that he has been summoned from the east to the west. In the middle recension of *Romans* 2.2, Ignatius writes, εἰς δύσιν ἀπὸ ἀνατολῆς μεταπεμψάμενος καλὸν τὸ δῦναι ἀπὸ κόσμου πρὸς θεόν, ἵνα εἰς αὐτὸν ἀνατείλω. *Romans* 2.2, in the long recension, contains an expansion. However, the east to west reference remains in place. It reads, εἰς δύσιν ἀπὸ ἀνατολῆς μεταπεμψάμενος τῶν ἑαυτοῦ παθημάτων μάρτυρα καλὸν τὸ διαλυθῆναι ἀπὸ κόσμου πρὸς θεόν, ἵνα εἰς αὐτὸν ἀνατείλω. Lightfoot observes this same east to west reference in *In sanctum Ignatium martyrem*, ταῦτα γὰρ καὶ τὰ τούτων πλείονα διὰ τῶν ἔργων αὐτοὺς παιδεύων ὥδευε, καθάπερ ἥλιός τις ἐξ ἀνατολῆς ἀνίσχων καὶ πρὸς τὴν δύσιν τρέχων, ... (14/50.593).

A second place Lightfoot notes same or similar vocabulary in the Ignatian letters and the *In sanctum Ignatium martyrem* centers on one word – ἔρως. In the middle recension of *Romans* 7.2, we hear Ignatius saying, ὁ ἐμὸς ἔρως ἐσταύρωται, καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν ἐν ἐμοὶ πῦρ φιλόυλον. The long recension of this text from *Romans* 7 is most similar, ὁ ἐμὸς ἔρως ἐσταύρωται, καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν ἐν ἐμοὶ πῦρ φιλοῦν τι. After quoting Ignatius as having said, "Bless those wild animals!" when he was about to die, Chrysostom then writes about Ignatius, τοιοῦτοι γὰρ οἱ ἐρῶντες.

The final place I highlight from Lightfoot's list of places where there exists parallel vocabulary contains a reference to Ignatius' relationship with the apostles. Ignatius writes in the middle recension of *Ephesians* 11.2, ἵνα ἐν κλήρῳ Ἐφεσίων εὑρεθῶ τῶν Χριστιανῶν, οἳ καὶ τοῖς ἀποστόλοις πάντοτε συνήνεσαν ἐν δυνάμει Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. There is a small addition to this text in the Ignatian long recension, ἵνα ἐν κλήρῳ Ἐφεσίων εὑρεθῶ τῶν Χριστιανῶν, οἳ καὶ τοῖς ἀποστόλοις πάντοτε συνῆσαν ἐν δυνάμει Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, Παύλῳ, Ἰωάννῃ, Τιμοθέῳ τῷ πιστοτάτῳ. In his *In sanctum Ignatium martyrem*, Chrysostom says

about Ignatius, συνεγένετο τοῖς ἀποστόλοις γνησίως, καὶ τῶν πνευματικῶν ναμάτων ἀπήλαυσεν (3/50.588).

I have provided a sampling of places where Lightfoot observes allusions and direct parallels in vocabulary between the Ignatian letters and Chrysostom's *In sanctum Ignatium martyrem*. When these six examples are evaluated in consideration with the other examples Lightfoot points to (not discussed above), I agree with Lightfoot "that this homily of S. Chrysostom shows an acquaintance with the Ignatian letters themselves."[38]

Furthermore, it is clear that Chrysostom quotes from the Ignatian middle recension in this homily, not the Ignatian long recension. Two important facts lead me to this conclusion. First, all of the allusions and vocabulary parallels emerge from the seven Eusebian Ignatian letters. There is no evidence of any of the Ignatian forgeries found in Chrysostom's *In sanctum Ignatium martyrem*. Second, from the data presented above, we saw no evidence that Chrysostom was referring to anything from the Ignatian long recension of the Eusebian seven letters. Many of the texts were similar in the Ignatian long recension. Where there were expansions there was nothing in Chrysostom's *In sanctum Ignatium martyrem* to indicate he preferred the Ignatian long recension over the Ignatian middle recension.

Even though Chrysostom does not cite from the Ignatian long recension, the question arises as to whether or not he knew the long recension. On the one hand, if I am correct about the genesis of the Ignatian long recension, we note that it emereged from a group that Chrysostom's own party, the neo-Nicenes, had been a part of. On the other hand, if my date for the Ignatian long recension of sometime around 350 or perhaps earlier is correct, then it is possible that it had fallen out of use by the time of Chrysostom's service in Antioch. Nonetheless I see no reason why Chryostom could not have been familiar with the Ignatian long recension in Antioch by 386. The reality that Chrysostom does not quote from it suggests that he rejected it in favour of the middle recension on theological grounds.

My thesis does not call for the Ignatian long recension to have had to originate in Antioch, as does Smith's thesis. Of course, if Smith is correct that the Ignatian long recension originated in Antioch then it is even more likely that

[38] Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, 2.1.166.

Chrysostom is familiar with it. Furthermore, Chrysostom's knowledge of the Ignatian long recension as well as the 'authentic' Ignatian letters would further support my argument that Chrysostom's *In sanctum Ignatium martyrem* evidences a keen awareness of the debates surrounding Ignatius during the fourth century.

If indeed Chrysostom knows the Ignatian long recension and as we saw Chrysostom only refers to the middle recension in his *In sanctum Ignatium martyrem*, the question arises: why might John think the Ignatian long recension belongs to the neo-Arians of his day – the Anomoeans (to be discussed in detail below)? This question is especially relevant because, according to my thesis, the Ignatian long recension was in existence long before the Anomoeans coalesced as a group.

In answer to this question I remind readers that the Ignatian long recension and the *Macrostichos* emphasis both the oneness of the Son with the Father as well as the subordination of the Son to the Father. The Ignatian long recension and the *Macrostichos*, in their attempt to recapture an earlier pre-Nicene manner of understanding the relationship of the Son to the Father, contain elements of both pro-Nicene Christology and non-Nicene Christology. This is why, after 359, some of the likely people responsible for drafting the *Macrostichos* cross over to the pro-Nicene camp and others identify with the Anomoean movement. Eudoxius, once again, is a good example of this. In 344 he was able to endorse a creed that stated the Son is like the Father in all things. However, when Eudoxius succeeds Leontius as bishop of Antioch, he becomes associated with the extreme Arian movement of Aetius.[39]

Even though the Ignatian long recension was in existence long before the Anomoeans of John Chrysostom's day, it is this group Chrysostom would have identified with the Ignatian long recension and not his own. The reason for this is due to the explicit and unqualified subordination of the Son to the Father found in the Ignatian long recension. I demonstrated this characteristic of the Ignatian long recension in chapter two. Chrysostom, like Athanasius, finds this explicit and unqualified subordination repulsive. I will provide a text that demonstrates Chrysostom's problems with the Son's subordination to the Father in the discussion

[39] See Socrates, *Historia ecclesiastica* 2.42-43. For a discussion of Eudoxius see Smith, "The Ignatian Long Recension," 55-59.

below. For now, however, I remind readers that Chrysostom's lineage as a church leader is traced back through Meletius of Antioch.

In early 361, Eudoxius moved from bishop in Antioch to become the bishop of Constantinople. The open see in Antioch then became a point of contention. The non-Nicene party installed Meletius who was advanced by Acacius of Caesarea. For his inaugural sermon, Meletius preached from the hotly contested text Proverbs 8.22 (Socrates, *Historia ecclesiastica* 2.43). To the chagrin of the non-Nicene party, which had been in power in Antioch since the deposition of Eustathius, Meletius' sermon appeared to promote a Nicene Christology.[40] Exactly what struck the non-Nicene party as uncomfortably Nicene about Meletius' sermon is difficult to determine. However, the issue could not have been the use of the word *homoousios* because we are not told that it was used in the sermon. Therefore, one likely possibility is that the problem with Meletius' sermon was a lack of an explicit subordination of the Son to the Father. After Meletius' disposition, however, loyalists formed around him. The two Nicene parties in Antioch – the Meletians and the Eustathians – were competing for recognition from Rome and the larger church. It was the Eustathian party that was recognized by Athanasius and Rome. However, most of Antioch and the east preferred Meletius and his party. It was Meletius who ordained John Chrysostom as a deacon in Antioch. Furthermore, during Meletius' third exile, his Nicene group was led by Diodore, the head of the catechetical school in Antioch, and the Antiochene presbyter Flavian.

Therefore, if I am correct that the problem with Meletius' sermon was a lack of an explicit subordinationism, then we see that even though Chrysostom's own Nicene lineage is a bit shady due to Meletius' association with non-Nicenes, Chrysostom's ancestry had problems with the subordination of the Son to the Father

[40] Theodoret informs us that the text under discussion was Proverbs 8.22 (*Historia ecclesiastica* 2.27). According to Theodoret the emperor requested anyone who was able to interpret Proverbs 8.22 to the church. Thus, not only did Meletius expound this text but so did Georgius of Laodicea and Acacius of Caesarea. The crowd was so pleased with Meletius' sermon that they applauded loudly and asked Meletius for a summary of his teaching. Meletius proceeded to hold up three fingers. He then withdrew two fingers and said, "In thought they are three but we speak as to one." In contrast with Theodoret, Sozomen makes no mention of the actual text under discussion. He does, however, agree that Meletius revealed himself to be of the Nicene position. When he did so, according to Sozomen, the archdeacon of the church covered Meletius' mouth with his hand in disgust. It was then that Meletius put forth three fingers, closed them, and then extended a single finger (*Historia ecclesiastica* 4.28). The problem that the Eustathians, under the leadership of Paulinus, had with Meletius and his followers was that Meletius had been ordained by non-Nicene bishops and his followers baptized by non-Nicene priests.

from the beginning. The explicit subordinationism of the Son to the Father found in the Ignatian long recension would have been extremely problematic for Chrysostom. Therefore, Chrysostom alludes to and draws texts from the Ignatian middle recension in his *In sanctum Ignatium martyrem*.

