

NOTES AND STUDIES

THE TESTIMONY OF IGNATIUS AND POLYCARP
TO THE APOSTLESHIP OF 'ST JOHN'.

I SHALL assume in this article that there died about the end of the first century a great leader of the Asian Churches of the name of John ; that the theology which finds its expression in the Johannine Gospel and Epistles was formulated by him ; and that he exercised a profound influence upon the mind of Ignatius. This influence I illustrated in the January number of this JOURNAL.¹ The point which I now set out to prove is that Ignatius and Polycarp imply that this John was the son of Zebedee. I maintain that these two witnesses whom Schmiedel examines briefly in *Enc. Bib.* 2511 when cross-examined give evidence against the view for which he and others claim their support.

My first point is suggested by a criticism on my previous article. If Ignatius was acquainted with St John's writings, how was it that he does not refer to him in letters addressed to the Johannine Churches? The objection was stated in a more definite form by Pfeiderer, who held that if Ignatius had known St John's Epistles he must have used them in his conflict with Docetism.

I might reply that the objection disproves too much ; for, if it is valid, it disproves the great influence of St John on the mind of Ignatius, and this is a *reductio ad absurdum*. But though this reply is sufficient, the difficulty is a real one. One might have expected Ignatius to appeal to the great protagonist, and to cite his condemnation of docetic error. If, then, in the course of this article I can adduce grounds for thinking that Ignatius was probably understood by his readers to be appealing to a pronouncement of St John on this subject, there will be a presumption, indeed a strong presumption, in favour of my reasoning.

I. We now turn to the thesis that John of Asia was the apostle, and we notice in the first place the authority which the theology of St John possessed for Ignatius, and also the fact that Polycarp accepts St John as a trustworthy witness for promises of Christ which are not recorded by the Synoptists, and quotes him as he would quote the apostles and their companions. Ignatius, who had a profound respect for apostolic authority, reveals himself to us as having a no less profound respect for St John's teaching. In the opinion of the two bishops he was a teacher of the very highest authority, and ranked in their minds with

¹ *Journal of Theological Studies* vol. xiv No. 54 p. 207.

St Peter and St Paul. It is not easy to believe that he was no more than an older contemporary whom they greatly venerated.

II. On p. 207 we examined the special motive which suggested the allusions to St Peter and St Paul, and I pointed out that Ignatius made just such a reference to St John as we might have anticipated in a letter addressed to the Church of Ephesus. In *Eph.* 11 he desires 'to be found in the company of those Christians of Ephesus who moreover were at all times of one mind with the apostles'. Here the words 'at all times' prohibit a limitation of the reference to St Paul. Again, it is inconsistent with the context to suppose that the agreement of the Ephesians was with the apostolic doctrines and ordinances. Ignatius is not praying that he may remain like the Ephesians orthodox; for it would never occur to him to utter such a prayer. His prayer is that he may remain like them steadfast under persecution (cf. *Apoc.* ii 3). This is more explicitly expressed in the words which follow: 'Ye are associates with St Paul in whose footsteps I fain would be found treading.' With what other apostles were the Ephesians associated? The answer is suggested by *Rev.* i 9. St John was a 'fellow-sufferer' with the Asian churches. We may add that the word *συνήνεσαν* (or *συνῆσαν*) suggests personal intercourse rather than loyalty to apostolic decrees.

III. Our letters form, with the non-Pauline Asian documents contained in the Canon, a single group which were occasioned by the same controversy and are closely related. We have already discovered that the thought of St John, whose influence dominates the earlier and canonical documents of this group, dominates Ignatius and influences Polycarp. Any contrasts, therefore, that we observe between the earlier and the later documents demand careful consideration. We observe, then, three points, which are prominent in the polemic of Polycarp and Ignatius, but are absent from the Johannine Epistles. (1) The latter say nothing of the Eucharist as a bond of unity. We must go to St Paul and not to St John, for the doctrine of the 'one loaf'. (2) The attack on the faith had become an attack on its discipline, but 1 and 2 John are silent as to the authority of the ministry which St John was reorganizing (cf. 3 John and *Ap. Const.* vii 46, *Eus. H. E.* iii 23 § 6). (3) There is no appeal in the epistles to the tradition as apostolic, and the letters of the Apocalypse which reflect his handling of the Nicolaitan uprising are also silent on this point.

