## "THE LORD'S DAY" IN THE LETTER OF IGNATIUS TO THE MAGNESIANS

## FRITZ GUY

La Sierra College, La Sierra, California

An ancient document, addressed to the Christian church at Magnesia and allegedly written by Ignatius of Antioch,1 mentions, among other matters, the problem of "Judaizing" that continued to plague the Christian community. It warns: "If we are still living according to Judaizing law, we confess that we have not received grace." Here "Judaizing" is not a matter of external ritual, but an inner, spiritual attitude; thus the document can say that even "the divine prophets lived according to Christ Jesus. Because of this they also were persecuted." Having thus introduced an historical precedent for rejecting the practice of Judaizing, the author asks, "If, then, those who walked in ancient practices came into a newness of hope, no longer sabbatizing but living a life according to the Lord's day, on which also our life arose through him and his death, ... how shall we able to live without Him to whom the prophets, being disciples in the spirit, looked forward as teacher?"2

This rhetorical question has been cited by practically every writer who has, during the last 300 years, discussed the early

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> The immediate background of the Ignatian letters is inferred primarily from internal evidence and from Eusebius, *Ecclesiastical History*, book III, ch. 36. A recent and useful discussion of this and other aspects of Ignatian studies is in Virginia Corwin, *St. Ignatius and Christianity in Antioch* (New Haven, 1960); cf. Cyril C. Richardson, ed., *Early Christian Fathers* (Philadelphia, 1953), pp. 74-83.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Magnesians 8-9. The rendering of Ignatius' comments as given here is based on the extant Greek text, which differs in places from the Latin text followed by most translators and editors.

2

history of "the Lord's day" in Christianity.<sup>3</sup> So frequently is it quoted that, as F. H. Yost noted, "every student of the question is under ethical compulsion to examine it thoroughly and without bias." The examination called for involves historical and literary criticism, textual criticism, and interpretation, and is summarized in the following discussion.

I

The question concerning the authenticity of the letter to the Magnesians arises not only from the 18½ centuries that separate Ignatius from the present, and from the spurious nature of many of the allegedly Ignatian writings (of which there are 18 in all),<sup>5</sup> but also and especially from the absence of any known manuscript in which the presumably genuine Ignatian correspondence appears in a "pure" form.

Three different recensions are extant, varying both in the number of letters they contain and in the amount of material included in each letter. These may be designated as follows: (I) the "long" recension, which presents seven possibly genuine letters (to the churches of Ephesus, Magnesia, Tralles, Rome, Philadelphia, and Smyrna, and to Polycarp) in a highly

<sup>4</sup> Frank H. Yost, *The Early Christian Sabbath* (Mountain View, California, 1947), p. 30.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> Archbishop Ussher referred to his newly-discovered Latin text of Ignatius in the course of an anti-Sabbatarian argument propounded in a letter written c. 1640 and published in Richard Parr, The Life of the Most Reverend Father in God, James Usher [sic] (London, 1686), p. 504.

beyond the seven probably genuine letters there are the following documents, either attributed to or associated with Ignatius: a letter from one Mary of Cassabola to Ignatius; a reply from Ignatius to Mary; letters from Ignatius to the Tarsians, to the Antiochenes, to Hero (alleged successor of Ignatius as episcopos in Antioch), and to the Philippians; and an account of Ignatius' martyrdom—all of which go back to approximately the 4<sup>th</sup> century. The medieval supplement known as the "Correspondence With Saint John and the Virgin," comprising two letters from Ignatius to John, a letter from Ignatius to the Virgin and a reply from the Virgin to Ignatius, was so patently fanciful that it was accepted only briefly.

interpolated form, supplemented by other letters that are now universally recognized as spurious; (2) the "middle" or "mixed" recension, which has the genuine letters in what is thought to be their original form (in general), but also includes several clearly spurious documents; and (3) the "short" or Syriac recension, which includes only three of the seven letters (with a fragment of a fourth incorporated into the text of one of the three), and which gives these in an abridged form. Of the three, the "long" is extant in Greek and Latin manuscripts; the "middle" in Greek and Latin manuscripts, Coptic and Syriac fragments, and an Armenian printed edition; and the "short" in Syriac manuscripts only.6