The Need to Defend Ignatius' Character

The results of this thesis indicate that Ignatius became a battleground upon which the fourth-century Arian controversy was fought. Because the Arian controversy was fought over the proper understanding of the relationship of the Son to the Father, it is interesting to note that in his sermon Chrysostom says nothing about Ignatius' Christology. Rather, Chrysostom is intent upon defending Ignatius' character as having been worthy of that of a Christian bishop. At first glance the nature of Chrysostom's defense seems puzzling. Upon further examination, however, it makes perfect sense.

John Chrysostom follows the example of Athanasius of Alexandria, and not that of Eusebius of Caesarea, in his handling of figures from the Christian past. Like Athanasius, Chrysostom's attitude towards earlier Christians was one of all or nothing. Either the past Christian leader was orthodox by the standards of John's late fourth-century theological climate or the past Christian leader was a heretic. In other words, unlike Eusebius of Caesarea, Chrysostom was not able to criticize aspects of a previous Christian writer while embracing something praiseworthy within the same Christian writer. Therefore, if Ignatius was an ancestor to the non-Nicene theological camp, as exemplified for example by the Ignatian long recension, then Ignatius was also of immoral character and should not even be classified a Christian. For Chrysostom, if Ignatius' character is acceptable then the logical conclusion is that his Christology is orthodox – it is Nicene.

In her article, "A Topography of Heresy: Mapping the Rhetorical Creation of Arianism," Rebecca Lyman sets out to clarify the manner of heresiological classification in Cyril of Jerusalem, Athanasius of Alexandria, and Gregory of Nyssa.[41] For our current discussion, Lyman's findings in relation to Cyril and Athanasius are relevant.

---

[41] Rebecca Lyman, "A Topography of Heresy: Mapping The Rhetorical Creation of Arianism," in *Arianism After Arius: Essays on the Development of the Fourth Century Trinitarian Conflicts* (ed. Michel R. Barnes and Daniel H. Williams; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1993), 45-62.

Lyman observes that for Cyril a true heretic has a close resemblance to the teachings of the Manichees. In relation to the fourth-century controversy over the relationship of the Son to the Father, however, Cyril does not refer to erroneous beliefs with any of the standard titles found in Athanasius – Arians, Sabellians, or followers of Paul of Samosata. Rather, in relation to these debates, Cyril "approached them cautiously and in a less polemical way, depending on established norms or perhaps creedal norms to contrast extremes."[42] Lyman goes on to say:

> These positions were held by 'heretics in disguise', those who appeared to be orthodox, yet were in danger of extreme and unacceptable teaching. For Cyril some humility about divine generation would have solved at least part of the theological controversies …, since speculation was fruitless on divine nature. However, he discussed and rejected these theological opinions without fixing them by classification with earlier teachers.[43]

Athanasius' manner of heresiological classification is found to be in stark contrast with that of Cyril. Whereas Cyril calls for humility and therefore allows for some diversity of thought in regards to the relationship of the Son to the Father, Athanasius does not allow for the same sort of diversity. Lyman summarizes Cyril's manner of heresiological classification as "heretics in disguise." She summarizes Athanasius' manner of heresiological classification as "demonic succession."

Lyman observes that in *Contra Arianos* 1.1 Athanasius links Arius to the devil and refers to Arius as the last great heretic. Athanasius goes on in *Contra Arianos* 1.2 to classify Arians with the Manichees. He says that for the Arians Christ is Arius and for the Manichees Christ is Mani. Thus, "By establishing a separate movement and demonic succession, Athanasius was able to construct a set of theological opinions and expectations of heresy which might be tied to Arius whatever the actual historical circumstances."[44] Furthermore, "in these works no legitimate theological discussion existed as in Cyril, but a confrontation of truth and falsehood, life and death."[45]

When we turn our attention back to John Chrysostom's *In sanctum Ignatium martyrem* and we consider what we know from his other writings, we find that

---

[42] Ibid., 53

[43] Ibid.

[44] Ibid., 54

[45] Ibid.

Chrysostom's own understanding of heresy is much more in line with that of Athanasius of Alexandria than that of Cyril of Jerusalem. Just as Athanasius says that his Arians are not even Christians like the Jews (e.g. *Contra Arianos* 1.1, 1.3) so does John Chrysostom, as we shall see momentarily.

In *De incomprehensibili* Chrysostom addresses the Arians of his day, otherwise known as the Anomoeans.[46] Margaret Amy Schatkin states that "Chrysostom purposefully overlooks the trinitarian heresy, and deals with the problem of God's knowability" in the first five sermons that make up the twelve sermons that modern scholars refer to as *De incomprehensibili*.[47] Her rhetoric, however, is misleading. In other words, it is a mistake to separate the issue of the knowability of God from that of the trinitarian debates. At the end of the fourth century, these two issues go hand and hand. The issue of God's knowability is the major face of extreme anti-Nicene Christology at the end of the fourth century. The extreme understanding of the Anomoeans (as perceived by proponents of Nicene Christology) that God's nature can be known by humanity coupled with their belief that the Son is of a different substance than the Father serves as a close parallel to the extreme nature of the beliefs of Arius himself during the first quarter of the fourth century (as perceived by proponents of emerging Nicene Christology).

Furthermore, Schatkin references two exceptions to her observation that Chrysostom purposefully overlooks the trinitarian heresy. She draws attention to homily 4.24-38/SC 4.234-283 and homily 5.9-23/SC 5.84-229.[48] These are lengthy

---

[46] For detailed treatments of the Anomoean movement see Kopecek, *A History of Neo-Arianism* and Richard Paul Vaggione, *Eunomius of Cyzicus and the Nicene Revolution* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000). See also R.P.C. Hanson, *The Search for the Christian Doctrine of God: The Arian Controversy 318-381* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2005; first published 1988), 598-617 and Frances M. Young with Andrew Teal, *From Nicaea to Chalcedon* (2nd ed.; Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2010), 135-169.

[47] Margaret Amy Schatkin, *John Chrysostom As Apologist* (Thessaloniki: Patriarchal Institute for Patristic Studies, 1987), 52. Homilies 1-5 were preached in Antioch in 386, Chrysostom's first year as priest. Homily 6 constitutes a break from the first five sermons in that it was delivered on the occasion of the feast day of Philogonius – bishop of Antioch in 320. This sermon was preached on December 20, 386. Homilies 7-10 too were delivered in Antioch during Chrysostom's first year. Homilies 11-12 were given approximately eleven years later in 398 during Chrysostom's tenure as bishop. There has been some debate over the authenticity of homily 9 – also referred to as *On Lazarus Four Days Dead*. However, the authenticity of homily 9 is not debated by modern scholars. For details surrounding the dating of these homilies as well as the issue of the authenticity of homily 9 see John Chrysostom, *On the Incomprehensible Nature of God* (trans. Paul W. Harkins; The Fathers of the Church 72; Washington: The Catholic University of America Press, 1982), 22-32. Harkins' introduction also provides a translation of Montfaucon's four notices to Chrysostom's twelve homilies on pp. 28-47.

[48] All translations of *De incomprehensibili* will be taken from Harkin's translation referenced in the above note. Harkins' translation of homilies 1-5 is based on the Greek text found in Jean

exceptions! I provide a brief sample from one of these two exceptions Schatkin herself notes:

> To say that the Son dwells in the bosom of the Father shows us and brings before our minds much more clearly his closeness to the Father than do the words "seated at the right hand." For the Father would not let himself have the Son in his bosom unless the Son were of the same essence, nor could the Son endure to dwell in the Father's bosom if the Son were of a nature inferior to the Father's (4.28/SC 4.278-283).[49]

The trinitarian controversies then that erupted at the beginning of the fourth century are still alive and well even after the Council of Constantinople under Theodosius I, in 381, pronounced Nicene Christology the orthodox faith of the Roman empire. It is true that the specific issues of the early and middle years of the controversy come to the forefront more so in homilies 7-12, where Chrysostom focuses on the glory of the only begotten Son. Nevertheless, in contrast with the position adopted by Schatkin, it seems that both a concern over the knowability of God and a concern to demonstrate the Son's same essence with the Father occupy the mind of Chrysostom in the first five sermons as well.

Chrysostom's tone with the Anomoeans begins on a conciliatory note in his first sermon due to the fact that his opponents are in the congregation. He says to his congregation in Antioch:

> For a long time now, like a mother in labor, I felt anguish in my desire to bring forth these arguments and present them to you. But I hesitated and held back when I saw that many who were sick with this disease were listening to my words and find pleasure in what I said. Since I did not wish to frighten off my prey (καὶ οὐ βουλόμενος ἀποσοβῆσαι τὴν θήραν), for a time I restrained my tongue from engaging in these contests with them (1.38/SC 1.335-340).

However, the Anomoeans had expressed their desire to hear Chrysostom defend his position that the essence of God, while being one with that of the Son, is incomprehensible. Chrysostom expresses great joy over the invitation from his

---

Chrysostome, *Sur l'incompréhensibilité de Dieu* (ed. Anne-Marie Malingrey; Sources chrétiennes 28bis.; Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1970). His translation of homilies 6-12 is based on the Greek text found in *Patrologia Graeca* 48. When I cite texts I will give the reference from Harkin's translation followed by the Greek text.

[49] In this text, Chrysostom acknowledges that to speak of the Son as in the bosom of the Father is crude. However, if the imagery is understood correctly it illustrates the oneness of the Son with the Father. Another example of crude imagery, if taken literally, is the idea of being seated at the right hand of God. Again, however, if interpreted properly the imagery makes known the equality of the Son to the Father.

opponents to defend his own understanding of orthodox belief. He then says about his battle with his opponents:

> I did not take up these weapons to strike my adversaries down but to lift them up as they lie prostrate … These weapons do not inflict wounds; rather they cure those who are sick. Therefore, let us not be provoked with these men, let us not use anger as an excuse, but let us talk with them gently and with kindness (1.39-40/SC 1.345-353).

