

THE
PRINCETON REVIEW.

JULY 1849.

No. III.

ART. I.—*Annual Report of the Board of Missions of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church, in the United States of America. Presented to the General Assembly, May, 1849.*

As a fruit of the Spirit of Christ in the church, and of the motions of that Spirit towards its proper manifestation, the Annual Reports of our Board of Missions are signs of the times. These yearly statements of the aims and results of our activity in the natural and legitimate direction of true Christianity, indicate a method and a scale of operations, honorable to the zeal and wisdom of the Board and its agents, and gratifying to the church; and while these operations are far behind the ability of the church and perhaps behind our advancement in some other things, they come from the spirit of the gospel, and are destined, as the gospel prospers, to a vast enlargement. While the same is true of the other Boards of our church, we would here offer a few hints concerning the ground of our system of Domestic Missions, for the sake of the bearing of our remarks on the nature and extent of our work.

exercised by presbyters; and this would prove that presbyters are the successors of the apostles in the highest of their powers which did not cease. If the possession of any apostolic powers is a proof of the succession, then the succession is in presbyters. If the possession of all the apostolic powers is necessary to establish a succession, then there is none at all. Either of these conclusions would be fatal to the adverse argument, which cannot have the slightest force, except on two conditions—(1) that the apostolic powers, shown to have been exercised by persons not of the original thirteen, be such as are not acknowledged to have ceased—(2) that they be such as were not exercised by Presbyters. For if they were powers possessed by Presbyters, their exercise proves nothing but the continuance of that office, which is not disputed; and if they were powers which have ceased, their exercise in apostolic times proves nothing as to the rights and powers of any office now existing in the church. With these preliminary observations, we here leave the subject, reserving to a future time the full exhibition of our fourth argument against the perpetuity of the Apostolic office, which is, that no peculiar apostolic powers are said in scripture to have been exercised by any person, who was not either an original apostle or a presbyter.

ART. III.—*Ignatius von Antiochien und seine Zeit. Sieben Send-schreiben an Dr. August Neander; von C. C. J. Bunsen. Hamburg. 1847.*

The personal history of Ignatius can be told in a few sentences; his writings, including all that bear his name, could be published in a single newspaper of ordinary size: while a full account of the controversies to which his writings have given rise would fill a considerable volume. According to a tradition intrinsically probable, and generally received, he was in his youth a scholar of the Apostles. He was settled in the pastoral charge of the church of Antioch, about A. D. 70; and remained in that important post, until his martyrdom A. D. 110–113. The emperor Trajan on his way to the east, stopped for some

time at Antioch—the third city in the world for wealth, extent and population, and the capital of the orient; during the sojourn of the emperor, Ignatius is summoned before him to give an account of his faith; for his noble confession of Christ, he is condemned to die, and ordered to be sent to Rome, to be exposed to wild beasts in the amphitheatre. As he slowly travelled towards the distant scene of his martyrdom, he wrote letters to personal friends and to Christian congregations, which, with similar productions of his contemporaries, Clement of Rome, and Polycarp of Smyrna, constitute the oldest uninspired monument of Christian literature.

The writings of these apostolical fathers no more form part of our rule of faith, than the works of the Reformers; but to the ecclesiastical historian they are of inestimable value. Indeed, next to the sacred record, there is no ancient document, of which it is so important that we have the *ipsissima verba*, as of these letters; the official position of their authors, their intelligence, and devoted piety render them perfectly reliable witnesses as to what was the faith of the church, and what the form of her government in the age immediately succeeding that of the apostles. Accordingly we find that the controversy respecting the Ignatian Epistles fills a much larger space, and has been more earnestly prosecuted than any similar discussion respecting any other author of the first three centuries. Why the falsifiers of early days, who really seem to have adopted the principle that forgery “is good if a man use it lawfully” selected Ignatius in preference to others, that they might convert him into a witness to doctrines which he never held, and an author of works which he never wrote, is uncertain. But that he has been thus treated,—that testimonies in favour of prelacy, and of Arianism have been put into his mouth, is a point—we may almost say—universally conceded. With respect to the first of the topics just mentioned, the pious forger, however, executed his work in a very bungling way; he has contrived to invest the venerable father with a lordly character, wholly unlike that of his contemporaries, but he has not succeeded in making him testify in favor of Prelacy, as it now exists. For even allowing the genuineness of the longer epistles, the kind of Episcopacy developed in them is not diocesan but parochial. Still it is quite obvious, from the tone of the interpolations and additions, from the

great importance attached to them by modern Prelatists like Hammond and Pearson,* and their zealous defence of their purity, that the aim of the falsifier was to secure for the hierarchy of the fourth century, the apparent sanction of one of the most eminent fathers of the first.

The earliest editions of the Greek text of Ignatius, viz., those of Pacaeus 1557, Gesner 1559, contained the twelve longer epistles. Among the first who questioned their genuineness, were the Magdeburg centuriators, though they did it in a cautious and hesitating tone. Calvin, with his usual perspicacity, saw through the fraud, and expressed himself respecting it in just such terms as might be expected from a man of his thorough honesty. "Nihil enim naeniis illis," said he, "quae subnomine Ignatii editae sunt, putidius." Cartwright, Perkins, Scultetus and other leading divines of the Protestant church, adopted the same opinion, partly on internal evidence, and partly from the great diversities which were found to exist in the manuscripts. With the exception of such high-church Anglicans as Whitgift, who insisted upon the genuineness of everything bearing the name of Ignatius, the whole Protestant world agreed in regarding only seven of these epistles, viz., those to the Ephesians, Magnesians, Trallians, Romans, Philadelphians, Smyrneans, and Polycarp, as the productions of Ignatius. Even these seven though held to be in the main genuine, were believed on good grounds to have been considerably interpolated. Under the influence of this belief Primate Usher engaged in those researches which resulted in the discovery of a Latin translation exhibiting a text materially differing from that of the received Greek. It contained the seven recognized epistles, but in a greatly abbreviated form—hence called the *Shorter Epistles*. He published an edition of it in 1644. About the same time that Usher made his discovery, Isaac Vossius found in the Medici library at Florence a Greek manuscript copy of the same epistles, agreeing very nearly with the Latin translation. From the first appearance of the *Shorter Epistles*, the same difference of opinion existed, as had previously obtained re-