These contrasts become much more impressive when we examine our evidence carefully. The apostles are to Ignatius 'a college' (*Trall.* 3), which is the Christian 'Sanhedrin' (*Trall.* 3, *Mag.* 6, *Philad.* 8) and legislates for the Christian dispersion (cf. 1 Pet. ii 11, James i 1). This college is 'the presbytery of the church' (*Philad.* 5), i. e. the body which stands in the same relation to the whole Church as the local

presbytery to the local church. The position of Ignatius is that of Clement, who insists upon the apostolic origin of the ministry whose authority he is sustaining, and, like Ignatius, emphasizes the position that the apostles were sent by Christ as Christ by God (1 Clem. 42-4). Polycarp ranks the injunctions of the apostles with those of the Lord and the prophets. We shall find below a reason why we must not press this passage, but when every deduction is made it is still significant.

When we turn to the Johannine books we find that, as we have seen, the position of these fathers was derived from St John. The Gospel narrates the great commission, *As the Father hath sent me so send I you*; in a section of the Apocalypse which is saturated with St John's teaching the New Jerusalem is built upon the foundation of the apostles (xxi 14). We turn, then, to the Epistles in which St John opposes himself, at one of its most critical moments, to the Nicolaitan revolt against the apostolic code, and on the assumption that he was not an apostle we expect him to make explicit and apply his doctrine of apostolic authority as the leaders of the Church who followed him applied it. If we hold that the son of Zebedee had visited Asia, or that his teaching lies in some way behind the Gospel, the confidence of our expectation is increased. We are astonished, then, to find that in the Epistles there is not a solitary allusion to the apostles. St John says nothing about the sacrament of unity, nothing about the Christian ministry, nothing about the apostolic tradition. How can we account for this threefold silence? The hypothesis that St John was a mystic, to whom matters ecclesiastical were indifferent, is quite impossible.

One hypothesis will explain the three silences. Throughout the epistles, and especially in the exordium of the first, St John is asserting his own apostolic authority. The apostolic commission and testimony, *that which was from the beginning*, is represented in his own person. In his person the Asians are linked with the first days. He knows that he is in communion with the historic and risen Christ, and with parental tenderness and authority he bids his children be in communion with him. The persistent note of authority which is overheard, rather than heard, in the Epistles is the more impressive because it is only implicit. St John assumes that his authority is unquestioned and unquestionable by those Asians who are loyal to the Christian tradition. When we compare his letters with those of his younger contemporaries we conclude that it was unquestionable because he was an apostle.

Our inference is confirmed when we compare the exordium of 1 John with its parallels. In the Epistle St John writes, 'That which we have seen . . . declare we also unto you that ye also may have fellowship with us, and truly our fellowship is with the Father and His Son Jesus Christ'.

The words bear a close resemblance to the great commission (John xx 21) where, as Christ is the speaker, the order descends. Our inference that St John is asserting his official position is confirmed by Ign. *Eph.* 5, 'I congratulate you that ye are so closely attached (to your bishop) as the Church to Jesus Christ and as Jesus Christ to the Father, that all things may be in unity'. The parallel with 1 John is even more clear when we observe that 'unity' is the Ignatian substitute for 'communion' in the citation of 1 Cor. x 16, 17 (*Philad.* 4).

Our conclusion is enforced by another comparison of the Johannine with the sub-apostolic epistles. Ignatius writes in *Eph.* 3, 'I do not command you as 'though I were somewhat'; in *Trall.* 3, 'I do not think myself competent for this, that being a convict I should order you as though I were an apostle'; and in *Rom.* 4, 'Not as Peter and Paul I command you. They were apostles; I am a convict'. This attitude is not a mere expression of humility. If it were it would be a pose and dangerously like the pride which apes humility. Ignatius was bishop of the important and apostolic see of Antioch, and he represented the Churches of Syria and Cilicia. The eyes of Christendom are following him to Rome. Yet he feels that to write in an authoritative strain to the Churches of Asia would be to assume a jurisdiction which did not belong to him; it would be, to use his own words, to write 'in apostolic style' (*Trall.* inscr.).

We find similar disclaimers in the letters of Clement, Polycarp, and Barnabas. The former does not write a single sentence which suggests his own personal or official authority, and in ch. vii, writing for the whole Church of Rome he explains that while rebuking the Corinthian Christians the Roman are putting themselves in remembrance as in the same lists: 'Wherefore let us forsake . . .' Polycarp writes concerning righteousness, 'not because I laid this charge upon myself but because ye invited me. For neither am I nor is any other like unto me, able to follow the wisdom of the blessed and glorious Paul who also wrote a letter unto you' (ch. iii). Barnabas writes 'Wishing to write many things unto you not as a teacher but as befits one that loves you, I hastened as your devoted slave to write to you not to fall short of that which we possess' (iv 9).