The "long" interpolated recension may have originated about the middle of the 4<sup>th</sup> century, with a further addition made approximately in the 11<sup>th</sup> century. Although this final section was soon regarded as a late forgery, the "long" recension in general was commonly accepted as authentic in spite of doubts that developed with the Renaissance. In the 17<sup>th</sup> century the letters became involved in the controversy over episcopacy, which led James Ussher to search out two manuscripts of a Latin translation that had been produced in England almost 4 centuries earlier (c. 1250). These manuscripts contained the "middle" recension, which, unlike the more familiar "long" recension, agreed exactly with quotations of Ignatius found in such early Christian fathers as Eusebius and Theodoret, and which was published by Ussher in 1644.8

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>6</sup> The most complete description of manuscripts and recensions is contained in J. B. Lightfoot, *The Apostolic Fathers* (London, 1885-1890), Second Part, Vol. I, pp. 70-134. On the Greek and Coptic fragments discovered since Lightfoot, cf. Corwin, *op. cit.*, pp. 5-6; also Richardson, *op. cit.*, p. 83.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>7</sup> But cf. Jack W. Hannah, "The Setting of the Ignatian Long Recension," *JBL*, LXXIX (1960), 221: It "appears to me probable [that] this recension was made about A.D. 140 in the vicinity of Ephesus."

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>8</sup> James Ussher, ed., *Polycarpi et Ignatii Epistolae* (Oxford, 1644). The then-newly-discovered Latin "middle" or "mixed" text of the Ignatian letters has a separate title page which reads *Epistolae Ignatii*:

When this recension was found to be paralleled by an even older (11<sup>th</sup> century) Greek manuscript published by Isaac Voss in 1646, it displaced the "long" recension as the accepted text of the Ignatian letters. Further confirmation of the authenticity of the "middle" recension came from the publication in 1783 of an Armenian version drawn from five manuscripts which have since been lost. 10

In the 19<sup>th</sup> century a new element was added when William Cureton, the English scholar who discovered the "short" recension in Syriac manuscripts in 1845, insisted that only the three letters it contained—to the Ephesians, to the Romans, and to Polycarp—were genuine, and these only in the "short" Syriac form.<sup>11</sup> Moreover, there were in the meantime other scholars, both liberal and conservative, who rejected the entire Ignatian corpus as pseudepigraphical.<sup>12</sup>

The whole subject was reviewed in detail and for all practical purposes settled in the latter part of the 19<sup>th</sup> century by Theodor Zahn and J. B. Lightfoot, who argued convincingly in favor of the general authenticity of the seven-letter "middle"

Vetus Latina ex Duobus Manuscriptis in Anglia Repertis and is dated 1642. This date is adopted by Richard B. Lewis, The Protestant Dilemma (Mountain View, California, 1961), p. 44. Since, however, this section is paged continuously with the preceding material, which bears a title-page date of 1644, it seems evident that the two were issued together in the latter year. There is no extant external evidence that Ussher had in fact published this Latin "middle" text separately in 1642. A contemporary biographer, Parr, op. cit., pp. 51-52, indicates 1644 as the date of initial publication, as does a later biographer, C. R. Elrington, The Life of the Most Rev. James Ussher (Dublin, 1848), p. 232.

<sup>9</sup> Isaac Voss, ed., Epistolae Genuinae S. Ignatii Martyris (Amsterdam, 646).

in The Armenian version is at present most readily accessible in J. H. Petermann, ed., S. Ignatii Patris Apostolici Quae Feruntur Epistolae (Leipzig, 1849), where it appears in extensive footnotes to the Greek text.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>11</sup> William Cureton, ed., Corpus Ignatianum (London, 1849).

<sup>12</sup> Cf., for example, Adolf Hilgenfeld, Die apostolischen Väter (Halle, 1853), pp. 274-279; C. J. Hefele, ed., Patrum Apostolicorum Opera, (3rd ed., Tübingen, 1847), pp. xl-lx.

or "mixed" recension.<sup>13</sup> They demonstrated (1) that the validity of the Ignatian letters is adequately established by internal and external evidence, and (2) that while the "short" Syriac version may in some cases preserve a more accurate reading, it on the whole represents an abridgment rather than the original form of the text. The conclusions of Zahn and Lightfoot have since been accepted by practically all scholars.<sup>14</sup>