In the second homily, Chrysostom's tone takes a remarkable shift. It moves from conciliatory to down right nasty. He begins this exhortation with, "Come now, let us again gird ourselves against the unbelieving and infidel Anomoeans (πρὸς τοὺς ἀπίστους Ἀνομοίους)" (2.1/SC 2.1-2). In light of this language, it comes as no surprise that Chrysostom directs his congregation to pray for the salvation of these nonbelievers. He says:

> Therefore, to prevent ourselves the greatest harm, let us avoid any association with them (φεύγωμεν αὐτῶν τὰς συνουσίας). Let us only pray for them and beseech the loving-kindness of God, who wishes all men to be saved and come to a knowledge of the truth, to free them from this deceit and snare of the devil, and to lead them back to the light of knowledge … (2.55/SC 2.531-536).

In fact, Chrysostom regularly requests prayer for these heretics (3.31/SC 3.346-347; 5.43/SC 5.421-428).

What exactly is the nature of the heretical belief that Chrysostom is combating? Chrysostom asks this question rhetorically in his second sermon. He says, "What, then, is the root of these evils? A mere human has the boldness to say: 'I know God as God himself knows himself'" (2.17/SC 2.157-159). In the course of his demonstration that even the angels and spiritual powers, as well as the prophets and apostles do not comprehend God completely, Chrysostom repeatedly accuses the Anomoeans of meddling (περιεργία) when they claim to know all there is to know about God (2.22/SC 2.190-193, 24/SC 2.219-222, 28/SC 2.267-268, 31/SC 2.292-295, 33/SC 2.309-312, 38-39/SC 2.357-379; 4.5/SC 4.36-39; 5.29/SC 5.279-283).[50]

---

[50] The Anomoeans' belief that the Son is of a different essence than that of the Father can be accurately labelled neo-Arian, as Arius himself held to this same belief. However, even Arius, in contrast with the likes of Aetius and Eunomius, believed that God was not comprehensible. Richard Vaggione's concise summary in the follow sentence is well put: "Eunomius represents the second generation of Arian thinkers, that is, the generation which attempted to carry on the theological work of Arius and Eusebius of Nicomedia after the break-up in the 340s of the original anti-Nicene coalition." See Eunomius, *The Extant Works* (Text and Trans, Richard Paul Vaggione; Oxford Early Christian Texts; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1987), xiii.

In his dealing with the events surrounding Jesus' raising of Lazarus from the dead, as found in John 11, Chrysostom places the Anomoeans in the same category as the Jews. Chrysostom announces:

> Today, Lazarus who was raised from the dead, gives us the solution to many different problems. However, the passage which was read has also, in some ways, given an opportunity for argument to the heretics and a pretext to the Jews to oppose our position. However, their argument and opposition are not founded in the truth – heaven forbid! – but arise from their malicious souls (9.1/PG 48.779).

The issue at stake here is that the Anomoeans argue that the Son cannot be like the Father because Christ needed to pray to God in order to raise Lazarus from the dead (9.1/PG 48.779). In a similar fashion, the Jews deny that Jesus was God because, in John 11, Jesus had to ask Mary and Martha where Lazarus lay (9.4/PG 48.780).

We find, therefore, that like Athanasius, as I demonstrated in the previous chapter and as Lyman demonstrates in her article, John Chrysostom takes an all or nothing approach to non-Nicene Christological understanding. For Chrysostom, the Anomoeans are infidels and non-believers like the Jews. There can be no middle ground.

Therefore, we must assume that if Ignatius is a forerunner to non-Nicene Christology then Ignatius cannot even be labeled a Christian, and therefore completely unsuited to be a bishop. Thus, in his sermon on Ignatius, Chrysostom is keen to defend Ignatius' character and qualifications for Christian leadership because if Ignatius is indeed a Christian then there is no way he can be a forerunner to non-Nicene theology.

The Reason

John Chrysostom finds it necessary to offer an initial defense of Ignatius of Antioch in his *In sanctum Ignatium martyrem* because by the end of the fourth century Ignatius had become a contentious figure. This reality compliments nicely the major finding of this thesis as a whole. As the Arian controversy was fought, Ignatius became a battleground upon which the fighting occurred. We have discovered that it is not the case that Ignatius suddenly appeared as an attractive figure for both the Nicene and the non-Nicene camps in the last fifteen years of the fourth century during John Chrysostom's service as a presbyter in Antioch and then bishop in Constantinople. Rather, by the time of John Chrysostom's *In sanctum*

Ignatium martyrem, the controversy over who had the legitimate rightful claim to Ignatius was reaching a boiling point.

We now know that the only surviving Greek manuscript of the Ignatian middle recension comes to us riddled with textual alterations that can be traced back to the fourth-century Arian controversy. I have suggested that these Arian controversy variants identified in the opening chapter of this thesis likely emerged by the middle of the fourth century. In addition, after demonstrating the strong link between the Christology of the Macrostichos Creed of Antioch 344 with the Ignatian long recension, and the strong possibility that the Ignatian interpolator/forger was attempting to restore an authentic Ignatian voice, it is indeed safe to conclude that these fourth-century alterations to the authentic Ignatian middle recension occurred during the first half of the fourth century. The important point to make is that they were in play long before Chrysostom's rise to power during the last quarter of the fourth century. Furthermore, we have seen Eusebius of Caesarea give much attention to Ignatius of Antioch in his *Historia ecclesiastica* at the beginning of the fourth century, and we found Athanasius of Alexandria offering his own defense of Ignatius, in his *De synodis*, at a time when Chrysostom was only about ten years old.[51] By the time of John Chrysostom's *In sanctum Ignatium martyrem* the Ignatian controversy, within the Arian controversy, was well established.

Though the Ignatian problem was well established, it was not known to all of John's congregants.[52] This is the reason Chrysostom's defense of Ignatius is implicit and not explicit. For those who were aware of the battle over Ignatius, Chrysostom's *In sanctum Ignatium martyrem* served to reinforce the belief that Ignatian Christology was compatible with Nicene Christology. For those still unaware of the controversy surrounding the rightful claim to Ignatius, Chrysostom's sermon may have simply seemed a touch more flowery than usual. Or the lay people in Chrysostom's congregation may have thought nothing of the emphasis on Ignatius' virtue in the opening half of the sermon because Chrysostom's sermons were characterized by all the marks of a fourth-century rhetorician anyway. In his sermon

---

[51] For a discussion that dates Chrysostom's birth to *circa* 349 see Kelly, *Golden Mouth*, 4 and 296-298.

[52] In relation to "John's congregants" see Ramsay MacMullen, "The Preacher's Audience (350-400)," *Journal of Theological Studies* 40.2 (1989): 503-511. In this article, based on material found in the writings and sermons of Chrysostom, MacMullen reconstructs what the typical audience gathered to hear a fourth-century preacher might have looked liked.

then Chrysostom is careful not to grant more exposure to the fourth-century debate over Ignatius' orthodoxy in order to protect Ignatius' reputation.[53]

The practice of suppressing perceived erroneous opinions, in order to prevent the further dissemination of that opinion, is commonplace in early Christianity. Socrates, the church historian, records a letter from Constantine to the bishop and the people in his *Historia ecclesiastica* 1.9. In this letter Constantine states that Arius' written works should be burned just like the writings of Porphyry had been destroyed. Eusebius quotes Dionysius of Alexandria's letter to Philemon the Roman presbyter entitled "On Baptism" (*Historia ecclesiastica* 7.7). In this letter Dionysius is combating the Sabellian heresy. Dionysius says that he has read the works of the heretics and thus he "polluted" his soul for a little while. I suggest that it is this prominent mentality, found within the late antique world, that accounts for Chrysostom's implicit defense of Ignatius of Antioch in his *In sanctum Ignatium martyrem*. For those congregants unaware that Christian leaders were fighting over Ignatius, Chrysostom sees no need to expose them to the Ignatian controversy of his day.

There is relevance to my argument here in Aideen Hartney's treatment of "Christian Preaching and its Audience" in her book *John Chrysostom and the Transformation of the City*.[54] She notes that a Christian congregation, gathered to be instructed by a sermon, was diverse. Some participants in the congregation were in opposition to Christianity. Others were people that had demonstrated a commitment to the faith, but that commitment was not at all zealous. There were other people who simply knew nothing about the Christian faith and therefore were in need of basic instruction. In addition I might add, as observed earlier in this chapter, in relation to Chrysostom's *De incomprehensibili* there were groups considered heretical by the agreed upon orthodoxy of late antique Rome.

In light of this diversity, Hartney concludes:

---

[53] For another argument, from ancient Christian literature, that an author produced a document intended to include two groups of people – those with an awareness of additional information and those without that information – and, at the same time, would not exclude the group without the awareness of the additional information see Richard Bauckham, "John for Readers of Mark," in *The Gospels for All Christians: Rethinking the Gospel Audiences* (ed. Richard Bauckham; Grand Rapids and Cambridge: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1998), 147-171.

[54] Aideen M. Hartney, *John Chrysostom and the Transformation of the City* (London: Duckworth, 2004), chapter 3.

> Thus any Christian homily could be read and understood at several levels, and when it was presented orally, the assembled congregation would presumably adopt whichever interpretation best suited their position within the ranks of the faithful. In order to function adequately in such a multi-layered guiding role, the Christian preacher needed particularly advanced yet subtle powers of public persuasion. It was a task not necessarily suited to all members of the clergy, and indeed not even assigned to all.[55]

It is this dynamic of a Christian homily delivered and received on different levels, depending upon the degree of knowledge concerning the controversy of Ignatius that had developed by the end of the fourth century, that also accounts for the implicit nature of Chrysostom's defense of Ignatius.

Conclusion

The goal of the concluding chapter of this thesis has been two-fold: 1) to demonstrate that Chrysostom's *In sanctum Ignatium martyrem* serves as an apology for Ignatius of Antioch and 2) to state why Chrysostom feels the need to defend Ignatius at the close of the fourth century.