When we turn to the Johannine documents, we are confronted with a tone of authority which is in the most startling contrast to the passages which we have been considering. St John's apostleship is not only the natural explanation of his silence as to the apostles, it is presupposed in his authority. The Asian Christians are his children. He regards them as concerned with his opinion of them. He brushes aside the idle charges of Diotrefes, and directs a church, which, I am confident, is that of Pergamum, to refuse hospitality to certain teachers, and Gaius

to send forward his envoys. In the Apocalypse the measures which he took with a view to the Nicolaitan revolt, such for instance as the excommunication of 'Jezebel' at Thyatira, are described as ratified by Christ. Christ retains the sins which he retains and binds what he binds. He acts, like St Paul, with absolute authority and in the name of Christ in churches far removed from Ephesus. It is inconceivable that St John, whose figure is to some extent visible behind the epistles and the messages to the seven churches, would have apologized, like Ignatius, for writing in *quite apostolic style* letters to defend the apostolic discipline. We conclude that if there is any intimate historical relation between the letters of Polycarp and Ignatius and those of St John, St John was an apostle.

IV. We must now consider a passage in Ignatius in which an appeal to apostolic authority will be argued to be an appeal to St John, a passage in Polycarp in which an appeal to St John will be argued to be an appeal to apostolic authority, and some evidence that suggests that the two arguments must be read together and regarded as mutually confirmatory.

(i) In *Philad.* 5 we read, 'Your prayer will make me perfect [unto God] that I may attain unto the inheritance (of martyrdom) wherein I found mercy. Inasmuch as I took refuge in the Gospel as in the flesh of Christ and in the apostles as the presbytery of God. And the prophets also we love'. The thought of the passage, though not at once obvious, can be accurately determined. It is clear from *Smyrn.* 4 and *Trall.* 10 that the martyr whose sufferings were real, and whose terror of the fate which awaited him in the Coliseum was not less real, felt strongly his need of a comfort more substantial than that provided by the doctrine of a docetic Passion. It follows that 'flesh' in this sentence is both emphatic and polemical and must govern our interpretation of the passage, and that it brings into subordination to itself the allusion which follows to the authority of the apostolic 'presbytery' over the whole church. The meaning of the sentence is that the writer takes refuge in the Gospel because it tells him of a real Passion, and *confirms* this statement by adding that he takes refuge in the apostles because they speak with authority. Lightfoot argues with force that the word 'apostles' implies the appeal of Ignatius to documents, though he does not suggest what documents. But this point, however true, is not present to the mind of the writer, whose emphasis is in the first place on the reality of the Passion, and in the second on the authority of the apostles. Further, there is a connexion in his mind between these two things, the only natural explanation of which is an apostolic condemnation of a docetic treatment of the Passion. If Ignatius had not added the phrase 'as to the presbytery of God', and if the parallel

passages did not shew that his thought was strongly anti-docetic and polemical, we might have paraphrased, 'I take refuge in the recollection of the Passion as recorded in the Memoirs of the apostles', but this is quite inadmissible. We must paraphrase 'I cling myself in the hour of my need, whatever others may think, to the Passion and to the apostolic affirmation of its reality and condemnation of docetism'. The words must refer to St John, and, if we follow Lightfoot, to St John's writings. No other apostle is possible. Our argument is confirmed by Pfliederer's. That scholar told us that on the assumption that Ignatius had read the Johannine writings we must expect an allusion to his condemnation of docetic error. Ignatius, as has been shewn, had read those writings or was at least saturated with St John's thought. It follows that we must expect an appeal to him. Here it is.