* Inea (Controv. Episcop.) autem tractanda magni ponderis merito habita est S. Ignatii viri apostolici et martyris auctoritas, cujus dissertissimo locupletissimoque testimonio, cum Episcopalis causa fulciatur, et paritatis Presbyterianae antiquitas nuper excogitata concidat. Pearson Vind. Ignat. cap. I.

specting the Longer;* the high churchmen, who had so pertinaciously maintained that every line of the latter came from the pen of Ignatius, quietly abandoned a position which they suddenly found no longer tenable, but without learning either wisdom or candour from the past, they just took the same stand in favour of the absolute purity of the shorter text; on the other the leading theologians of the Reformed churches insisted that it was corrupted, though they did not pretend to be able to identify the interpolations. The whole subject was thoroughly discussed by Bishop Pearson on the one side in his *Vindiciae Ignat.*, and by Daillé in his *De Scriptis Ignatii* on the other; by Bishop Beveridge, Hammond, Cotelerius, LeClerc, Blondel, L'Arroque and Jameson. In fact, it was one of the chief theological questions of the latter part of the 17th century; and incidentally the discussion has been often renewed since. High churchmen have all along asserted that the Shorter Epistles are unadulterated, with the same pertinacity with which the Whitgifts and the Bilsons defended the Longer; though not a few candid Episcopalians of later times have owned that all the passages in the Ignatian epistles bearing on the episcopal office are more than suspicious. Still it could not be proved with absolute certainty that they are not genuine; and it seemed as if the controversy about what Ignatius did, and what he did not write was one which must remain forever undecided.

The appearance of M. Bunsen's work forms a new era in the history of the Ignatian controversy. If party interests had not so much to do with the formation and the maintenance of opinions, if men were as open to the force of evidence as they claim to be, we should look for a change of sentiment on this subject quite as great as that produced in the days of Usher, by the discovery of the shorter recension. However this may be, one thing is certain, that every candid reader of the work before us will be compelled to admit that the views of Blondell and Daillé are completely established, and that the testimonies so often quoted and so highly prized by the advocates of the hierarchy are the worthless coinage of pious fraud. In a word, the long

* Thus Grotius in a letter to G. Vossius, dated 22d Aug. 1643, says of Blondell: "Ignatii epistolas quas fiius tuus ex Italia attulit puras ab omni bus illis quae eruditi hac tenus suspecta habuere? admitte non vult, quia episcopatum vetustati clarum praebent testimonium."—*Erudit Vir Epist. H. Wetstein*, p. 825.

agitated question respecting the Ignatian epistles is settled, by the discovery of the Syriac Version of them which M. Bunsen has been at the pains to edit and illustrate.

It was long ago intimated by Usher, by Dr. Fell of Oxford and by Renaudot of France, that if ever the genuine text of Ignatius was found, it would be in a Syriac translation. The discovery by the two Assemani of a Syriac manuscript containing "The Acts of the Martyrdom of Ignatius" awakened the hope that such a version would yet be brought to light. More recently Mr. Cureton of the British Museum, found among the papers of the late Mr. Rich a Syriac manuscript containing a portion of the "Martyrdom," and appended to it a part of the epistle to the Romans. In 1839 Dr. Tatam the learned Coptic scholar, presented to the British Museum a large number of Syriac manuscripts which he obtained from the monasteries in the Lybian desert. On examining them, Mr. Cureton to his great delight found in a manuscript of the early part of the 6th century, the Letter to Polycarp in a Syriac version evidently made by a man of learning, and with great care. The curators of the Museum at once resolved thoroughly to explore a field whose first fruits were so precious and promising; they accordingly, in 1842 sent Dr. Tatam to Egypt, with orders to make the fullest search, and to secure all the remaining manuscripts, at any cost. His mission was crowned with success; and in March 1843 he returned with two hundred and forty-six manuscripts on parchment, and seventy on paper. Some of them are probably the oldest manuscripts in Europe, their dates ranging from A. D. 411 to 1292. Among them is a Syriac version of the long lost Theophania of Eusebius. At the end of a work of an unknown author (the first few pages being lost) is the following inscription—" *The First Epistle of the holy Ignatius to Polycarp.*" At the end of this letter, in the middle of the page, and without any break or dividing space, is " *The Second Epistle of the same to the Ephesians.*" At the end of this letter and again without a break, comes " *The Third Epistle of the same to the Romans.*" The whole concludes with the following remarkable statement: "Here end *The Three Epistles of Ignatius, Bishop and Martyr.*"

This version was probably made early in the 2d century by Procopius, who according to Eusebius translated many works

into the Aramean. That was the flourishing period of Syrian literature; and when we remember, that next to the Holy Scriptures, the Syrian church most highly prized the letters of their oldest pastor, it is quite supposable that they were translated soon after the death of Ignatius. However this may be, it is evident that the translator was a native Syrian, that he was well acquainted with Greek, and that he translated only three of the Epistles, and these too in their shortest form. M. Bunsen's position is, that these three Epistles as given in the Syriac version are the only genuine productions of Ignatius, and in this volume he investigates the subject under the guidance of the established principles of philological and historical criticism.

The volume is divided into two parts. The first is entitled "*Ignatius und seine Zeit*," and consists of seven letters addressed to Neander, for whom he manifests the most affectionate veneration. The second is addressed to Lachmann, and contains, 1. The Greek text of the three genuine letters restored from the Syriac, with a German translation. 2. A comparative view of the various recensions of the genuine epistles, viz. the Restored Greek, the Syriac in a literal Latin version—the Medicean—the Longer, and at the bottom of the page, the Latin version found by Usher. 3. The four supposititious epistles in Greek and Latin; to each of the seven are appended critical scholia.

M. Bunsen sets out with a discussion of the question, "Is the Syriac translation of the three letters to Polycarp, the Ephesians and the Romans only an abbreviation of the original text, or does it exhibit that text?" In replying to this inquiry he first of all deals with the probabilities of the case. Which, he asks, is the most probable that the Syriac is an abbreviation, or the common text an enlargement of the genuine? Mr. Cureton, with all his Anglican prejudices in favour of the system which the latter is supposed to support, is forced to admit that the balance of probabilities is decidedly on the side of the Syriac. For example, the passages which it wants, consist of three classes; the first includes those (decidedly the most numerous) which refer to the divine authority of bishops; the second, those which bear upon the doctrine of the Trinity; the third, personal narratives and greetings of particular friends by name.