There was a need to demonstrate the apologetic nature of Chrysostom's sermon because his defense of Ignatius is implicit and not explicit. In order to demonstrate that Chrysostom's sermon is indeed a defense of Ignatius of Antioch, I drew attention to *Against the Games and Theatres* and *On Eleazar and the Seven Boys*. We saw that the same rhetorical technique of anticipating someone's objection with a rhetorical question is found in all three sermons. The difference is that in *Against the Games and Theatres* and *On Eleazar and the Seven Boys* Chrysostom's defense of his point of view that Christians should not attend the games and the theatres, as well as his defense of the Maccabean martyrs as Christian martyrs, is not implicit. Rather, it is explicit from the beginning to the end of the sermon. Via this process, we observed that before Chrysostom can place the spotlight on Ignatius' actual martyrdom in Rome, he must clear the ground with a defense of Ignatius' character. The reason for the implicit nature of Chrysostom's defense of Ignatius is due to the fact that he does not want to expose the controversy over Ignatius to those in his congregation who are unaware of it. We saw that this was a common strategy amongst Christians from antiquity.

---

[55] Ibid., 35.

If we had started our study of Ignatius of Antioch and the Arian Controversy with Chrysostom's *In sanctum Ignatium martyrem* we would have been puzzled by this need to defend Ignatius. In fact, due to the implicit nature of the defense found in *In sanctum Ignatium martyrem*, we may have reached conclusions about the beginning of this sermon contradictory to those found in this chapter. Yet, the results found in the first four chapters of this thesis enabled us to clearly understand that Chrysostom is offering an apology for his city's second-century martyr. In fact, with the foundation provided by the first four chapters, this conclusion makes good sense.

Nonetheless, I added further argumentation to that provided by earlier chapters. I drew attention to the divided state of Antiochene Christians in the fourth century. Furthermore, we considered the reality that Chrysostom says nothing about Ignatius' Christology. This was initially perplexing because the major fourth-century controversy was Christological. However, by comparison with Athanasius of Alexandria we concluded that, like Athanasius, Chrysostom views past Christians as either orthodox or heterodox. There is no middle ground as there is with the likes of Eusebius of Caesarea and Cyril of Jerusalem. Thus, like Athanasius, the heretic is a non-Christian and therefore his whole character is of a demonic nature. This is why Chrysostom concentrates on aligning Ignatius of Antioch with the qualifications for a bishop found in Paul's letter to Titus and his first letter to Timothy.

Now we turn our attention to brief concluding remarks directed at the results of this thesis as a whole.

CONCLUSION

We come now to the end of our study devoted to Ignatius of Antioch and the Arian controversy. The primary gain to scholarship this thesis provides is the demonstration of a fourth-century controversy surrounding the second-century martyr Ignatius of Antioch. I have argued that Ignatius of Antioch was one battleground upon which the Arian controversy was waged. In the process of this demonstration, I have offered an alternative historical reconstruction of the role of Ignatius of Antioch in the fourth century to that of James D. Smith III. In contrast with my interpretation of the evidence that Ignatius of Antioch was a battleground figure during the fourth century, Smith contends that Ignatius was an obscure figure until the rediscovery of his relics in the cemetery just outside the Daphnitic gate sometime during the period 364-373.[1]

The details of my argument are found in the preceding chapters. Here I offer a summary of the major points made in this thesis that illuminate the battleground that Ignatius of Antioch became in the fourth century. I am persuaded that Smith's thesis that Ignatius of Antioch was an obscure figure until the last thirty-six years, or possibly even the last twenty-seven years, of the fourth century is impossible.

Eusebius of Caesarea

We saw that Eusebius of Caesarea gives considerable attention to Ignatius of Antioch. He mentions Ignatius briefly in his *Chronicon*. Eusebius also makes a brief mention of Ignatius on three different occasions in his *Historia ecclesiastica* (3.22, 3.38, and 5.8). In yet a fourth reference, Eusebius quotes at length from Ignatius' letter to the Roman church (3.36). Eusebius also quotes *Ephesians* 19.1 in his *Questions and Answers on the Genealogy of our Savior Addressed to Stephanus*. We heard Timothy Barnes date the first edition of Eusebius' *Chronicon* and his *Historia*

[1] James David Smith III, "The Ignatian Long Recension and Christian Communities in Fourth Century Syrian Antioch" (Th.D. diss., Harvard University, 1986). I note a similar type of scholarly disagreement pointed to by Aideen M. Hartney. After a careful consideration of the evidence, Hartney can not agree with Peter Brown's assessment that "Chrysostom's preaching sounded the death knell of the ancient city." Rather, according to Hartney "Chrysostom does not speak of an entirely new city where everyone will be poor and humble, but rather a more ordered version of what currently exists, and where there will always be a more well-off group of people who will bestow the alms needed by their poorer counterparts." She goes on to list numerous other places where she reads the evidence in the entirely opposite direction than Brown. See Aideen M. Hartney, *John Chrysostom and the Transformation of the City* (London: Gerald Duckworth & Co. Ltd., 2004), 190-191. In a similar manner I have offered an entirely alternative historical reconstruction of Ignatius' place in the fourth century to that of James D. Smith III.

ecclesiastica to the years just before 300.[2] Barnes dates Eusebius' *Questions and Answers on the Genealogy of our Savior Addressed to Stephanus* to around 320.[3] With this much attention given to Ignatius in the writings of one who was such a key figure in the early stages of the fourth-century Christological debates, it is difficult to see how Ignatius could have been obscure anywhere in the eastern half of the Roman empire. This is especially so given the popularity of his theological works and in particular his *Historia ecclesiastica*. Furthermore, due to the lamentable relationship Eusebius shared with Eustathius of Antioch (bishop 324-331 or 324-327)[4] and the laudable relationship he shared with Paulinus of Tyre (predecessor or successor to Eustathius as bishop of Antioch)[5], it is hard to believe that the churches in Antioch would not have been acquainted with Ignatius of Antioch via Eusebius' *Historia ecclesiastica* alone.

Fourth-Century Ignatian Quotations and Allusions

Besides Eusebius of Caesarea, we observed that there are numerous additional fourth-century personalities who either mention Ignatius by name, or, at least arguably include allusions to Ignatius' works in their own. For example, Athanasius of Alexander calls Ignatius by name and quotes from Ignatius' letter to the Ephesian church in his *De synodis*. We saw that it is significant that Athanasius does so in the context of an argument from authority which implies that Athanasius' opponents also grant to Ignatius a place of great importance.

The most interesting figure, in light of the historical reconstruction found in this thesis, which may allude to Ignatius is Cyril of Jerusalem. If indeed Cyril is alluding to Ignatius' writings there is no twenty-year period in the fourth century

---

[2] Timothy D. Barnes, *Constantine and Eusebius* (Cambridge, Mass., and London: Harvard University Press, 1981), 111 and 277.

[3] Ibid., 122.

[4] For the debate over the date of Eustathius' deposition as bishop of Antioch see Henry Chadwick, "The Fall of Eustathius of Antioch," *Journal of Theological Studies* 49 (1948): 27-35 and R.P.C. Hanson, *The Search for the Christian Doctrine of God: The Arian Controversy 318-381* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1988; repr. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Baker Academic, 2005), 209-210. For a more recent discussion see Sara Parvis, *Marcellus of Ancyra and the Lost Years of the Arian Controversy 325-345* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006), 101-107. She favors a date of October 327 for the deposition of Eustathius.

[5] For a detailed discussion over the issue of whether Paulinus of Tyre preceded or succeeded Eustathius as bishop of Antioch see Richard Burgess, *Studies in Eusebian and post-Eusebian Chronology* (Historia – Einzelschriften Series 135; Franz Steiner Verlag, 1999), 184-191. Burgess concludes that Paulinus preceded Eustathius. Whatever the case, Eusebius dedicated book ten of his *Historia ecclesiastica* to Paulinus as well as his *Onomasticon*.

where Ignatius is not considered a figure of interest and authority. In relation to Cyril's use of Ignatius we concluded that it is possible, though not definite, that he refers to the long recension of Ignatius' works. Cyril's own Christology would have been compatible with that found in the Ignatian long recension. Therefore, Cyril may serve as additional evidence for an earlier dating of the long recension than Smith allows.

Ignatius of Antioch: A Battleground

However, the major focus of the argument found in this thesis is not that Ignatius of Antioch was a well-known personality throughout the fourth century. The major contribution of this thesis is that Ignatius of Antioch represents one battleground upon which fourth-century theologians fought for their understanding of correct belief concerning the relationship of the Son to the Father.

In the opening chapter of this thesis I drew attention to fourteen places, within the textual tradition of the middle recension of Ignatius of Antioch's letters, where Ignatius is said to have referred to Jesus as "God." Of these fourteen places, we observed that three of them contain no variants (*Eph.* 18.2, *Rom.* Inscription (1), and *Poly.* 8.1). The remaining eleven do contain significant variants (*Eph.* 1.1; *Rom.* *6.3*; *Eph.* Inscription; *Rom.* Inscription (2), 3.3, and 7.3; *Trall.* 7.1; *Smyrn.* 10.1, 6.1, 1.1 and *Rom.* 9.1). The point of this discussion was to lay out the evidence for what I conclude represents a scribal intensification of Ignatius' God language due to Christological concerns of the fourth century.

I then turned attention to four places within the textual tradition of the Ignatian middle recension where Christological variants related to specific texts can be traced to the fourth-century Arian controversy with a high degree of certainty (*Magn.* 8.2; *Eph.* 7.2; *Magn.* 7.1; *Magn.* 13.2). I referred to these as "Free Standing Arian Controversy Variants." I employed this rubric in order to indicate that the variants corresponding to these texts can be traced back to the Arian controversy in and of themselves. This is in contrast with the "God Language Variants," which can only be traced to fourth-century with confidence when placed alongside the "Free Standing Arian Controversy Variants."

The primary goal of this chapter was to demonstrate that the Ignatian middle recension comes to us with battle wounds that can be traced back to the Arian controversy. In contrast with the Ignatian long recension, however, it is the pro-

Nicene party that is responsible for these remarkable variants. Furthermore, because some of these variants can be traced to concerns over Marcellus of Ancyra, I concluded that these variants began to enter into the manuscript tradition sometime during the first half of the fourth century.