(ii) In *Ep. Polyc.* 6, 7, we read 'Let us, therefore, so serve Him with fear and all reverence, as He Himself gave commandment and the *apostles* who preached the Gospel to us and the *prophets* who announced beforehand the coming of our Lord, being zealous as touching that which is good, refraining from the *scandals* and from the false brethren, and from them which bear about the name of the Lord in hypocrisy, who *seduce empty men*. For every one *who shall not confess that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh, is antichrist: and whosoever shall not confess the testimony of the cross, is of the devil*, and whosoever shall *pervert the oracles of the Lord to his own lusts* and say that there is neither resurrection nor judgment, that man is *the firstborn of Satan*. Wherefore let us forsake the *vanity* of the many and their false teachings, and turn unto the *word which was delivered unto us from the beginning*, being sober unto prayer and constant in fastings, entreating the all-seeing God with supplications that He bring us not into temptation, according as the Lord said, The Spirit indeed is willing, but the flesh is weak'. I italicize the Johannisms.

We must observe that the injunctions of the Lord, the apostles, and the prophets are injunctions not merely to serve Christ, but to serve Christ in the particular way which they enjoined, just as in 2 John v 6 the point is that love must be proved sincere by the observance of the traditional *praxis*. The injunctions are antithetical to the perversions and hypocrisies of Polycarp's opponents and must bear upon the points at issue. Our anticipation is confirmed when we come in ch. vii to the explanatory *γάρ*. The passage is strongly controversial and more relevant to the line of argument suggested in ch. vi than anything which follows. We may plausibly, therefore, deem that Polycarp was leading up to it in his sentence, *as He enjoined . . . and the apostles . . . and the prophets*. But if so, the words which are obviously from the lips or the pen of St John are apostolic. At any rate the coincidence that there

is other evidence for the view that this John was an apostle is, to say the least, remarkable.

Our argument that Polycarp in ch. vi is leading up to this citation is confirmed by the Johannine phrasing of his characterization of heresy: 'scandals', 'false brethren', 'seduce' are all used by St John in connexion with the Nicolaitan controversy.

Our interpretation of our passage is again confirmed when we read on further. His vein of Johannine reminiscence ended, Polycarp seems to feel that he has made good his appeal to apostolic authority. He then turns to another part of the programme, which he has announced, and gives us two citations of our Lord's words. This naturally leads to a digression as to the example of Christ (*Ep. Pol.* 8) which is described in the language of 1 Peter. This leads on again to the example of Ignatius and other martyrs.

Chapter x opens with some pointed phrases from St Paul, and then Polycarp makes good his indication that he has something to give from the O.T. He quotes from Prov. iii 28 and Tobit iv 11 two short phrases which emphasize the duty of almsgiving which the Nicolaitans neglected (1 John iii 17, *Ign. Smyrn.* 6). He then adds a short phrase from Isaiah, 'Woe unto them through whom the name of the Lord is blasphemed'. If the writings of St John are apostolic, Polycarp has made his appeal to the apostles and the Lord, but has very inadequately fulfilled his promise so far as the O.T. is concerned. This he seems to have felt, for after referring to the case of Valens, whose avarice had probably led him into some compromise with idolatry, he apologizes for his unfamiliarity with the O.T., 'Ye are well trained in the sacred writings . . . but to me this is not granted'. How can we account for this apology otherwise than by the hypothesis that when he appealed to Christ, the apostles, and the prophets, he was conscious of laying down what might be expected to be the lines of the subsequent argument? He is conscious that he has somewhat misled his readers so far as the appeal to the prophets is concerned. But if this is the case, Polycarp must have regarded the anti-docetic formula which he has cited as possessing apostolic authority, and therefore its author St John as an apostle.

The reader will have observed that while Polycarp indicates a scheme, and in the remainder of his letter shews that he has not forgotten it, he takes but little interest in it. Something suggested it to his mind, but it does not dominate him. The explanation will appear in the next section of our argument.

(iii) I have argued from *Philad.* 5 that an apostle had condemned docetism and, if this is the case, that apostle must be St John, and, conversely, from *Ep. Pol.* 8, that the Johannine condemnation of docetism

was apostolic. If we can shew that Polycarp was in that passage thinking of *Philad.* 5, there will be no room left for doubt that Ignatius and Polycarp regarded St John as an apostle.

The evidence for this third hypothesis is as follows :—

(1) Polycarp alludes to the letters of Ignatius (ch. xiii), and his letter contains reminiscences of them (Lightfoot *Ap. Fathers* ii 1, 128).