Now as respects the last class, there is no conceivable reason for their omission by the Syriac translator; on the contrary, it

might be supposed that these personal and local references would to Syrians possess a peculiar charm. How, or why then, should these passages, if genuine, be left out? They are not long; there is not the shadow of proof that the translator was careless or unfaithful; his work in fact, from first to last bears the character of a translation prepared with painful care. And then as to the other two classes, perhaps it may be argued that the translator did not believe in the doctrine of the divinity of Christ, and was opposed to the Episcopal constitution of the church. But Mr. Cureton has proved by indubitable evidence that he was a decided friend of the orthodox faith. Nor can it be said that a falsifier would not have dared to put into the mouth of a venerable martyr like Ignatius words and sentiments which he never uttered, for ecclesiastical literature abounds with similar interpolations, of so early a date, that even the fathers of the 4th and 5th centuries were suspicious of them.

The force of this argument in favour of the truthfulness of the Syriac version, is greatly enhanced by considering the history of the Syrian church. From the time of the council of Ephesus, A. D. 431, this church was decidedly Nestorian. Hence it would not be surprising, if we found in a Syrian collection of the letters of Ignatius—supposing it to have been made after the date just mentioned—some traces of Nestorianism. No such traces are to be discovered in this translation; it contains passages directly opposed to this system. In truth, nothing can be more improbable than the supposition that it is the work of a Nestorian; on the contrary, all the proofs in the case go to show that it was made long before the days of Nestorius himself.

Having thus disposed of the probabilities of the case, M. Bunsen next proceeds to institute a careful and minute comparison between the Syriac version, and the common text of the three epistles. The first of these—to Polycarp—has been hitherto regarded by critics as the most corrupt in the whole collection. Even Halloix the Jesuit, one of the most zealous defenders of the Medicean text, declares that it contains many things very stumbling to him, particularly the tone used in addressing a brother bishop. Usher too, though hardly willing to allow a doubt to be cast on the purity of the common text, excludes it from the number of the genuine epistles of Ignatius. Yet there is really nothing remarkable or stumbling in the letter, when we bear

in mind that it consists of the last words of a venerable servant of Christ, just ready to seal his testimony with his blood, addressed to a young fellow-labourer. All the objections to its genuineness rest upon passages whose true meaning has been darkened or perverted by false readings. The whole letter may be divided into four parts; the first containing counsels to Polycarp with reference to his faith as a Christian and a pastor; the second relates to his conduct as a bishop, in his commerce with the world, and his contests with the times, closing with a noble exposition of the comparative value of the temporal and the eternal; the third lays down rules of conduct towards the several classes of which his pastoral charge was composed; and thus he is naturally led, in the last place, to speak of the collective assembly. In giving direction as to the proper management of the various classes of the congregation, Ignatius refers to those who were in bondage, and on this subject holds the same language with Paul in 1 Cor. vii. 21.* He knew that the mighty power of the gospel, if allowed to have free course, would in due time correct this and all the other evils of the social state; but he also knew that any attempt to remove them by the mere force of ecclesiastical laws would be not only fruitless but pernicious.

Thus far all is coherent; but now comes a statement which completely breaks the natural train of thought. "Flee evil arts," *τας κακοτεχνιας φευγε; μαλλου δε περι τουτων ομιλιαν ποιου.*† Mr. Bunsen is strongly of opinion that there could be no ground for giving any such direction to a man like Polycarp; and as the reading is found both in the Syriac and the common text, he thinks that an error consisting of two letters had very early crept into the text. He amends it by changing *τεχνιας* into *τεχνουσ*, making the whole passage refer to the female members of the congregation, who are expressly mentioned in the next sentence: "Likewise command my sisters that they love their own husbands," &c.

The closing sentence in the Syriac version is short and natural: "A Christian has no power over himself, but ever waits upon God: I salute him who shall be deemed worthy to go

* M. Bunsen translates this passage—"kannst du frei werden, so bediene dich lieber der Freiheit; sonst bedenke, das du frei bist in Christus."

† In the Larger Epist. the reading is *μη ποιου*.

to Syria in my place, even as I directed you." Instead of this brief and simple statement, which is precisely such as we should expect from Ignatius in his circumstances at the time, the Medicean text has a long passage amounting to two sections, in which the natural order of ideas is entirely destroyed. With this exception, the epistle to Polycarp has been much less corrupted than any other. In our present investigation, it is of great importance because it supplies a test by which to try the other letters, as to their style, structure and contents. We discover in it a compressed brevity, a sharply defined personality, and a simple style remote from everything like rhetorical amplification. The language is good Hellenistic Greek, formed on the model of the epistles of Paul and John. On the other hand, the falsified passages exhibit a corrupt Hellenism, and a style extremely redundant. This observation particularly applies to the epistle to the Ephesians, which has been largely interpolated for the obvious purpose of magnifying the prelatial office.

In order to judge of this rightly, it is necessary to look at the general scope of this epistle, and the coherence of its several parts. These are four. In the 1st, or the introduction, Ignatius thanks the Ephesians for the affectionate interest they had manifested for him, and expresses his confidence in their piety. In the 2d, he declares to them the indispensable necessity of a holy life—"live," says he, "a God-pleasing life, as those who are living stones in the true temple." The 3d part counsels them how to act towards those beyond the pale of Christian fellowship. They should diligently labour for their salvation, and should manifest in their conduct an ever active, all enduring love, which is the essence of Christianity, and the most efficient means to attract those who are without. Then follows a highly animated passage—a sudden burst of holy feeling, excited by a glimpse of the glories of the cross—"My soul sinks down before the glory of the cross, so full of mysteries concealed from the princes of this world," &c. What thoughts could be more natural than these, or more suitable in a farewell letter to a beloved sister congregation?