In my efforts to bring to light the battle for Ignatius in the fourth century, I then dedicated two chapters to the Ignatian long recension. I argued that the Ignatian long recension represents a response to the work of the pro-Nicene party on the seven 'authentic' letters of Ignatius. The non-Nicene person or persons responsible for the interpolations and the forgeries found in the Ignatian long recension went about their work due to their perception of textual corruptions (unintentional) and textual alterations (intentional) to the authentic letters of Ignatius. I referred to the efforts of the interpolator/forger with the rubrics "Christological Demarcation" and "Basic Clarification." In addition, I concluded that the Ignatian long recension was composed in the following manner: the person responsible for the interpolations and the forgeries went about his his work by first cleaning up and clarifying the text of the middle recension. He then added the interpolations and the forgeries.

In contrast with the consensus view that the Ignatian long recension emerged sometime during the last quarter of the fourth century, I argued that it is likely, though not definite, that the Ignatian long recension emerged shortly after the *Macrostichos* Creed of Antioch 344. The reason I think this likely is because of the Christological match between the *Macrostichos* and the Ignatian long recension. After detailing the Christological similarities between these two documents, I then embraced the view of Arnold Amelungk that the *Macrostichos* was a source for the interpolator/forger of the Ignatian long recension.[6] If this is the case, there is no reason why the Ignatian long recension could not have been in circulation by 350, perhaps a year or two sooner.

My interpretation of the Ignatian long recension parted company with that of James D. Smith III on two fronts. The first, of course, is the date. He dates it to sometime between 364-373. While a date this late is still a possibility within the historical reconstruction of this thesis, a date of approximately fifteen to twenty-five years earlier is made possible and seems plausible. In light of the historical

---

[6] Arnold Amelungk, *Untersuchungen Uber Pseudo-Ignatius* (Marburg: G. Otto's Hofbcchdruckerei In Darmstadt, 1899; repr., Kessinger Publishing's Legacy Reprints), 71.

reconstruction found in this thesis, it is significant that Smith makes no mention of Arnold Amelungk's work anywhere in his thesis. Second, Smith labels the Christology of the Ignatian long recension with an established fourth-century category. Smith calls the Christology of the Ignatian long recension *homoian*.[7] As such he embraces the opinion of Lightfoot that the Ignatian long recension represents an "eirencon."[8] In contrast with Smith and Lightfoot, I have argued that the Christology of the Ignatian long recension (and the *Macrostichos*), comes from the time before the clear differentiation of the Christology of the non-Nicenes from 357 onwards. The authors of the *Macrostichos* and, I have argued, the Ignatian long recension, are both trying to recover what they see as an earlier manner of Christological thinking still, before the Nicene crisis erupted. This manner of thinking enabled the paradox of the Son's equality to the Father and the Son's subordination to the Father to remain in place. In chapter two, I demonstrated this pattern of the Son's equality and subordination found within the Ignatian long recension via a Christological profile. In chapter three, I pointed to the same pattern in the *Macrostichos*.

Not only does Eusebius of Caesarea engage with Ignatius of Antioch in the early fourth century but so does Athanasius of Alexandria engage with Ignatius of Antioch towards the close of the 350s in his *De synodis*. While Eusebius gives us more information about Ignatius of Antioch in his writings, Athanasius explicitly draws Ignatius into his corner as he battles for the accuracy of the Nicene *homoousios* even though *homoousios* had been declared out of bounds during the third-century debates over Paul of Samosota. Thus we were given more exposure to the battle over Ignatius in the fourth century via the embrace of Ignatius by the Nicene Athanasius of Alexandria and the non-Nicene Eusebius of Caesarea.

According to my reading of the evidence, all of the above fourth-century turmoil over Ignatius occurred many years before James D. Smith III suggests Ignatius became a popular figure. Smith suggests that Ignatius was obscure before the period 364-373. Yet I have argued that pro-Nicene proponents had intentionally altered the middle recension of Ignatius' letters sometime during the debates surrounding Marcellus of Ancyra, which were at their most intense from 336-345.

---

[7] See Smith, "The Ignatian Long Recension," 94-129.

[8] J.B. Lightfoot, *The Apostolic Fathers* (Part 2, 3 vols.; *Ignatius, St. Polycarp*; 2nd ed.; London and New York: Macmillan and Co., 1889), 2.1.272.

Furthermore I see no reason why the Ignatian long recension could not date to a similar time period due to its close affinity with the *Macrostichos* of Antioch 344. Thus, the Ignatian long recension was in circulation soon after the pro-Nicene tampering with the Ignatian middle recension. And all of this could have occurred as early as the 350s, or even a couple of years sooner, but certainly before 364.

As we moved into the evidence found in the time period that Smith assigns to the reemergence of Ignatius' popularity – the last quarter of the fourth century – alarms continued to sound in relation to Smith's thesis that Ignatius was an obscure figure for most of the fourth century. To the contrary, I argued that Ignatius was still such a battleground figure during the last quarter of the fourth century that John Chrysostom, presbyter in Antioch 386-397, found it necessary to defend Ignatius' character before he could put him forward as a model Christian in his *In sanctum Ignatium martyrem*.

We heard Smith date Chrysostom's *In sanctum Ignatium* to sometime after Jerome's *De viris illustribus*. It is here that Jerome mentions Ignatius' remains lying in Antioch outside the Daphnitic gate in the cemetery. Smith dates *De viris illustribus* to 392. Therefore Chryostom's sermon could be as late as the last year of John Chrysostom's service as presbyter in Antioch – 397. Yet, Smith makes no mention of Eduard Schwartz's *Christliche und Judische Ostertafeln*.[9] In this work, Schwartz persuasively argues that Chrysostom preached his *In sanctum Ignatium* on 17 October 386 – the first year of Chrysostom's service as presbyter in Antioch. A date of post 392 for Chrysostom's *In sanctum Ignatium* is friendlier towards Smith's theory of Ignatius' obscurity until 364-373 because by the time of *In sanctum Ignatium* there is clearly a cult of Ignatius. A date of 386 does not necessarily negate Smith's theory but it is does raise a question that threatens Smith's theory: how many years before 386 was a cult of Ignatius in existence?

While a date of 386 *may* not prove Smith's theory wrong, the existence of *British Museum Add.* 12,150 a well-known Syriac manuscript dated to 411, with the dates for the church's remembrance of Pelagia's martyrdom on 8 October and Ignatius' martyrdom on 17 October does. This manuscript, discussed in detail in the concluding chapter, serves as evidence that Ignatius' martyrdom was a fixture on the

[9] Eduard Schwartz, *Christliche und Judische Ostertafeln* (Der Königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften Zur Göttingen Philologisch-Historische Klasse; Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, 1905).

ecclesiastical calendar by the mid fourth century. I note that this date of the mid-fourth century coincides nicely with my proposal that the Ignatian long recension could have been in circulation by then. It appears that there was much interest in Ignatius of Antioch by the middle of the fourth century.

Ignatius of Antioch and the Arian Controversy

There has been no dearth of scholarly interest in Ignatius of Antioch or in the Arian controversy because both represent captivating areas of inquiry. However, until now, there has been no detailed investigation into the role Ignatius played in the Arian controversy over the course of the entire fourth century. I do not mean to suggest that my work is comprehensive. It is not. There are numerous leads that other scholars could pursue in relation to Ignatius' fourth-century life. I will be grateful if my work inspires such pursuits. Nonetheless, until now the work that has been done on the Ignatius of the fourth century has been mostly limited to the Ignatian long recension. And even here there has not been an abundance of research carried out. As stated in the introduction, I suspect this is due to current scholarly interest in the historical Ignatius that has been maintained since Lightfoot.

The goal of this thesis has been to demonstrate that there is much more to say about the fourth-century Ignatius than his manifestation in the Ignatian long recension. Indeed, the Ignatian long recension represents just one manner in which Ignatius was used during the fourth century. Some of the debates remain hidden and we have to rely for a glimpse of them on surmise and allusion. But I trust this thesis has clearly demonstrated that we can now say that Ignatius of Antioch was one battleground upon which proponents of pro-Nicene and non-Nicene Christologies faced off.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Critical Texts

Athenagoras. *Legatio Pro Christianis*. Edited by Miroslav Marcovich. Patristische Texte und Studien. Berlin and New York: Walter De Gruyter, 1990.

Athanasius. *Werke*. Edited by Hans-George Opitz et al. 3 vols. Berlin and Leipzig: Walter de Gruyter & Co., 1943ff.

Cyril of Jerusalem. *Opera Quae Supersunt Omnia*. Edited by W.K. Reischl and J. Rupp. Munich: 1848-1860.

Eunomius. *The Extant Works*. Text and Translation by Richard Paul Vaggione. Oxford Early Christian Texts. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1987.

Eusebius of Caesarea. *Historia ecclesiastica*. Edited by Kirsopp Lake. The Loeb Classical Library. vol.1, Cambridge and London: Harvard University Press, 2001. First published 1926.

Dionysius of Alexandria. *The Letters of Dionysius of Alexandria*. Edited by Charles Lett Feltoe. Cambridge Patristic Texts. Cambridge: The University Press, 1904.

Eusebius of Caesarea. *Werke*. Vol. 1. *Über das Leben Constantins, Constantis Rede an die Heilige Versammlung, Tricennatsrede an Constantin*. Edited by Ivar Heikel. Die Griechischen Christlichern Schriftsteller der Ersten Jahrhunderte. Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1902.

_____. *Werke*. Vol. 4. *Gegen Marcell, Uber die Kirchliche Theologie, Die Fragmente Marcells*. Edited by Erich Klostermann. Die Griechischen Christlichern Schriftsteller der Ersten Jahrhunderte. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1972.

_____. *Werke*. Vol. 6. *Die Demonstratio Evangelica*. Edited by Ivar Heikel. Die Griechischen Christlichern Schriftsteller der Ersten Drei Jahrhunderte. Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1913.

_____. *Werke*. Vol. 7. *Die Chronik des Hieronymi (Hieronymi Chronicon)*. Edited by R. Helm. Die Griechischen Christlichern Schriftsteller der Ersten Jahrhunderte. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1956.

_____. *Werke*. Vol. 8. *Die Praeparatio Evangelica*. Edited by Karl Mras. Die Griechischen Christlichern Schriftsteller der Ersten Jahrhunderte. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1954.