Among the various and often complex lines of argument that have been introduced for and against the "middle" and "short" recensions, the most impressive evidence for the "short" recension is the fact that for 200 years after Ignatius, the church fathers did not clearly allude to any of his writing outside of that which appears in the "short" recension in Syriac; there is no indisputable evidence for a corpus of seven letters until Eusebius, early in the fourth century. On the other hand, however, in favor of the "middle" or "mixed" recension of seven letters is the fact that whereas Eusebius seems to have recorded questions concerning authenticity wherever such questions had arisen in connection with the works he used in compiling his *Eccle*-

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>13</sup> Theodor Zahn, *Ignatius von Antiochien* (Gotha, 1873), pp. 75-240, and *Ignatii et Polycarpi Epistulae Martyria Fragmenta* (Leipzig, 1876), pp. v-xiii; Lightfoot, op. cit., pp. 281-340.

<sup>14</sup> Exceptions have included W. D. Killen, The Ignatian Letters Entirely Spurious (Edinburgh, 1886), pp. 14-78, denying, as the name indicates, authenticity to any of the letters; Daniel Volter, Die Ignatianischen Briefe (Tübingen, 1892), pp. 4-125, and Die apostolischen Väter (Leyden, 1901-10), pp. 65-209, denying Ignatianic authorship to all except the letter to the Romans; Henri Delafosse, Lettres d'Ignace d'Antioche (Paris, 1927), pp. 9-89, denying even the existence of Ignatius, episcopos of Antioch.

A Seventh-day Adventist dissent is expressed in Walter E. Straw, Origin of Sunday Observance in the Christian Church (Washington, D.C., 1939), pp. 107-118, denying authenticity to any of the material beyond the "short" Syriac recension.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>15</sup> The letter (or letters) of Polycarp to the Philippians includes a reference to the Ignatian letters; those who deny the genuineness of the latter frequently deny also the genuineness of the former.

siastical History, he left no indication that there had been any doubt about the correspondence he attributed to Ignatius. Furthermore, there is evidence that besides the "short" recension there was also in Syriac a version of the "middle" recension; of this longer version several fragments have been found (including fragments of the letter to the Magnesians). Also, there is evidence that the "short" recension is the result of an extraction of material from a longer text: there are peculiarities of structure that cannot otherwise be adequately explained, 16 and there are alterations of the wording of references to Jesus as the Son of God, apparently for polemical purposes.<sup>17</sup> Finally, the Greek text of the seven letters displays a clear consistency in content, style, and vocabulary. 18

Thus, there is at present no adequate reason to deny the general authenticity of the letter of Ignatius to the Magnesians on the basis of historical or literary criticism.

16 Cf. Lightfoot, op. cit., pp. 314-319. Especially significant is the presence of a portion of the letter to the Trallians in the "short" Syriac text of the letter to the Romans, where it does not fit into its context as well as it does in the "middle" text of Trallians.

17 This was pointed out to me in a letter from Robert M. Grant, April 28, 1961: "The authentic Greek Ignatius contains a Christology which while maintaining the humanity of Jesus does not shrink from speaking of Jesus Christ as 'God' or 'our God'—as is sometimes the case in the New Testament itself. There are 16 passages of this kind, 12 of which occur in the three letters (Polycarp, Eph., Rom.) contained in the Syriac version. Two of the passages at the beginning of Ephesians are retained; one is changed (Eph. 19:3) to refer to the manifestation of the Son, not of God; and nine such references are omitted. I conclude that the Syriac version is directed against something like monophysite doctrine."

18 The only document of the seven which differs markedly from the others in content is the letter to the Romans—a difference immediately explained by its different purpose: whereas the other six were written in gratitude for gestures of hospitality and brotherhood as Ignatius was being taken to Rome, the letter to the Romans was intended to prepare them for his imminent arrival and martyrdom.

Also, however, the textual history of the letter to the Romans is divergent from that of the others, since even in the "middle" recension it is found, not in the same manuscript, but embedded in the spurious

Acts of Ignatius' Martyrdom.