Now in the Medicean copy, the two sentences—"Thanks be to Him who has given you grace to be worthy of such a bishop—But since love does not permit me to be silent, I entreat you to

run together in the will of God"—are separated by an interpolation of two long sections, and are followed by another of no less than four. In one of these passages Burrhus, Euplus, Crokus and Fronto, are spoken of as members of the embassy sent to him from Ephesus, while the genuine text names Onesimus alone; in the others, absolute obedience to the bishop is insisted upon, as an essential condition of holiness and salvation. "Being subject in all things to the bishop and the presbytery, ye are sanctified." "Let us hasten therefore to be obedient to the bishop, that we may be obedient to God." "When any one sees the bishop silent, let him be so much the more afraid." Such are the expressions employed on this subject with an excessive frequency. A little farther on, we meet with a still more violent disruption of two closely connected sentences.—"Strive not to imitate the unconverted, but be imitators of the Lord, for who was ever so much abused as he.—But this (imitation) is not a mere profession, it is rather done by those alone who continue to the end in the power of faith." Between these two sentences, which so obviously ought to follow each other, a long passage amounting to four sections has been foisted in. The limits of our article will not permit us to notice all the other interpolations of this epistle; the examples already adduced may serve to give some idea of the manner in which the letters of Ignatius have been treated, and of the extent to which they have been corrupted; but the strong contrast between the two texts, the natural, truthful, life-like air of the Syriac version, and the precisely opposite features of the common text can be fully appreciated only by those who will be at the pains to read the two consecutively.

The epistle to the Romans—which is next discussed—casts more light on the personal character of Ignatius than either of the others. According to the Syriac version, it was written by him when near the end of his journey to the capital; the Medicæan text, on the other hand, represents it as written at Ephesus. The Syriac account on this point is much the most probable, because it agrees best with the whole tone of the epistle, and with the design of Ignatius which seems to have been, to induce the Romans to throw no obstacles in the way of his winning the martyr's crown. The interpolations of this letter however are neither so numerous nor so important as those of the epistle

to the Ephesians; we therefore forbear entering into a particular notice of them.

Before leaving this epistle Mr. Bunsen examines a question, which critics hitherto have not been able satisfactorily to answer, viz: why was Ignatius sent to Rome? Some have held that this journey never was made; but the fact however explained, must be admitted, or else all the epistles bearing his name must be set aside as forgeries, for we find allusions to it in each of them. Scaliger, Rivet, and Basnage put the case in this form. If Ignatius was a Roman citizen how could he be condemned to wild beasts? If he was not a Roman citizen, how could he appeal to the emperor, and in virtue of his appeal be sent to Rome? Here is a dilemma, both horns of which are unpleasantly sharp, and the advocates of the common text not knowing which to choose, have concluded that the safest course is to be silent on the subject. Not a word, however, is said in any of these epistles about an appeal; Ignatius simply describes himself as one who had been condemned to fight with beasts, and was therefore sent to Rome under military escort. Vossius attempts to get over the difficulty by referring to a passage in the Pandects in which, as he says, provincial governors were authorized to send the ring-leaders of insurrections to Rome; but in the place alluded to, the persons mentioned are not "ring-leaders," but men of remarkable strength and skill. The passage in question, however, warrants the inference that before the days of Severus, governors of provinces were allowed under certain circumstances to send malefactors to the capital, with a view to their gratifying the people, by taking a share in the cruel sports of the amphitheatre. No citizen, whether Christian or pagan, could indeed be condemned to such a death. That Ignatius was not a citizen is expressly asserted by himself, as M. Bunsen thinks, in the following words;—"I do not command you like Paul and Peter; they were apostles, I am a prisoner; they were freemen, I am even now a servant,"—words, as he holds, which must be understood in their literal sense. But our limits warn us not to enlarge on points of this kind.

M. Bunsen having thus shown the superior claims of the Syriac text of the three letters found in that version, and which he affirms are the only genuine epistles of Ignatius, proceeds to examine the remaining four, viz. to the Magnesians, the

Trallians, the Philadelphians, and the Smyrnians, and to adduce the evidences, that they are entirely suppositious. We have already had occasion to remark that the undoubted and the interpolated portions of the genuine epistles are each marked by peculiar features. In the latter we always find the same style; instead of the compact brevity of Ignatius, great prolixity; instead of his fullness of thought sharply defined and strongly expressed, rhetorical flourishes, in which the poverty of ideas is proportioned to the multitude of words. Even when we encounter an Ignatian idea, it is feebly and awkwardly brought out. Now if these identical features are found in the four epistles above named,—if between the four doubtful epistles, taken as a whole or in their particular parts, and the three undoubted epistles there is the same contrast as between the undoubted and the interpolated portions of the latter, the presumption that the former are wholly false is very strong. If in addition to this, we find the author in the polemical parts of the epistles contending against heresies which were unknown until long after the death of Ignatius, the presumption of falsity rises to indubitable certainty. Let us then, as briefly as possible, examine these epistles in the order in which they stand in the Medicean manuscript.

The first is addressed to the Magnesians. It consists of two parts, the first including the chapters from the first to the seventh. The Magnesians are commanded to yield implicit submission to their bishops as standing in loco Dei. The injunction is repeated usque ad nauseam;—the whole passage is manifestly the product of the same pen which composed the portion of the epistle to the Ephesians, where the episcopal office is so highly glorified. Widely different is the whole tone of this letter from that which the true Ignatius uses when addressing Polycarp on the same subject. In the latter he exhorts the Christian people to manifest a proper respect for those set over them in the Lord, or in other words to honour the ministry as an institution of Christ; but in the letter to the Magnesians, the bishop is every thing, and the people nothing; they must render absolute obedience to his behests, and no man must presume to exercise his own mind, or to think differently from “the lord over God’s heritage.”

But the second part—extending from chapter eight to the

end—contains the most decisive proof that the whole thing is a forgery. It is found in the passage in which the Magnesians are warned against “other doctrines and old and useless fables.” The heresies referred to are:—1. That of the Sabbatarians, who observed the seventh instead of the first or Lord’s day: 2. The doctrine that Christ did not proceed eternally from the Father, but was the offspring of eternal Silence ($\Sigma\iota\gamma\eta$): 3. That the death of our Lord, and his whole earthly life were not realities, but merely seemed to be such. Now this last heresy, as all who have investigated the subject agree in holding, originated in the school of Valentinus. This man, according to Irenæus, came to Rome about A. D. 130, was in great repute there from A. D. 133 till 154, and was still living, A. D. 163.