_____. *Kirchengeschichte*. Edited by Eduard Schwartz. Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1922.

Jean Chrysostome. *Sur l'incompréhensibilité de Dieu*. Edited by Anne-Marie Malingrey. Sources chrétiennes 28bis. Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1970.

Theodoret of Cyrus. *Eranistes*. Critical Text and Prolegomena by Gerard H. Ettlinger. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1975.

The Apostolic Fathers

Bihlmeyer, Karl, ed. *Die Apostolischen Väter*. 2 vols. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1956.

Donaldson, James and Alexander Roberts. "The Epistles of Ignatius," in *The Apostolic Fathers: Ante-Nicene Christian Library*. Vol.1. Edited by James Donaldson and Alexander Roberts. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1867. Reprinted in the *Ante-Nicene Fathers*.

Ehrman, Bart D. ed. and translator. *The Apostolic Fathers*. 2 vols. Cambridge and London: Harvard University Press, 2003.

Holmes, Michael. ed. and translator. *The Apostolic Fathers*. 3d. ed. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Baker Academic, 2007.

Lightfoot, J.B. *The Apostolic Fathers*. Part 2. *S. Ignatius, St. Polycarp*. 2nd ed. 3 vols. London and New York: Macmillan and Co., 1889.

Primary Texts in Translation

Athanasius. *De Synodis*. In vol. 4 of *Nicene and Post-Nicene* Fathers, Series 2. Edited by Philip Schaff and Henry Wace. 1885-1887. 10 vols. Repr. Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1994.

_____. *De Decretis*. In vol. 4 of *Nicene and Post-Nicene* Fathers, Series 2. Edited by Philip Schaff and Henry Wace. 1885-1887. 10 vols. Repr. Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1994.

Cyril of Jerusalem. *The Works of Saint Cyril of Jerusalem*. Translated by Leo P. McCauley and Anthony A. Stephenson. The Fathers of the Church 61 and 64. 2 vols. Washington: The Catholic University of America Press, 1969-1970.

Eusebius. *Life of Constantine*. Introduction, translation, and commentary by Averil Cameron and Stuart G. Hall. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1999.

Dionysius of Alexandria. *St. Dionysius of Alexandria*. Translated by Charles Lett Feltoe. Translations of Christian Literature. London and New York: The Macmillan Company, 1918.

Gregory of Nazianzus. *On God and Christ: St. Gregory of Nazianzus: The Five Theological Orations and the Two Letters to Cledonius*. Translated by Frederick Williams and Lionel Wickham. Popular Patristic Series. Crest Wood, NY: 2002.

John Chrysostom. *On the Incomprehensible Nature of God*. Transalted by Paul W. Harkins. The Fathers of the Church 72. Washington: The Catholic University of America Press, 1982.

_____. *The Cult of the Saints*. Introduced, translated, and annotated by Wendy Mayer with Bronwen Neil. Popular Patristics Series. Crestwood, N.Y.: St Vladimir's Seminary Press, 2006.

John Chrysostom. *John Chrysostom*. Translated by Wendy Mayer and Pauline Allen. The Early Church Fathers. London and New York: Routledge, 2000.

Origen. *On First Principles*. Translated by G.W. Butterworth. Gloucester, Mass.: Peter Smith, 1973.

Rufinus. *Epilogue to Pamphilus the Martyr's Apology for Origen*. In vol. 3 of *Nicene and Post-Nicene* Fathers, Series 2. Edited by Philip Schaff and Henry Wace. 1890-1900. 14 vols. Repr. Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1994.

Socrates. *Historia ecclesiastica*. In vol. 2 of *Nicene and Post-Nicene* Fathers, Series 2. Edited by Philip Schaff and Henry Wace. 1890-1900. 14 vols. Repr. Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1994.

Sozomen. *Historia ecclesiastica*. In vol. 2 of *Nicene and Post-Nicene* Fathers, Series 2. Edited by Philip Schaff and Henry Wace. 1890-1900. 14 vols. Repr. Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1994.

Theodoret. *Historia ecclesiastica*. In vol. 3 of *Nicene and Post-Nicene* Fathers, Series 2. Edited by Philip Schaff and Henry Wace. 1890-1900. 14 vols. Repr. Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1994.

Cyril of Jerusalem. *Cyril of Jerusalem*. Translated by Edward Yarnold. Early Church Fathers. London and New York: Routledge, 2000.

Secondary Literature

Abramowski, Luise. "Dionys von Rom (268) und Dionys von Alexandrien (264/5) in der arianischen Streitigkeiten des 4 Jahrhunderts." *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte* 93 (1982): 240-272.

Achtemeier, Paul J. *1 Peter: A Commentary on First Peter*. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1996.

Amelungk, Arnold. *Untersuchungen Uber Pseudo-Ignatius*. Marburg: G. Otto's Hofbcchdruckerei In Darmstadt, 1899. Kessinger Publishing's Legacy Reprints.

Anatolios, Khaled. *Athanasius*. The Early Church Fathers. London and New York: Routledge, 2004.

_____. *Athanasius: The Coherence of his Thought*. London and New York: Routledge, 2005. First published 1998.

Andresen, Carl. *Logos und Nomos. Die Polemik des Kelsos wider das Christentum*. Arbeiten zur Kirchegeschichte 30. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1955.

Arnold, Duane Wade-Hampton. *The Early Episcopal Career of Athanasius of Alexandria*. Notre Dame and London: University of Notre Dame Press, 1991.

Ayres, Lewis. *Nicaea and its Legacy: An Approach to Fourth-Century Trinitarian Theology*. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004. Paperback, 2006.

_____. "Athanasius' Initial Defense of the Term Ὁμοούσιος: Rereading the De Decretis." *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 12.3 (2004): 337-359.

Bammel, C.P. Hammond. "Ignatian Problems." *Journal of Theological Studies* N.S. 33 (1982): 62-97.

Barnes, Michel René. "The Fourth Century as Trinitarian Canon." Pages 47-67 in *Christian Origins: Theology, Rhetoric and Community*. Edited by Lewis Ayres and Gareth Jones. New York and London: Routledge, 1998.

Barnes, Timothy D. *Constantine and Eusebius*. Cambridge, Mass., and London, England: Harvard University Press, 1981.

_____. *Tertullian: A Historical and Literary Study*. 2nd ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1985.

_____. "Panegyric, History and Hagiography in Eusebius' *Life of Constantine*." Pages 94-123 in *The Making of Orthodoxy: Essays in Honour of Henry Chadwick*. Edited by Rowam Williams. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989.

_____. *Athanasius and Constantius: Theology and Politics in the Constantinian Empire*. Cambridge Mass., and London, England: Harvard University Press, 1993.

_____. "The Date of Ignatius." *Expository Times* 120/3 (2008): 119-130.

Bauckham, Richard. "John for Readers of Mark." Pages 147-171 in *The Gospels for All Christians: Rethinking the Gospel Audiences*. Edited by Richard Bauckham. Grand Rapids and Cambridge: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1998.

Berkhof, H. *Die Theologie des Eusebius*. Amsterdam, 1939.

Bienert, Wolfgang A. *Dionysius von Alexandrien: Das erhaltene Werk*. Bibliothek Der Griechischen Literatur. Stuttgart: Anton Hiersemann, 1972.

Brennecke, Hanns Christof, Uta Heil, Annette von Stochhausen, und Angelika Wintjes, eds. *Athanasius Werke: Dokumente zur Geschichte des Arianischen Streites*. Vol.3. Part 1. Berlin and New York: Walter De Gruyter, 2007.

Brent, Allen. "Ignatius and Polycarp: The Transformation of New Testament Traditions in the Context of the Mystery Cults." Pages 325-349 in *Trajectories through the New Testament and the Apostolic Fathers*. Edited by Andrew F. Gregory and Christopher M. Tuckett. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2005.

_____. *Ignatius of Antioch and the Second Sophistic: A Study of an Early Christian Transformation of Pagan Culture.* Studien und Texte zu Antike Christentum. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006.

_____. *Ignatius of Antioch: A Martyr Bishop and the Origin of the Episcopasy*. London and New York: T&T Clark, 2009. Originally published 2007.

Brown, Milton P. "Notes of the Language and Style of Pseudo-Ignatius." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 83.2 (1964): 146-152.

Brox, Norbert. *Falsche Verfasserangaben: Zur Erklärung der frühchristlichen Pseudepigraphia*. Stuttgarter Biblestudien 79. Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1975.

Burgess, Richard. *Studies in Eusebian and post-Eusebian Chronology*. Historia – Einzelschriften Series 135. Franz Steiner Verlag, 1999.

Chadwick, Henry. "The Fall of Eustathius of Antioch." *Journal of Theological Studies* 49 (1948): 27-35.

_____. "The Silence of Bishops in Ignatius." *The Harvard Theological Review* 43.2 (1950): 169-172.

_____. Review of Dieter Hagedorn, *Der Hiobkommentar Des Arianers Julian*. *Journal of Theological Studies* 28 (1977): 559-561.

Chestnut, Glenn F. *The First Christian Histories: Eusebius, Socrates, Sozomen, Theodoret, and Evagrius*. 2nd ed. Revised and Enlarged. Macon, Ga.: Mercer University Press, 1986.

Chin, Catherine M. "Rufinus of Aquileia and Alexandrian Afterlives: Translation as Origenism." *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 18.4 (2010): 617-647.

Clark, Elizabeth A. *The Origenist Controversy: The Cultural Construction of an Early Christian Debate*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1992.

Crowin, Virginia. *St. Ignatius and Christianity in Antioch*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1960.

Cureton, William. *The Ancient Syriac Version of the Epistles of St. Ignatius to St. Polycarp, the Ephesians, and the Romans: Together with Extracts from his Epistles, collected from the Writings of Severus of Antioch, Timotheus of Alexandria, and others, Edited with an English Translation and Notes: also the Greek Text of these Three Epistles, Corrected According to the Authority of the Syriac Version*. London and Berlin: Rivingtons, Asher & Co., 1845.