## II

From the paragraph that has commonly been translated to read approximately "no longer sabbatizing, but living according to the Lord's day," a collation of the extent manuscript evidence yields the following:

- (I) The Greek text of the authentic "middle" or "mixed" recension is represented by four known manuscripts, of which one, Codex Mediceus Laurentius, is the parent, either directly or indirectly, of the other three and is therefore the only one of primary textual significance in the present study. This manuscript, now in Florence, Italy, is the one ascribed to the II<sup>th</sup> century and published by Voss. It reads: μηκέτι σαββατίζοντες, ἀλλὰ κατὰ κυριακὴν ζωὴν ζῶντες.<sup>19</sup>
- (2) The Latin text of the "middle" recension is represented by three manuscripts, of which one, Codex Caiensis 395, is the direct parent of the other two, which were prepared in connection with Ussher's publication of the text. However, one of these copies, Dublin D. 3. 11, records Ussher's careful notation of variant readings found in another, independent manuscript, Codex Montacutianus, which is now lost. Caiensis 395 is dated A.D. 1444 and is at Cambridge University; the Dublin transcript is dated A.D. 1631 and is at the University of Dublin. The unanimous reading of these manuscripts is: non amplius sabatizantes sed secundum Dominicam viventes.<sup>20</sup>
- (3) The Greek and Latin texts of the "long," interpolated recension reflect so great an expansion at this point that Magnesians 9 in this recension is about three times as long as it is in the "middle" recension. It is, furthermore, so divergent <sup>21</sup> that no valid inference can be drawn as to the reading from which it originally derived.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>19</sup> See Figure 1; cf. Voss, op. cit., p. 35.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>20</sup> See Figure 2; cf. Ussher, op. cit., p. 204.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>21</sup> In spite of its greater length, the "long" recension in Greek omits, in four places in Magnesians 9, words that appear in the "middle" or "mixed" recension, and which total more than one-third of the original paragraph. Cureton's collation, op. cit., pp. 59-73, identifies 37 such omissions in the "long" recension of Magnesians.

- (4) The Armenian text, which was translated from a Syriac version of the "middle" recension and is thus twice removed from the Greek text, shows clear signs of literary embellishment, making it of little value in determining the precise reading of the original. Translated into Latin by the editor of the only surviving text, the passage reads: nunc non observant (tenant) sabbata, sed dominicam diem sanctam et primam.<sup>22</sup>
- (5) The Syriac fragments of the "middle" recension of Magnesians do not include this section, and the "short" recension, which exists only in Syriac, omits the letter to the Magnesians altogether.

The manuscript evidence is thus both scant and late, since only the Greek and Latin manuscripts of the "middle" recension are of significance in determining the original wording of the text. The Greek manuscript itself, the best single witness to the original text, was produced about 900 years after the autograph, and is removed from it by an indeterminable number of manuscript generations; the Latin is even later and farther removed.

A comparison of the Greek and Latin readings shows an illuminating variation: whereas the Greek can be translated as "living according to the Lord's life," the Latin can only be "living according to the Lord's day." Of the various

The highly interpretative "long" recension remains of no real help in the present study even if it did not originate in the 4<sup>th</sup> century, as is usually thought, but as early as mid-2<sup>nd</sup> century, as Hannah, loc. cit., suggests. But if in fact "this recension was made about A.D. 140," its admonition to "let each one of you sabbatize spiritually, and after sabbatizing spiritually let every friend of Christ 'festivalize' the Lord's day" must be considered important evidence on the Christian observance of Sabbath and Sunday in the 2<sup>nd</sup> century.

<sup>22</sup> Petermann, op. cit., p. 78.

<sup>23</sup> The use of dominica for dominica dies goes back to Tertullian, De Jejuniis, ch. 15, and remains common throughout ecclesiastical Latin. See, for example, Albert Blaise, Dictionnaire Latin Française des Auteurs Chrétiens (Strasbourg, 1954), p. 290; Thesaurus Linguae Latinae (Leipzig, 1900-1942), V, 1891-1892; cf. Alexander Souter, A Glossary of Later Latin to 600 A.D. (Oxford, 1957), p. 112.

or a come puly, o' that do puly. It do to bradland airo by by o peper. product Lho dattory rom Grantant airey. Of our oist man as ois mp of sant air a dacted outging , mas oligido destero peruztiones perpis attribite olompo Strong productions of proto rapi. . is o by Duroland of actoby rapostob town. that apar first do leafy orten oxten Dochilappelitationunarizopration وهو معدمة و موليم و لدم و الرصوبيد، لدر سعة مد مرموم عدد وول و ١٥٥ ومود phills purch frank prois man has ober a of the boly of rop proper wills o orderly awtround or or and show of learned of plice ray of the by or learned mayord or in the second as soir of the polar of power of it for all to or of ago of they mande والمدور علي مديد ويد ويدور ويدور إله ما حرق وي وي المودر ويد والدي المودر ويدور ويدور ويدور والمدور to the portal and party of personal property person by the forest of Xa leave lup : alling a olim of pite of the will their of soft straig من ما رهم وي موسع مع الروادي. من م وهم ويدم الايديا وي بدي وي وياده سهاد مع وديد grandformers impoblished learney to to leasy. It experies foll a police France popular was the yage me arton i garo rat thoog of while as to to a and do wire and or the det por & apope and fourth place it was to work out I are in its if I had a or any open op in a coop ling con air is to ley out out out