Pierson, who undertook, as we have already stated, to establish the genuineness and the purity of all the epistles, found this a very troublesome place. How does he get over it? By asserting that the reference is not to the heresy of the Docetæ but to that of the Ebionites, and by translating the passage in a way which violates the plainest rules of grammar. If the doctrine of the Docetæ be really described here, why he asks with singular simplicity—why did not Irenæus quote it when discussing the tenets of that sect? For the very good reason that there was no such passage to quote; it was clearly impossible for him to adduce a testimony from Ignatius, against a heresy which was never heard of until long after he was in his grave.

The next is the epistle to the Trallians. Artistically considered, it is decidedly inferior to the preceding. The Introduction is to the last degree bombastic—so that it is scarcely possible to make any sense of it. It abounds with commands to honour and obey the bishop, conveyed in language even more offensive than that employed in the epistle to the Magnesians. We also meet with warnings against heresies which had no existence in the days of Ignatius, viz. of those who denied the reality of our Saviour’s human nature, his earthly life, and death upon the cross. There is one circumstance connected with this epistle, which Mr. Bunsen regards as furnishing conclusive evidence that the forged letters and the interpolations in the genuine are the productions of one and the same man; it is the fact that the last section has been transferred from the epistle to the Romans where it properly belongs. As it stands in the

letter to the Trallians, the passage is almost senseless, while in its proper place it is full of meaning. There is an indirect allusion in it to the contrast between the oriental and the Roman mind,—the speculative, mystical tendencies of the former as displayed in its conceptions of the Christian system, and the decidedly practical turn of the latter. Ignatius tells his Roman brethren that there were many things connected with the heavenly world about which he might discourse to them; but he forbore to do so, as he was aware that topics of this kind, while peculiarly interesting to an oriental, would not be so well relished by a Roman—whose taste ran upon the ethics of the Gospel rather than its mysteries. He does not say this in so many words; but such is undoubtedly the drift of the passage.

Each of the remaining two epistles—to the Philadelphians and the Smyrnians—contains evidences of falsity, of precisely the same kind with those already adduced and just as conclusive. There is the same glorification of the episcopal office—and warnings against the Docetian heresy similar to those addressed to the Magnesians and the Trallians. It is therefore unnecessary to enlarge upon this branch of the subject, as it would be a mere repetition of what has been said already.

We have thus indicated as briefly as possible, the grounds on which it is maintained that the Syriac version includes all the genuine epistles of Ignatius, and exhibits these in their purest form. Of its high antiquity there can be no doubt, yet no one pretends that it was made directly from the originals. The copy from which it was derived probably was not immaculate; the translator may have mistaken the sense in some places; and even his work, like all similar writings, probably has suffered somewhat by transcription. That there are some false readings in it, M. Bunsen thinks is not only probable but certain; at the same time it conveys far more exactly than any other recension, and with as much accuracy as we may ever hope to attain, the views of Ignatius respecting the essential doctrines of the Christian faith, and those principles of church polity which have occasioned, in past ages, and still call forth so much discussion.

Thus far the investigation has been mainly of a philological character, and a negative result has been reached; in other words, there is evidence derived from the established rules of

criticism, that a large part of the writings bearing the name of Ignatius must be rejected as spurious. Is there any positive proof of the genuineness of the residuum? Baur, and others of the Tübingen school maintain that all are spurious—that all the letters ascribed to Ignatius, Clement, and Polycarp, are forgeries. Mr. Bunsen devotes a large space to the refutation of this Tübingen conceit—much larger than it deserves—and conclusively establishes the fact—admitted by all historical inquirers, a few such men as Baur alone excepted, that the letters of the apostolic fathers are in the main, what they claim to be. In doing this, he portrays the times of these fathers, taking a rapid but comprehensive view of the condition of the church, her subjective faith, her discipline and government during this period. With reference to the Ignatian epistles, he asks, do the *three* which remain after having subjected the whole to the test of philological criticism, bear the positive impress of the Ignatian age? Do they, so far as they go, exhibit the faith of the church at this precise epoch, and the form of polity which then obtained? He answers these questions in the affirmative; the three epistles as given in the Syriac version, have the true stamp, and only these. This branch of the argument is by far the most interesting and important, because it involves the practical inquiry what doctrines, and what polity did Ignatius hold—with which one of the various parties in later times, that have been accustomed to appeal to his authority, has the genuine Ignatius the strongest affinity?

On the first of these points—the doctrinal character of his letters—it may suffice to say that the views of Ignatius respecting the fundamental truths of the Gospel, the person and work of Christ, the way of salvation, the nature, necessity and author of sanctification, are exactly those which obtain among evangelical Christians of the present day. The city of which he was pastor, was the centre of primitive missions to the Gentile world—a sort of metropolis of Gentile Christianity, a circumstance which may have led him to study the character of the great apostle to the Gentiles, and imitate its peculiar features; whatever may have been the cause, it is certain that the cast of Ignatius' mind, and the tone of his theology are decidedly Pauline. He magnifies the riches of that grace which contrived and executed the scheme of redemption; with him, Christ is all in all. Not a syllable can be

found in any of his epistles, which even seems to countenance the noxious tenets of those who teach that the water of baptism necessarily regenerates, and who put the church in the place of her Divine Lord. We cannot find the first trace of this system of doctrine in the Ignatian epistles. But we pass on to consider their bearing upon the second point—ecclesiastical polity.

In bringing out the views of Ignatius on this subject, Mr. Bunsen is led by the necessities of his argument to trace the successive changes in the government of the church, from the days of the apostles, down to the era when the hierarchy was fully developed. He begins by observing that a reader of the New Testament who had never heard of the theological contests of the last two centuries, would hardly believe it possible that any one could be found to deny that Bishop and Presbyter or Elder are convertible terms. That they are used to designate the same officer, is sufficiently evident from 1 Tim. iii. 1-7, compared with Tit. i. 5-9; it is equally plain from other passages of the New Testament, that, towards the close of Paul's life, i. e. a few years before the destruction of Jerusalem, each church was governed by a college of elders or presbyters aided by a bench of deacons. In Acts xx. 17-28, the same persons, in one part of Paul's address are styled "presbyters (or elders) of the church," in another "bishops" or overseers. Again, in Phil. i. 1, "Paul and Timothy the servants of Jesus Christ" send their greeting "to all the saints which are at Phillippi with the bishops and deacons." These are the only places in the New Testament where the word *Bishop* occurs. Rothe, has directed attention to the fact that Peter, whenever he has occasion to speak of the overseers of the church, always uses the term *Presbyter* because it was one with which the Jewish Christians were familiar, just as the Gentile Christians were with the word *Επισκοπος* which Paul employs. In the epistle to the Hebrews a phrase differing from both these is chosen (*ἡγουμένοι*) "obey them *that have the rule over you.*" Coming down to a still later period, in the Apocalypse of John we meet with the term *Angel* as a designation of the pastor of a church. And finally, near the close of the first century, we have in the third epistle of the same Apostle, (as Rothe further remarks,) not indeed the title of *Prelate*, but a picture of one; a prelate who seems to have possessed great power in the congregation, and