(2) Ignatius wrote, 'I took refuge in the Gospel as in the flesh of Christ, and in the apostles as the presbytery of God. And the prophets also we love'. Polycarp writes, 'As He himself gave commandment, and the apostles who preached the Gospel, and the prophets who announced beforehand the coming of the Lord'. Now the hypothesis that Polycarp is here influenced by the words of Ignatius explains four difficulties. (i) Why did Polycarp appeal to the O.T. at all? His citations are short and conventional, and, as he himself says, he is not familiar with it. (ii) He does not in a single passage allude to Messianic prophecy, and the subject has nothing to do with his letter. Yet he describes the prophets as 'announcing beforehand the coming of the Lord'. (iii) It is surprising to find in so early and unoriginal a writer the utterances of the apostles ranked with those of our Lord and the prophets of the O.T. (iv) Polycarp's order, Christ, apostles, prophets, is not very natural.

All these difficulties are solved by our hypothesis. Polycarp referred to the O.T. and Messianic prophecy because Ignatius referred to them, and he appears to rank the apostles with Christ and Moses because he is following the words of Ignatius. For the same reason the order is unchronological. The reference to the prophets after that to the apostles in the Ignatian context is inevitable. The sequence of thought is the Gospel of the Passion, the apostolic interpretation of it, the Jewish controversy on the subject which troubled the Philadelphian church and which turned on the prophetic scriptures. In Polycarp the order is pointless and the co-ordination difficult.

Our hypothesis is confirmed when we apply it more closely to Polycarp's letter. In ch. v Polycarp has two parallels with Ignatius, 'altar of God' (*Eph.* 5), 'as deacons of God and Christ' (*Smyrn.* 5, see note Lightf. II ii 1 p. 316). In ch. vi he bids his readers serve Christ 'in the way that He Himself enjoined, and the apostles who evangelized us, and the prophets who foretold the coming of our Lord'. He then bids them refrain from heresy in terms borrowed from St John, and in a phrase which he probably borrows from Ign. *Eph.* 7 he describes the claim of the heretics to be Christian as hypocrisy. We then have a close parallelism with the thought of Ignatius which leads up to the mention of his name. The charge that heresy is hypocrisy is explained

in 7 (*γάρ*) as justified by the docetism which refused to confess the coming in the flesh and the testimony of the cross, and which tampered with the words of Christ. If we turn to the tradition, he continues, we read the story of Gethsemane and the Cross. We read how Christ bade His disciples watch and pray that they might not be led into temptation, 'for the spirit is willing but the flesh weak' (Matt. xxvi 40, 41), and then bore our sins on the tree. Polycarp uses in this appeal to tradition the phraseology of 1 Pet. and this leads up to the point that we must follow Christ's example as Ignatius and others had done.

Polycarp could scarcely have shewn more clearly that throughout this passage he has in mind his martyred friend and the thoughts suggested by *Philad.* 5. He confirms this impression when he picks up his appeal to the words of Christ, the apostles and the prophets. For if he seems to go out of his way to say that he knows nothing about the O.T., he is encouraged to do so by the letter of Ignatius which suggested his allusion to the prophets; for we gather from *Philad.* 8 that the martyr had not found his arguments from the O.T. very effective in his debate with the Philadelphian Jews, and regarded the appeal to the O. T. as superfluous.

We will return to our starting-point, assuming that Polycarp's allusion to the apostles and prophets is suggested by *Philad.* 5. On our interpretation of that passage the writer is taking refuge in apostolic testimony to the reality of Christ's death. We will now treat Polycarp as a commentator and turn to this letter to see how he amplifies the brief utterance of Ignatius. We find that he amplifies it in two paragraphs which are introduced by an explanatory *γάρ*, and that in the forefront of his explanation he puts the testimony of St John, which he supports by a brief summary of the Passion, which he gives in terms borrowed from 1 Peter. If, then, Polycarp was following the suggestions of the letter of Ignatius, it follows that he regarded the appeal which Ignatius made to the apostles as an appeal to the utterances of St John.

V. Our next argument runs on somewhat similar lines to the last, but is less secure, though by no means negligible.

We start with the assumption that St John himself was concerned with the organization of the Asian churches and their episcopate. Now Lightfoot assumes that Ignatius refers to this action of St John when he writes, 'If ye be inseparable from Jesus Christ and from the bishop and from the constitutions of the apostles' (*Trall.* 7).

Lightfoot has not argued his position, but a close examination of the context indicates that he is right.

My first point is that in the words cited Ignatius is thinking primarily of the episcopate.