Figure 1. Codex Mediceus Laurentius (Florence), 11th century, is the oldest extant Greek manuscript of the 'middle" recension of the Ignatian letters. This page of the Letter to the Magnesians contains the critical passage of this study in lines 10 and 11. (BIBLIOTECA MEDICEA LAURENZIANA)

Figure 2. Codex Caiensis 395 (Cambridge), A.D. 1444, is the oldest extant manuscript of the Latin version of the "middle" recension of the Ignatian letters, a translation by Robert Grosseteste c. A.D. 1250. The critical passage is in lines 4 and 5. (GONVILLE AND CAIUS COLLEGE)

developments that could have produced this difference between the Greek and Latin texts, two possibilities are: (1) that the Greek reading, including  $\zeta\omega\dot{\gamma}\nu$ , is original, and that the word was omitted in the transmission of the Greek text or in the translation into Latin; or (2) that the Latin reading, omitting the corresponding vitam, reflects the original, and that  $\zeta\omega\dot{\gamma}\nu$  was added to the Greek text sometime before the 11<sup>th</sup> century.<sup>24</sup> The second of these possibilities was chosen by Zahn and Lightfoot, (whose independent editions of the Greek text do not include  $\zeta\omega\dot{\gamma}\nu$  but note its presence in the Medicean manuscript by means of footnotes) <sup>25</sup> and by almost all later editors, who omit the word with or without comment.<sup>26</sup>

Perhaps one reason for the decision of these editors is the fact that *Caiensis 395* seems on the whole to be an extremely literal translation, and may in some instances present a reading that is superior to that of the extant Greek text. Recent trends in textual criticism, however, have tended toward the establishment of an original reading, not on the basis of the overall reliability of various manuscripts, but rather on the principles (I) that the preferred reading is the one which best explains the origin of the other readings,<sup>27</sup>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>24</sup> Overlooking this second possibility, Seventh-day Adventist expositors have sometimes severely criticized editors who omit ζωήν from the text; see, for example, Yost, op. cit., pp. 30-31.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>25</sup> Zahn, *Ignatii et Polycarpi Epistulae Martyria Fragmenta*, pp. 36-38; Lightfoot, op. cit., Second Part, Vol. II, pp. 129-130.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>28</sup> Cf. F. X. Funk, ed., Opera Patrum Apostolicorum (Tübingen, 1881), I, 198; Adolf Hilgenfeld, ed., Ignatii Antiocheni et Polycarpi Smyrnaei Epistolae et Martyria (Berlin, 1902), p. 11; Karl Bihlmeyer, ed., Die apostolischen Väter (Tübingen, 1924), p. 91; P. Th. Camelot, ed., Ignace d'Antioch et Polycarpe de Smyrne: Lettres (2<sup>nd</sup> ed., Paris, 1951), p. 102.

An earlier precedent, perhaps influenced by the Armenian, is Petermann, loc. cit., which is followed by Albert R. M. Dressel, ed., Patrum Apostolicorum Opera (Leipzig, 1857), pp. 146-147.

The single exception to the general practice of the last hundred years is J. P. Migne, ed., *Patrologia Graeca*, V (Paris, 1894), col. 669.

<sup>27</sup> See, for example, Ira M. Price, *The Ancestry of Our English Bible* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed., revised by William A. Irwin and Allen P. Wikgren, New York, 1956), p. 221.

and (2) that, among other things, the theological bias of the translator or copyist must be taken into account. An application of these principles to the present problem suggests that  $\zeta \omega \dot{\gamma} \nu$  should probably be retained; of the Greek, including  $\zeta \omega \dot{\gamma} \nu$ , can be read as exactly equivalent to the extant Latin, and such a reading and rendering would be entirely consistent with the presumable theology of the translator.