who exercised it in the way of "casting men out of the church," with an energy not inferior to that of Henry of Exeter in modern days. His name was Diotrephes—the first historical Prelate. Here the records of inspiration terminate; after this, no man, no church can pretend to *know* any thing respecting the organization of the early Christian societies, beyond what may be learned from the epistles of Clement written about the end of the first century, and those of Ignatius about the beginning of the second;—epistles, which, as mere human, though we doubt not, truthful testimonies respecting matters of fact, are not to be put upon a level with the infallible word of God, our only rule of faith.

The passages in the New Testament bearing upon the earliest constitution of the church are not numerous; but few as they are, there cannot be two opinions as to their meaning among readers free from partisan prejudices. By what steps did the church pass from her earliest form to the organization existing in the second and third centuries? This question has been often asked; by the fathers of the fourth and fifth centuries, by the reformers of the sixteenth, by theologians of the seventeenth, by historians of the nineteenth. In answer to it we observe that the commission given to Timothy and Titus casts light upon the state of things during the period extending from the date of the earliest epistle of Paul down to the oldest of the apostolical fathers. The Apocalypse and the third epistle of John seem to indicate that in Ephesus and in other congregations in Asia Minor, even before the destruction of Jerusalem, a slight change had been made in the form of government, each of these churches, instead of having a college of presbyters, was under the charge of a single pastor. We find, for example, at the close of the first century, Clement the pastor of the church at Rome, Ignatius at Antioch, Polycarp at Smyrna; gradually this plan extended itself, and before the end of the second century, it was universal. Each church had a single pastor—to whom the Greco-Roman term *Episcopus* was applied;—he was assisted by a council of presbyters, all holding the same rank as the bishop, and having the same authority to preach, govern and ordain. Episcopalians indeed maintain that a much greater change was made than that, from a collective pastorate to a single pastor; they affirm that the Apostles or such of them as survived

the destruction of Jerusalem, placed at the head of each church, a bishop, in the modern sense of the word, investing him as the representative of the unity of the church with peculiar powers, and that they established this as the only lawful form of government, and which therefore should be observed by the church universal in all future time. The advocates of this theory have been accustomed to rely upon the authority of Ignatius, of course, taking it for granted that the commonly received text of his epistles is genuine. If they can make out this part of their theory, we are ready to admit their pretensions to the apostolical succession. But the evidence must be decisive and irresistible; for the question to be settled, as Mr. Bunsen remarks, is one of more than ordinary moment; the real point in debate is not merely whether a certain class of men have a divine right to exercise a spiritual authority over the Christian people, but, whether it belongs to them exclusively and unconditionally to determine what is truth, by authoritatively declaring what the Bible means. Did the fathers of the primitive church claim either for themselves individually, or for the collective ministry any such prerogative? Do they any where teach that the Head of the church directly, or through the medium of the Apostles, invested them and their lawful successors with a power like this? How far they were from making such lofty pretensions, may be gathered from the epistle of Clement to the Corinthians. The church of Corinth was rent by intestine divisions. One party claimed that the congregation had the right to compel the presbyters to resign their office, however blameless their conduct, and to appoint others in their place. This power was not only asserted, but exercised. Those who sided with the excluded presbyters complained of the proceeding as unrighteous, at last they agreed to refer the matter to the pastor of Rome. In his reply, there is a long passage in which he says, that the apostles, as they went from city to city preaching the Gospel, ordained in every church "bishops and deacons," who should retain their offices for life, unless guilty of some crime. This passage, which is too long to be quoted, has been subjected to all kinds of torture, in order to make it testify that the Prelate is the true and only successor of the apostles; but no such testimony has been or can be got out of it.

If the Episcopal theory were well founded, Clement should

have addressed the Corinthians in some such strain as the following—"the apostles provided that after their death the bishops should be invested with their authority; now if such successors of the apostles, worthily discharge the duties of their high office by governing the church, ordaining presbyters and deacons, it is a great sin in any people to compel them to resign their bishoprick." But there is nothing like this in his whole letter; it contains not a word about the appointment of successors to the apostles; there is not even the most distant hint that the church of Corinth was under the charge of a single bishop of any kind. On the contrary, he distinctly intimates that it was governed by a college of presbyters. "What a shame—says he--that the old congregation of the Corinthians, through the instigation of one or two persons, should be involved in an uproar against *their Presbyters.*"—"I will go where you like, I will do whatever the people (i. e. the congregation) require, only let the flock of Christ be at peace with *their appointed Presbyters.*" "You who have occasioned this disturbance submit yourselves *to the Presbyters.*" Such language is utterly inexplicable on the supposition that there was a Prelate or Bishop on the spot. If there had been such an officer in the church of Corinth at this time, he could not possibly avoid taking part in the controversy which distracted it; he must have sided with the faction that created the uproar; or, in attempting to sustain the cause of the injured, have found his own authority as little regarded as that of the ejected presbyters. In either case, it would be impossible for Clement to avoid all allusion to him. Yet there is not the most distant hint of this kind. Perhaps it may be said that the office happened to be vacant; the old bishop being dead, and a new one not yet chosen. But this supposition can be proved to be as groundless as the other, for, Clement in this very letter, alluding to the earlier history of the Corinthian church, to its peacefulness and good order, at a time which must have been between the death of Paul, and the breaking out of the present divisions, says—"Once ye acted without respect of persons, being obedient to the commands of God, and subject to *those who have the rule over you*" (τοῖς ἡγουμένοις ὑμῶν); the very expression used in the epistle to the Hebrews xiii. 17.