The letter opens with praise of the Trallian bishop, Polybius. The

Trallians must obey him 'after Jesus Christ', i.e. as Christ obeyed the Father. Nothing, therefore, must be done without the bishop. Further, they must obey the presbyters as the apostles of Jesus Christ. The presbyters were associated with the bishop as the apostles with Christ (and as the angel-presbyters with God), and, in the former case as in the latter, disobedience to the subordinate was disobedience to the higher authority. The deacons must win the respect of the church, which must be given to them as to Jesus Christ; they represent, like Christ, a higher authority. 'Let all men respect the deacons as Jesus Christ, even as they should respect the bishops as being a type of the Father, and the presbyters as the council of God, and as the college of the apostles. Apart from these there is not even the name of a church.'

We pause to observe the confusion which Ignatius has introduced into his subject. The deacons are like Jesus Christ; the presbyters, a higher order, are like the apostles. As Lightfoot says the latter must be introduced as an after-thought, in which Ignatius recurs to a favourite comparison, which if it indicates anything more than the principle of order emphasizes the subordination of the presbyterate. That the emphasis of Ignatius is on the authority of the bishop is also shewn by the consideration that nobody in those days had ever heard or thought of either a Jewish or a Christian congregation without its presbyters. Ignatius is not writing an abstract treatise, but dealing with a danger and defending something. He can only be defending the authority of the episcopate.

After his allusion to the three orders Ignatius returns to the subject of the loyalty due to Polybius. The Trallians must avoid the danger of heretical poison. They must cleave to Christ, to the bishop, to the ordinances of the apostles. Ignatius, who may safely be assumed to see matters from a Johannine point of view, is asserting the authority of an office to which St John paid much attention, and in doing so he bids the Trallians cleave to the bishop and to the ordinances of the apostles. This suggests that the status of the bishop was in some sense specially connected with apostolic authority, and that this was represented in the person of St John.

One or two alternative explanations may be considered.

(i) It has been suggested that the eyes of Ignatius are turned to the future rather than to the past, and that he sees in the episcopate an instrument by which the scattered congregations can be welded into a larger unity. But (a) in his eight allusions to ecclesiastical unity the unity is that of the local church with its bishop, and in *Smyrn.* 8 where he refers to 'the Catholic Church', the object is to enforce this local unity. The relation of the Church universal to Christ is in that passage

the *datum*, the local unity the *probandum*. (b) The letters represent a single mood, and the mood is not that of constructive statesmanship. We see in them a bishop of high authority treading the Via Dolorosa which leads to the Roman Calvary, asserting the reality of his Lord's Passion and appealing against the Docetic heretics and to the authority of the apostles.

(ii) Ignatius is not enforcing the authority of the episcopate in order that the Trallians may cleave the better to ordinances of the apostles relating to other matters than church government. If for instance he is referring to an apostolic condemnation of docetism, our fourth main argument would be confirmed; but the run of the passage is against this. The Johannine writings suggest that he might have in mind the apostolic condemnation of *idolothuta*. But Ignatius, strange to say, never approaches this topic; nor does Polycarp, who had his letters in mind, refer to it. Nor is the run of the passage consistent with this explanation. Again, it is not easy to suppose that Ignatius is referring in general terms to the apostolic discipline. This appears to be inconsistent with his mood. Never were letters written which expressed more exclusively the needs and emotions of the moment. Ignatius is no more defending in general terms the obligatory character of the apostolic discipline than he is writing a treatise on the Christian ministry. He is nothing if not definite and practical. The letters are the dying charge of a man of action who is dealing with a concrete situation. His mind is at the moment occupied not with the end but with the means, not with the discipline but with the episcopate.

We conclude, both from the positive indications of the context and from the negative indications of the context and the letters as a whole, that Ignatius implies that the status of the episcopate had been dealt with authoritatively by apostles, or by an apostle, and that he is probably referring to the recent action of St John.

Our argument is confirmed by a sentence which occurs almost immediately afterwards. The mind of Ignatius is, as we have seen, occupied with the thought that the Trallians must be loyal to the episcopate with which St John's authority was so closely identified. While this thought is uppermost in his mind he adds 'I do not command you like an apostle'. The words most probably mean, 'I do not command you like St John'.

Again, we must observe that he uses here the word *διατάσσομαι* and in § 7 *διαταγμάτων*. The phrase gains much in point if we suppose that it is allusive, and that we may paraphrase: 'My remarks about bishops in general, and Polybius in particular, are the advice of a criminal, not the constitutions of an apostle.'

H. J. BARDSLEY.