_____. *Vindiciae Ignatianae; or The Genuine Writings of St. Ignatius, As Exhibited in the Ancient Syriac Version, Vindicated From the Charge of Heresy*. London: Rivingtons, 1846.

_____. *Corpus Ignatianum: A Complete Collection of the Ignatian Epistles, Genuine, Interpolated, and Spurious; Together with Numerous Extracts from them as Quoted by Ecclesiastical Writers Down to the Tenth Century; In Syriac, Greek, ands Latin: An English Translation of the Syriac Text, Copious Notes, and Introduction*. London: Francis & John Rivington, 1849.

Daley, Brian E. " 'Heavenly Man' and 'Eternal Christ': Apollinarius and Gregory of Nyssa on the Personal Identity of the Savior." *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 10.4 (2002): 469-488.

De Riedmatten, H. *Les Actes du Procès de Paul de Samosate*. Friborg: Editions St. Paul, 1952.

Donaldson, James. "The Epistles of Ignatius," in *The Apostolic Fathers: Ante-Nicene Christian Library*. Vol.1. Edited by Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1867

Downey, Glanville. *A History of Antioch in Syria from Seleucus to the Arab Conquest*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1961.

Ehrman, Bart D. *The Orthodox Corruption of Scripture: The Effect of Christological Controversy on the Text of the New Testament*. New York and London: Oxford University Press, 1993.

_____. "Textual Traditions Compared: The New Testament and the Apostolic Fathers." Pages 9-27 in *The Reception of the New Testament in the Apostolic Fathers*. Edited by Andrew F. Gregory and Christopher M. Tuckett. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2005.

Elliot, J. Keith. "Thoroughgoing Eclecticism in New Testament Textual Criticism." Pages 321-335 in *The Text of the New Testament in Contemporary Research: Essays on the Status Quaestionis*. Edited by Bart D. Ehrman and Michael W. Holmes. Studies and Documents 46. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1995.

Epp, Eldon. "Textual Criticism." Pages 76-126 in *The New Testament and Its Modern Interpreters*. Edited by E.J. Epp and G.W. MacRae. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989.

Epp, Eldon J. and Gordon D. Fee. *Studies in the Theory and Method of New Testament Textual Criticism*. SD 45. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993.

Ernest, James D. *The Bible in Athanasius of Alexandria*. Boston and Leiden: Brill Academic Publishers, 2004.

Fee, G.D. "Rigorous or Reasoned Eclecticism – Which?" Pages 174-197 in *Studies in New Testament Language and Text: Essays in Honour of George D. Kilpatrick on the Occasion of His Sixty-fifth Birthday*. Edited by J.K. Elliot. NovTSupp 44. Leiden: Brill, 1976.

Ford, Harold W. "A Comparison of the Recensions of the Ignatian Corpus." Th.D. diss., Illif School of Theology, 1961.

Foster, Paul. "The Epistles of Ignatius of Antioch and the Writings that later formed the New Testament." Pages 159-186 in *The Reception of the New Testament in the Apostolic Fathers*. Edited by Andrew F. Gregory and Christopher M. Tuckett. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.

_____. "The Epistles of Ignatius of Antioch." Pages 81-107 in *The Writings of the Apostolic Fathers*. Edited by Paul Foster. London: T&T Clark, 2007.

Funk, Franciscus Xaverius. ed. *Patres Apostolici*. Vol.2. Tübingen: Libraria/henrici Laupp, 1901.

Gamble, Harry Y. *Books and Readers in the Early Church: A History of Early Christian Texts*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1995.

Grant, Robert M. "The Heresy of Tatian." *Journal of Theological Studies* 5 (1954):62-68.

_____. *Gods and the One God: Christian Theology in the Graeco-Roman World*. London: SPCK, 1986.

Greenlee, J. Harold. *Introduction to New Testament Textual Criticism*. Rev. ed. Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson Publishers, 1995

Gregg, Robert C. and Dennis E. Groh. *Early Arianism: A View of Salvation*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1981.

Gregg, Robert., ed. *Ariansim: Historical and Theological Reassessments: Papers from the Ninth International Conference of Patristic Studies*. Patristic Monograph Series 11. Philadelphia: The Philadelphia Patristic, 1985. Repr., Eugene, Ore.: Wipf and Stock Publishers, 2006.

Grillmeier, Aloys. *Christ in Christian Tradition: From the Apostolic Age to Chalcedon (451)*. Translated by John Bowden. 2d revised ed. Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1975.

Gwatkin, Henry Melvill. *Studies of Arianism: Chiefly Referring to the Character and Chronology of the Reaction which Followed the Council of Nicaea*. Cambridge: Deighton Bell and Company, 1900.

Haines-Eitzen, Kim. *Guardians of Letters: Literacy, Power, and the Transmitters of Early Christian Literature*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2000.

Hannah, Jack W. "The Setting of the Ignatian Long Recension." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 79.3 (1960): 221-238.

Hanson, R.P.C. *The Search for the Christian Doctrine of God: The Arian Controversy, 318-381*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1988. Repr., Grand Rapids, Mich.: Baker Academic, 2005.

Harnack, Adolf. *Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschicte*. 4th ed. Vol. 2. Tübingen: Verlag von J.C.B. Moher (Paul Siebeck), 1909.

Hartney, Aideen M. *John Chrysostom and the Transformation of the City*. London: Duckworth, 2004.

Haugaard, William P. "Arius: Twice a Heretic? Arius and the Human Soul of Jesus Christ." *Church History* 29.3 (1960): 251-263.

Hausherr, I. "Un grand auteur spirituel retrouvé," *Orientalia Christiana Periodica* 14 (1948): 3-42.

Hawthorne, Gerald F. "Tatian and His Discourse to the Greeks." *The Harvard Theological Review* 57 (1964):161-188.

Hegedorn, Dieter. *Der Hiobkommentar Des Arianers Julian*. Patristische Texte und Studien 14. Berlin and New York: Walter De Gruyter, 1973.

Heil, Uta. *Athanasius von Alexandrien: De Sententia Dionysii*. Berlin and New York: Walter De Gruyter, 1999.

Hengel, Martin. *Studies in Early Christology*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1995.

Holmes, Michael W. "Reasoned Eclecticism in New Testament Textual Criticism." Pages 336-360 in *The Text of the New Testament in Contemporary Research: Essays on the Status Quaestionis*. Edited by Bart D. Ehrman and Michael W. Holmes. Studies and Documents 46. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1995.

Hübner, R.M. "Thesen zur Echtheit und Daiterung der sieben Briefe des Ignatius Antiochen." *Zeitschrift f*ür *antikes Christentum* 1 (1997): 44-72.

Hurtado, Larry W. *Lord Jesus Christ: Devotion to Jesus in Earliest Christianity*. Grand Rapids, Mich. and Cambridge, U.K.: William Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2005.

Joly, Robert. *Le dossier d'Ignace d'Antioche*. Université libre de Bruxelles, Faculté de Philosophie et Lettres 69. Brussles: Éditions de l'Université de Bruxelles, 1979).

Kannengiesser, C. "Le Témoignage Des Lettres Festales de Saint Athanase Sur La Date de L'apologie *Contra Le Paiens sue L'incarnation de Verbe*." *Recherches de Science Religieuse'* 52 (1964): 91-100.

Kelly, J.N.D. *Early Christian Creeds*. 3rd ed. London and New York: Continuum, 1972. Originally published 1950.

_____. *Golden Mouth: The Story of John Chrysostom Ascetic, Preacher, Bishop*. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1995.

_____. *Jerome: His Life, Writings and Controversies*. Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson Publishers, 1998. Originally published 1975.

Kopecek, Thomas A. *A History of Neo-Ariansim*. 2 vols. Cambridge, Mass.: The Philadelphia Patristic Foundation, 1979.

Lampe, G.W.H., ed. *A Patristic Greek Lexicon*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2007. First Published 1961.

Lebon, J. "Le sort du 'consubstantiel' Nicéen." *Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique* 48 (1953): 632-682.

Lechner, T. *Ignatius adversus Valentinianos? Chronologische und theologiegeschichtliche Studien zu Briefen des Ignatius von Antiochen*. Vigiliae Christianae. Supplement Series 47. Leiden: Brill, 1999.

Lienhard, Joseph T. "Marcellus of Ancyra in Modern Research." *Theological Studies* 43.3 (1982): 486-503.

_____. "The 'Arian' Controversy: Some Categories Reconsidered." *Theological Studies* 48.3 (1987): 415-437.

_____. "Basil of Caesarea, Marcellus of Ancyra, and 'Sabellius.' *Church History* 58 (1989): 157-167.

_____. "Acacius of Caesarea: *Contra Marcellum*. Historical and Theological Considerations," *Cristianesimo nella Storia* 10 (1989): 1-22.

_____. *Contra Marcellum: Marcellus of Ancyra and Fourth-Century Theology*. Washington: Catholic University of America Press, 1999.

Lightfoot, J.B. "Two Neglected Facts Bearing On The Ignatian Controversy." *Journal of Philology* 1.2 (1868): 47-55.

_____. "Eusebius of Caesarea." Pages 2.308-348 in *A Dictionary of Christian Biography*. Edited by William Smith and Henry Wace. 4 vols. London: John Murray, Albermarle Street, 1880.

_____. *The Apostolic Fathers*. Part 2. *S. Ignatius, St. Polycarp*. 2nd ed. 3 vols. London and New York: Macmillan and Co., 1889.

Loofs, F. “Arianismus.” *Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft* (1897): 28.

Lotz, John-Paul. *Ignatius and Concord: The Background and Use of the Language of Concord in the Letters of Ignatius of Antioch*. New York: Peter Lang Publishing, 2007.

Luibhéid, Colm. *Eusebius of Caesarea and the Arian Crisis*. Dublin: Irish Academic Press, 1978.

Lyman, Rebecca J. “A Topography of Heresy: Mapping The Rhetorical Creation of Arianism.” Pages 45-62 in *Arianism After Arius: Essays on the Development of the Fourth Century Trinitarian Conflicts*. Edited by Michel R. Barnes and Daniel H. Williams. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1993.

MacMullen, Ramsay. “The Preacher’s Audience (350-400).” *Journal of Theological Studies* 40.2 (1989): 503-511.