In Greek (or Hebrew or Aramaic) syntactical constructions that use a "cognate accusative," a noun in the accusative case is coupled with a verb or participle belonging to the same etymological family, producing an idiom that often has no proper literal parallel in English. Whereas a Greek sentence may read literally, "Do not fear the fear of them" (r Pe 3:14), the meaning is more smoothly rendered in English by the reading "Do not fear them" or "Have no fear of them" (RSV). Thus κατὰ κυριακὴν ζωὴν ζῶντες can be read "living a life according to the Lord's day" just as correctly 30 as "living according to the Lord's life." In the former case κυριακὴν alone would be equivalent to κυριακὴν ἡμέραν, a shortened form (directly parallel to the Latin dominicam for dominicam diem in this passage) attested at about the middle of the 2nd century. 31

<sup>28</sup> See Harold H. Oliver, "Present Trends in the Textual Criticism of the New Testament," *JBR*, XXX (1962), 311-312. Although both this and the preceding reference apply primarily to the New Testament, the principles they express are valid in the study of early Christian documents generally.

<sup>29</sup> Among the older editions of the Greek text retaining ζωήν are Johannes Pearson and Thomas Smith, eds., S. Ignatii Epistolae Genuinae (Oxford, 1709), p. 23; C. J. Hefele, ed., Patrum Apostolicorum

Opera (Tübingen, 1847), p. 182; Cureton, op. cit., p. 67.

30 A similar cognate accusative with "live a life" appears in Herodotus, book IV, par. 112: ἀλλὰ ζόην ἔζωον τὴν αὐτὴν ἐκείησι (Loeb edition, II, 312). In the New Testament, a cognate accusative with a participle appears in I Jn 5:16: ἐὰν τις ἴδη τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτου ἀμαρτάνοντα ἁμαρτίαν μὴ πρὸς θάνατον...

<sup>31</sup> Gospel of Peter 9: 35; 12: 50; cited in W. F. Arndt and F. W. Gingrich, A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature (Chicago, 1957), p. 459. Another possibility is Didache 14: 1, although the reading here is difficult and perhaps

Inasmuch as the translator of the extant Latin version—a 13<sup>th</sup> century Englishman (probably Robert Grosseteste, bishop of Lincoln)—would have been accustomed to refer to Sunday by χυριακή and/or dominica, it would have been entirely natural for him to understand Ignatius as meaning "living a life according to the Lord's day"; indeed, it would have been remarkable if he had understood the passage in any other sense. Accordingly, he translated it as secundum dominicam viventes. Had he wanted to render each separate element of the Greek, he could have used an idiomatic Latin construction involving what may be called a "quasi-cognate accusative" 32 and providing a parallel to ζωήν ζῶντες in the idiom vitam agentes, "leading a life" or "living a life." 33 This, in fact, is precisely the construction adopted by Ussher himself in the publication of "a new Latin version" of the Ignatian letters in 1647: 34 non amplius Sabbatum colentes, sed juxta Dominicam vitam agentes.

corrupt: κατὰ κυριακὴν δὲ κυρίου (The Apostolic Fathers, Loeb edition, I, 330). But a quotation from Dionysius of Corinth in Eusebius, Ecclesiastical History, book IV, par. 23 (Loeb edition, I, 382) does not make use of the shortened form: τὴν σήμερον οὖν κυριακὴν ἀγίαν ἡνέραν διηγάγομεν, nor does Clement of Alexandria, Stromateis, book VII, par. 12 (quoted in Lightfoot, op. cit., p. 129): οὖτος ἔντολην τὴν κατὰ τὸ εὐαγγέλιον διαπραξάμενος κυριακὴν ἐκείνην τὴν ἡμέραν ποιεῖ.

The argument that in the early  $2^{nd}$  century  $\kappa \nu \rho \iota \kappa \kappa \gamma$  alone was not yet used to mean "Lord's day" is not cogent because it assumes a negative answer to the question here being investigated: whether or not Ignatius actually referred to "the Lord's day." Furthermore, the paucity of literary evidence from the sub-Apostolic period makes it impossible to establish precisely the ways in which specific words could or could not have been used at that time. And finally, there is the significant parallel usage of  $\sigma \epsilon \beta \alpha \sigma \tau \dot{\eta}$ , "Emperor's day"; see Adolf Deissmann, Bible Studies (Edinburgh, 1901), pp. 218-219; cf. J. H. Moulton and George Milligan, The Vocabulary of the Greek Testament (Grand Rapids, 1960), p. 364.