Here then is a letter from the pastor of the church in the

capital of the empire addressed to a congregation in one of the chief cities of Greece, and written for the express purpose of healing the painful divisions by which it was disturbed. Now if it were true that the apostles ordained prelates as their successors, and invested them with full apostolical authority, this letter of Clement, considering its occasion and object, must be precisely the document to furnish indubitable evidence of the fact. Surely a church like that of Corinth has or ought to have a prelate; or if her turbulent Christians, true to their Greek nature had hitherto refused to allow the episcopal office to be established among them, one of the first injunctions of Clement—himself a prelate—would certainly be that they remodel their church constitution, that they receive and obey a successor of the apostles, and thus get rid of present disorders, as well prevent them for the future. This is what the document in question ought to contain, if the Episcopal theory be true. Whereas, in point of fact, Clement declares, almost in so many words that the church of Corinth neither had been under episcopal government, nor was at that time; and instead of proposing it as the only effectual means of healing their disunion, he earnestly exhorts them to submit to the rule of *their presbyters*. We have already intimated that in Asia Minor, the prevailing form of government during the latter years of the apostle John was congregational episcopacy: but this letter of Clement conclusively proves that at least some of the principal churches in Greece retained the still earlier constitution described in Phil. i. 1.

If from Corinth we pass to the capital of Egypt we shall find proofs equally convincing as those just given, that the dogma—no bishop, no church—was unknown there. The great patriarchal church of Alexandria was for many years under the control of presbyters, who not only elected, but consecrated by imposition of hands, one of their own number to the office of Patriarch. We have the express testimony of Jerome, and of Eutychius to this important fact. Jerome's language is "presbyteri semper unum ex se electum in excelsiori gradu collocatum episcopum nominabant, quomodo si exercitus imperatorem faciat." Some Prelatists unwilling to lose so eminent a man and so learned a theologian, maintain that Jerome is here speaking of the election, not of the ordination of the Alexandrian

bishop, and in support of this exposition make a great deal of the word *nominabant*. Now without going into a verbal exegesis of the passage, we simply affirm that such an explanation is absurd, because the very object for which the fact is mentioned, is to show the original identity of the offices of bishop and presbyter. But besides the evidence of Jerome we have that of Eutychius, himself a Patriarch and historian of Alexandria. His account differs from, but does not contradict the former; his words are,—“cum vacaret patriarchatus, unum duodecim presbyteris eligerent, *cujus capiti reliqui undecim manus imponentes ipsi benedicerent et patriarcham crearent.*” He adds that until the time of the Patriarch Demetrius, A. D. 190, except at Alexandria, there was not a bishop in all Egypt. Demetrius ordained three; his successor, Heraclas, twenty.

That the Alexandrian church was not alone in her ignorance of the doctrine “no bishop, no church,” or in other words, in holding that presbyters had full episcopal authority, appears from the thirteenth canon of the council of Ancyra* (held about ten years before that of Nice) on the subject of Chorepiscopi. It prohibited them from ordaining presbyters and deacons and also enjoined city presbyters to abstain from such acts unless they had written consent of the bishop of the diocese. Dr. Routh and other prelatie writers have laboured hard to weaken the force of the evidence which this canon furnishes against their theory, by resorting to verbal criticism, and bringing forward various readings whose worthlessness they themselves would be the first to denounce if they were not blinded by party interests and prejudices. In fact they appear to have persuaded themselves that if there is one thing more certain than another it is the doctrine of the apostolical succession, the divine and exclusive right of prelates to govern the church of Christ; this is an ecclesiastical axiom, and therefore if Jerome or Eutychius or any other ancient writer makes a statement that seems to contradict it, either they are misinformed or their language is misunderstood. The canon of the council of Ancyra on the subject of country bishops, cannot possibly have the

* In commenting on Dr. Routh's philological observations on this canon, Mr. Bunsen says, “In der Klasischen Philologie kommen dergleichen Erklärungsversuche nicht mehr vor: in der biblischen und theologischen muss man nichts für unmöglich halten, so lange die heilige Philologie der Theologen ubelassen wird.”

sense indicated by its terms; it cannot possibly be supposed to intimate that chorepiscopi, and city presbyters ever exercised episcopal authority; the council could have intended no more by this canon than simply to warn the chorepiscopi against presuming to ordain presbyters in the large towns and cities. Yet how palpably absurd is this explanation of the act in question? Suppose that the last General Assembly had solemnly enacted, that hereafter no board of trustees should ordain ministers, and that the ruling elders of congregations should not ordain and install their pastors, we venture to say that every one would conclude that the members had taken temporary leave of their senses, when they thus forbade what trustees and elders had never dreamed of doing. Now Dr. Routh and others of his school will have it that the council of Ancyra perpetrated an exactly analogous absurdity, by passing an act prohibiting the chorepiscopi from ordaining city presbyters, when the council very well knew that they never had presumed to ordain even a deacon in the most obscure country village or hamlet. We cannot believe that any ecclesiastical assembly would be guilty of such ridiculous legislation. The canon in question was enacted during one of the transition periods in the history of the church, when prelacy zealously sustained by a newly converted emperor was rapidly developing its energies, though it had not yet become universally established. This accounts for the prohibition; which, at the same time, clearly implies that country bishops and city presbyters had exercised the powers, of which they were now deprived. If the limits of this article permitted, we might bring from the historical records of the first two centuries additional testimonies to show that the nature of the primitive episcopate was such as we have described, and that the claims of the pretended successors of the apostles are historically as groundless as they are destitute of scriptural authority.

The constitutional history of the New Testament church, or the history of the changes in her form and principles of government, from her origin until the complete development of the hierarchy, may be divided, says our author, into *three periods*, of very unequal length.

The first period extends from the Ascension of our Lord to the death of Paul, embracing between thirty and forty years.

The church at first consists simply of the apostles and the brethren ; this is the primal and for a while the only distinction in the visible body of believers. Very soon the increase of members by thousands renders the erection of a new office necessary, and accordingly seven deacons are ordained. The persecution of which Stephen was the first victim, compels the apostles and their associates to separate for a time ; they visit Samaria and other regions, preaching the gospel, and forming their converts into congregations. Each of these had a bench of presbyters or elders, who jointly governed the congregation, all of them being invested with precisely the same powers of ruling, teaching, ordaining others, and administering the sacraments. These societies consisted exclusively of Jewish Christians, and the model of their constitution was naturally taken from the Synagogue. Whether these Presbyters, or to use the Graeco-Roman term, *Episcopoi* (Bishops) were originally chosen for life is uncertain ; but before the death of Paul the law was fixed, that unless deposed for misconduct they should discharge their functions while they lived. As for the apostles, we find that they were called and ordained by the Lord himself ; they were not ministers of local churches, nor were they charged with the care of particular districts, but held a special relation to the collective church. Theirs was truly an office of exalted dignity ; but nowhere in the New Testament are they represented as priests, or as acting the part of mediators between the church and Christ ; on the contrary, they plainly taught that there is only "one mediator between God and man," and that all believers are "priests unto God." In congregations fully organized the only helpers employed by the apostles were their regular pastors, viz. the presbyters ; while to regions which they were unable to visit, or through which they had passed hastily, Evangelists were sent "to set in order the things that were wanting and ordain elders in every city."