Mayer, Wendy. “The Provenance of the Homilies of St John Chrysostom: Towards a New Assessment of Where he preached What.” Ph.D. dissertation. University of Queensland, 1996.

Meslin, M. *Les Ariens d’Occident*. Patristica Sorbonensia 8. Paris: 1967.

Metzger, Bruce. *The Text of the New Testament: Its Transmission, Corruption, and Restoration*. 3d ed. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 1992.

Minns, Dennis and Paul Parvis, ed. *Justin, Philosopher and Martyr: Apologies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009.

Moll, Sebastian. “Three Against Tertullian: The Second Tradition About Marcion’s Life.” *Journal of Theological Studies* 59.1 (2008): 169-180.

Mosshammer, Alden A. *The “Chronicle” of Eusebius and the Greek Chronographic Tradition*. Lewisburg, Pa. and London: Bucknell University Press, 1979.

Nautin, P. “La date du *De viris inlustribus* de Jérôme, de la mort de Cyrille de Jérusalem et de celle de Grégoire de Nazianze.” *Revue d’histoire ecclésiastique* 56 (1961): 33-35.

Neil, Stephen and Tom Wright. *The Interpretation of the New Testament 1861-1986*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 1988.

Newman, John Henry. *The Arians of the Fourth Century: Their Doctrine, Temper and Conduct, Chiefly as Exhibited in the Councils of the Church between 325-381*. London: J.G. & F Rivington, 1833.

Ortiz de Urbina, Ignatius. *Patrologia Syriaca*. 2nd ed. Rome: Pontifical Institute of Oriental Studies, 1965.

Parvis, Sara. *Marcellus of Ancyra and the Lost Years of the Arian Controversy 325-345*. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006.

_____. “Christology in the Early Arian Controversy: The Exegetical War,” Pages 120-137 in *Christology and Scripture: Interdisciplinary Perspectives*. Edited by Andrew T. Lincoln and Angus Paddison. London and New York:T&T Clark International, 2007.

Perler, Othmar, "Pseudo-Ignatius und Eusebius von Emesa." *Historisches Jahrbuch* 77 (1958): 73-82.

Perumalil, A.C. "Are not Papias and Irenaeus Competent to Report on the Gospels?" *The Expository Times* 91.11 (1980): 332-337.

Petterson, A. "A Reconsideration of the Date of the *Contra Gentes – De Incarnation* of Athanasius of Alexandria." *Studia Patristica* 17 (1982): 1030-1040.

Prestige, Leonard. "ἀγέν[ν]ητος and γεν[ν]ητός, and Kindred Words, in Eusebius and the Early Arians." *Journal of Theological Studies* 24 (1923): 486-496.

Rackl, Michael. *Die Christologie Des Heiligen Ignatius von Antiochen*. Freiburger Theologische Studien 14. Freiburg: Herder, 1914.

Rapp, Claudia. "Imperial Ideology in the Making: Eusebius of Caesarea on Constantine as 'Bishop'." *Journal of Theological Studies* 49 (1998): 685-695.

Richardson, Cyril Charles. *The Christianity of Ignatius of Antioch*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1935.

Rius-Camps, J. *The Four Authentic Letters of Ignatius, the Martyr*. Christianismos 2. Rome: Pontificium Institutum Orientalium Studiorum, 1979.

Robertson, Archibald. Introduction to "*De Sententia Dionysii*," in *Athanasius: Select Works and Letters*. Edited by Philip Schaff and Henry Wace. Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers 2.4. Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson Publishers, 2004. Originally published 1891.

Robertson, Jon M. *Christ as Mediator: A Study of the Theologies of Eusebius of Caesarea, Marcellus of Ancyra, and Athanasius of Alexandria*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.

Robinson, Thomas A. *Ignatius of Antioch and the Parting of the Ways: Early Jewish-Christian Relations*. Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson Publishers, 2009.

Schatkin, Margaret Amy. *John Chrysostom As Apologist*. Thessaloniki: Patriarchal Institute for Patristic Studies, 1987.

Schoedel, William R. "Are the Letters of Ignatius of Antioch Authentic?" *Religious Studies Review* 6 (1980): 196-201.

_____. *Ignatius of Antioch*. Hermeneia. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1985.

Schwartz, Eduard. *Christliche Und Judische Ostertafeln*. Der Königlichen Gesellschaft Der Wissenschaften Zur Göttingen Philologisch-Historische Klasse. Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, 1905.

_____. "Eusebios von Caesarea." Pages 1370-1439 in *Realencylopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft* 6. Edited by F. Pauly and G. Wissowa. Stuttgart, 1909.

Smith, James David III. "The Ignatian Long Recension and Christian Communities in Fourth Century Syrian Antioch." Th.D. diss., Harvard University, 1986.

_____. "Reflections on Euzoius in Alexandria and Antioch." Pages 514-519 in *Studia Patristica*. Edited by M.F. Wiles and E.J. Yarnold with the assistance of P.M. Parvis. Vol. XXXVI. Leuven: Peters, 2001.

_____. "On Pseudo-Ignatius' Fourth-Century Antiochene Assertion of Episcopal Supremacy." Pages 231-236 in *Studia Patristica*. Edited by F. Young, M. Edwards, and P. Parvis. Vol. XLII. Leuven, Paris, Dudley Mass.: Peters, 2006.

Spoerl, Kelley McCarthy. "Apollinarian Christology and the Anti-Marcellan Tradition." *Journal of Theological Studies* 45.2 (1994): 545-568.

_____. "The Schism in Antioch since Cavallera." Pages 101-126 in *Arianism after Arius: Essays on the Development of the Fourth Century Trinitarian Conflicts*. Edited by Michel R. Barnes and Daniel H. Williams. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1993.

_____. "The Liturgical Argument in Apollinarius: Help and Hindrance on the Way to Orthodoxy." *The Harvard Theological Review* 91.2 (1998): 127-152.

Stead, Christopher. "'Eusebius' and the Council of Nicaea." *Journal of Theological Studies* 24.1 (1973): 85-100.

Stein, F.J. *Eusebius Bischof von Cäsarea*. Würzburg, 1859.

Trakatellis, Demetrios Bishop. "God Language in Ignatius of Antioch." Pages 422-430 in *The Future of Early Christianity: Essays in Honor of Helmut Koester*. Edited by Briger A. Pearson. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1991.

Trevett, Christine. *A Study of Ignatius of Antioch in Syria and Asia*. Studies in the Bible and Early Christianity 29. Lewiston: Edwin Mellen Press, 1992.

Trigg, Joseph W. *Origen*. The Early Church Fathers. London and New York: Routledge, 1998.

Vaggione, Richard Paul. *Eunomius of Cyzicus and the Nicene Revolution*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.

Wallace-Hadrill, D.S. *Eusebius of Caesarea*. London: A.R. Mowbray & Co., 1960.

Weijenborg, Reinoud. "Is Evagrius Ponticus the Author of the Long Recension of the Ignatian Letters?" *Antoninaum* 44 (1969): 339-347.

_____. *Les letters d'Ignace d'Antioche*. Leiden: Brill, 1969.

Weinandy, Thomas G. "The Apostolic Christology of Ignatius of Antioch: The Road to Chalcedon." Pages 71-84 in *Trajectories through the New Testament and the Apostolic Fathers*. Edited by Andrew F. Gregory and Christopher M. Tuckett. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.

Weis, M. *Die Stellung des Eusebius von Caesarea im arianischen Streit*. Ph.D. diss. Freiburg-im-Breisgau, 1919.

Wenger, A. "Restauration de l'*Homélie* de Chrysostome sur Eléazar et les sept frères Macchabées (PG 63.523-530)." Pages 599-604 in *Texte und Textkritik. Eine Aufsatzsammlung*. Edited by J. Drummer, J. Irmscher, F. Paschke, and K. Treu. Texte and Untersuchungen 133. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1987.

Whiston, William. *Primitive Christianity Reviv'd*. 5 vols. London: Booksellers of London and Westminster, 1711-1712.

_____. "Suspicions Concerning Athanasius." Pages 1.cxvi-cxxviii in *Primitive Christianity Reviv'd*. 5 vols. London: Booksellers of London and Westminster, 1711-1712.

_____. "Athanasius Convicted of Forgery." In Mr. William Whiston's letter to Mr Thirlby of Jesus-College in Cambridge. London: A. Baldwin, 1712.

_____. The Council of Nice Vindicated from the Athanasian Heresy." In his *Three Essays*. London: Cross-Street Hattongarden, 1713.

Wiles, Maurice. "In Defense of Arius." *Journal of Theological Studies* 13 (1962): 339-347.

Wilken, Robert L. *John Chrysostom and the Jew: Rhetoric and Reality in the Late 4th Century*. Eugene, Oreg.: Wipf & Stock Publishers, 2004. Originally published 1983.

_____. "Person of Personification? A Patristic Debate about Logos." Pages 281-289 in *The Glory of Christ in the New Testament: Studies in Christology in Memory of George Bradford Caird*. Edited by L.D. Hurst and N.T. Wright. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1987. Repr., Eugene, Oreg.:Wipf and Stock Publishers, 2006.

Williams, Daniel H. "Proverbs 8:22-21." *Interpretation* 48 (1994): 275-279.

Williams, Rowan. *Arius: Heresy and Tradition*. Rev. ed.: Grand Rapids, Mich. and Cambridge, U.K.: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2001.

Woollcombe, K.J. "The Doctrinal Connections of the Pseudo-Ignatian Letters." Pages 269-273 in *Studia Patristica*. Edited by F.L. Cross. Vol. 6. Part 4. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1962.

Young, Frances M. with Andrew Teal. *From Nicaea to Chalcedon*. 2nd ed. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2010.

Zahn, Theodor. *Ignatius von Antiochien*. Gotha: Friedrich Andreas Perthes, 1873.

Zizioulas, J.D. "The teaching of the 2nd ecumenical council in historical and ecumenical perspective." In *Credo in Spiritum Sanctum: Atti del Congresso Teologico Internazionale di Pneumatologia*. Rome: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 1983.