<sup>32</sup> The term is borrowed from A. T. Robertson, A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research (4<sup>th</sup> ed., New York, 1923), p. 477.

<sup>33</sup> See, for example, Eugene W. Miller, *Introduction to Latin* (Pittsburgh, 1956), p. 22.

34 Ussher, Appendix Ignatiana (London, 1647), p. 13. This "new

Since the Latin version was apparently made from the same textual tradition as that represented by the oldest Greek manuscript extant, Codex Mediceus Laurentius (although perhaps not from this manuscript itself),  $^{35}$  and since it is clear that the extant Greek text could have been translated exactly as the Latin reads, it seems unnecessary to postulate another, presumably "purer" form of the Greek text—a form which omitted the word  $\zeta \omega \dot{\eta} \nu$  and for the existence of which there is no convincing evidence. Therefore it is concluded that to the extent to which the available manuscript evidence represents the original document, it is probable that  $\zeta \omega \dot{\eta} \nu$  belongs in the text.  $^{36}$ 

## III

But even having concluded that ζωὴν is probably original, the modern interpreter still faces the problem of discovering whether κατὰ κυριακὴν ζωὴν ζῶντες means "living according to the Lord's life" or "living a life according to the Lord's day." Three kinds of evidence require examination: (I) the context of the passage under discussion, which may prefer one interpretation rather than the other; (2) the literary style of the seven Ignatian letters, which may indicate a likelihood that the passage does or does not involve a "cognate accusative"; and (3) the theological emphases of Ignatius, which may provide a clue to the way he would most likely have expressed himself in this passage.

version" should not be confused with his edition (see above, note 8) of the 13<sup>th</sup> century Latin version published 3 years earlier, before the Greek text of the "middle" recension had been published by Voss (see above, note 9).

<sup>35</sup> Cf. Lightfoot, op. cit., Second Part, Vol. I, p. 79; Cureton, op. cit., p. xi.

<sup>36</sup> It is possible that the entire passage is the work of an unknown interpolator sometime between the composition of the genuine letters and the translation of the "middle" recension into Syriac in the 4<sup>th</sup> or 5<sup>th</sup> century (a dating based on the early appearance of the Armenian version, which derives from the Syriac). But this possibility is entirely hypothetical.

It is clear that whether Ignatius was referring to "the Lord's life" or "the Lord's day," he was describing the opposite of "sabbatizing." By "sabbatizing" he intended to describe legalistic Judaizing as a governing attitude toward religious life, rather than the keeping of the Sabbath as a particular act involving a particular day; for when he said that "those who walked in ancient practices"—in this case, "the divine prophets"—"came into a newness of hope, no longer sabbatizing," he could hardly have meant that they had stopped observing the Sabbath. Moreover, the verb  $\zeta \bar{\gamma} \nu$  itself tends to emphasize the inner quality of life, as distinguished from  $\pi \rho \acute{\alpha} \sigma \sigma \epsilon \iota \nu$ , which emphasizes outward action or performance and which also appears in the Ignatian letters.<sup>37</sup>

By the same reasoning, however, Ignatius could have described the prophets as "living according to the Lord's day" without meaning that they had in fact observed the first day of the week as a holy day. He could have intended to describe the prophets as living in the hope of that which "the Lord's day" had later come to symbolize: a victorious, resurrected Messiah, whom they could trust for their salvation and through whom they would be free from the inadequate spiritual experience symbolized by legalistic "sabbatizing." <sup>38</sup>

Thus, as far as Ignatius' immediate purpose was concerned, he might have contrasted the practice of "sabbatizing" either with "the Lord's life" (a life of loving trust in Christ, the opposite of religious legalism), or with "the Lord's day" (a symbol of the Resurrection, which as the central emphasis of the earliest Christian witness<sup>39</sup> was also the opposite of "Judai-

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>37</sup> Cf. Ephesians 8:2; 16:2; Philadelphians 4:1; 8:2 where πράσσειν is used in an "according to ..." construction parallel to the use of ζην in Magnesians 9:1 and elsewhere (see below, notes 44, 45).