Such seems to have been the constitution of particular Christian societies during this period ; the work of teaching, ruling, &c., was performed by a body of presbyters all equal in dignity and power, while the care of the poor, and other temporal concerns were managed by a bench of deacons. The only exception to this rule was the church of Jerusalem, which, beside having the usual bench of presbyters and deacons, was presided

over by a single pastor of apostolical dignity—James the brother of our Lord. Every congregation, was to a certain extent independent, regulating its own affairs in its own way, at the same time, it regarded itself as a part of the great whole of regenerated humanity, as a member in particular of the one catholic church of Christ. Above the consciences of its members there was no one but the Lord Jesus himself who enlightened and guided them by his word and Spirit in all questions of truth and duty. Even the apostles (except as the instruments of the Spirit of revelation) never claimed to be lords over God's heritage. Nor can it be said that the whole power of government was lodged with them. We have an account of an apostolic election, and of an apostolic decree, and in both instances we are told that the whole body of professing Christians was present, not merely looking on, but co-operating and consenting.

The Second Period extends from the death of Paul, about A. D. 66, down to the calling of the Council of Nice. It begins with the second generation of the church, near the time of the destruction of Jerusalem. We now find in Ephesus and other great cities of proconsular Asia, in addition to the body of elders or congregational presbytery, a single pastor, (in the Apocalypse styled the Angel of the church) to whom the name of Bishop is specially applied. This was the first change in the form of government; it was indeed very slight, for it consisted in nothing more than giving to one of the presbyters that oversight of the congregation, which hitherto had been exercised by the presbytery or the elders conjointly. Both methods are apostolical and scriptural; and therefore in speaking of one of them as a departure from the original model, we do not mean to intimate that its introduction indicated any decline in the purity of the church nor do we believe that the prelacy of later times is in any proper sense the natural offspring of this primal, parochial, presbyterian episcopacy. These first bishops were not appointed to fill the place and preserve the succession of apostles; the two offices were entirely distinct; the apostle, as before stated, was an extraordinary minister of the church universal, while the bishop was simply the pastor of a local congregation, deriving from the former nothing but what had been already transferred to presbyters. As to rank and power he was still a simple presbyter. In fact the dogma of apostolical succession is a Jewish hea-

then heresy, and the enslavement of mind and conscience involved in it is palpably opposed to the express teachings of the Gospel.

Between A. D. 70 and 107, or from the destruction of Jerusalem down to the death of Ignatius, this episcopal system—as we are obliged to call it for the sake of distinction—gradually extended itself. In the early part of the 2d century it was generally, though by no means universally adopted, as appears from Clement's letter to the Corinthians. In the presbytery, the bishop was only *primus inter pares*; he was chosen by the people, ordained by presbyters; and in the exercise of government the elders and the congregation had a voice as potential as his own. That this was the scheme of government which generally obtained at this early period, is proved by the reliable records of its history which have survived the ravages of time. And with this account those writings which we recognise as the only genuine epistles of Ignatius exactly agree; while those which we reject as spurious exhibit a picture of the times entirely unlike that portrayed by every other witness whose testimony is admissible.

The difference between bishop and presbyter, at first imperceptible, gradually increased as the church grew in wealth and numbers, and declined in purity of faith and manners, until in the days of Cyprian of Carthage, and chiefly through his influence, it became very marked. It was claimed that bishops alone had authority to ordain; deacons began to be regarded as helpers of the bishop, rather than as servants of the congregation; they were viewed as members of the clerical order, between whom and the laity there at length came to be "a great gulf fixed." But this radical change in the constitution of the church was not effected without a struggle. The history of the times shows that, during the life of Cyprian, and long after his death a two-fold contest was carried; presbyters resisted the ambitious claims of bishops, and the people resisted the priestly pretensions of bishops, presbyters and deacons. The overthrow of Paganism, the accession of the might and majesty of the empire to the cause of the church, and her consequent union with the state, of necessity gave an immense impulse to the causes which, even in spite of repeated and terrible persecutions, had been long working a sad change in her constitution. She was

thoroughly reorganised, and prelacy became the order of the day. We are thus brought to

The Third Period, extending from the council of Nice to that of Trent, when the absolute power of the papacy and the priesthood obtained the positive sanction of ecclesiastical law, and assumed a form which can never be modified or amended, but must continue unchanged until the Lord comes to consume it with the spirit of his mouth.

We have thus given as fully as the limits of this article will permit, the arguments by which the able author of this volume sustains his position that the only genuine letters of Ignatius are those found in the Syriac translation, and that they are there given in their purest form. Some of the statements in regard to the early development of episcopacy are perhaps questionable; but his main point, that the genuine Ignatius is only to be found in the Syriac version, we believe he has triumphantly established. We feel sure that every candid reader, of whatever party, will agree with us in this opinion. There can be no longer any reasonable doubt as to what Ignatius wrote, and what he did not write; and if our prelatie friends really possess the veneration for the fathers of which they boast so much, they will no longer quote the worthless forgeries of one whose very name has sunk into oblivion, as if they were the genuine testimonies of the venerable pastor of Antioch.

ART. V.—*The Calcutta Review.*

THIS is a quarterly publication equal in size and not inferior in ability and interest to its compeers of Edinburgh and London. It was commenced May 1844. The advertisement prefixed to the first number states “that the object of the work is simply to bring together such useful information, and propagate such sound opinions, relating to Indian affairs, as will, it is hoped conduce, in some small measure, directly or indirectly, to the amelioration of the condition of the people.” Its success exceeded the expectations of its projectors. Of many numbers a second and even a third edition has been published. For some