<sup>38</sup> Or if, as seems possible, a primary factor in the application of κυριακή (ἡμέρα) to the first day of the week was the custom of participating in the κυριακὸν δεῖπνον (cf. 1 Cor 11:20) on that day, Ignatius could have meant that the ancient prophets realized in some way the kind of spiritual fellowship and divine communion experienced by Christians in the Supper.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>39</sup> Cf. Acts 1:22; 2:31-32; 4:33.

zing"). In other words, it is possible that in this context "the Lord's life" and "the Lord's day" could have had for Ignatius the same connotation; it would then have been simply a choice of one allusion or the other. In any case, the burden of his message was not to discuss days of worship but to encourage a correct attitude toward religious life.<sup>40</sup>

Immediately following the participial phrase κατὰ κυριακὴν ζωὴν ζῶντες are the words ἐν ἢ καὶ ἡ ζωἡ ἡμῶν ἀνέτειλεν δι' αὐτοῦ καὶ τοῦ θανάτου αὐτοῦ. This clause could mean "in which life" (the whole life and ministry of the Lord, including His triumph over both physical and spiritual death) is found the basis of religious experience; or it could mean "on which day" (the day of the Resurrection, the day, therefore, "of the Lord") is found the ground of assurance of eternal life.

Zahn, the only editor<sup>41</sup> to discuss the syntax of this passage

40 When the author of the interpolated "long" recension came to this passage, he revised it to refer directly to the religious observance of particular days, and specifically to encourage the observance of both the Sabbath and "the Lord's day" (cf. Cureton, loc. cit.): μηκέτι οῦν σαββατίζωμεν ἰουδαϊκῶς . . . ἀλλὰ ἔκαστος ὑμῶν σαββατίζετω πνευματικῶς . . . καὶ μετὰ τὸ σαββατίσαι ἑορταζέτω πᾶς φιλόχριστος τὴν κυριακὴν . . .

But John Lawson, A Theological and Historical Introduction to the Apostolic Fathers (New York, 1961), p. 122, is certainly incorrect in reading this emphasis into the original document: "Christians must make a point of not keeping the Sabbath. Ignatius teaches that to keep exclusively to the Lord's day, the distinctive Christian day of worship and anniversary [sic.] of Christ's rising from the dead, is a mark of sharing Christ's risen life."

<sup>41</sup> Hefele, op. cit., p. 183, and Migne, op. cit., V, col. 670, cite Pearson and Smith, op. cit., pp. 43, 79, to the effect that ζωήν should be understood in connection with ζῶντες (thus rendering inaccurate the comment by Zahn, Ignatii et Polycarpi Epistulae Martyria Fragmenta, p. 37, footnote: "Lectio, quae in G¹ exstat, defendi nequit"), and that χυριαχήν should be understood as χυριαχήν ήμέραν.

Lightfoot, op. cit., Second Part, Vol. II, p. 130, says only: "The insertion  $\zeta_{\omega \gamma \nu}$  in the Greek text is condemned alike by the preponderance of authorities and by the following words in  $\chi_{\kappa, \tau, \lambda}$ ." It seems remarkable that neither Lightfoot nor "the preponderance of authorities" followed up the suggestion of Pearson and Smith that a cognate accusative might be involved.

Other editors who cite the variant readings do not comment.

in detail, maintains that if Ignatius had actually meant to refer to "the Lord's life,"42 the wording would be, not ἐν ἢ καὶ ή ζωή ήμῶν ἀνέτειλεν, but rather ἐν ἢ καὶ ἡμῶν ἡ ζωή ἀνέτειλεν. In view of the general Greek tendency to place the more significant words first, it is true that Zahn's suggested alternate wording would emphasize more clearly the connection (in this case, by contrast) between "the Lord's life" and "our life." On the other hand, even if Ignatius were (as Zahn supposes) referring to the Resurrection on "the Lord's day," he would still have had in mind a connection (by contrast) between the physical Resurrection of "the Lord's life" and the spiritual resurrection of "our life." Furthermore, it can be argued that if Ignatius had actually meant "living a life according to the Lord's day" he could have said κατά κυριακήν ζῶντες ζωήν and avoided the ambiguity of the construction as it stands. But arguments based on presumptions concerning what an author would or should have said are far from conclusive.

The context, therefore, does not present decisive evidence for the preference of either "the Lord's life" or "the Lord's day" in an interpretation of the passage.

In an analysis of the literary style of the letters of Ignatius, answers may be sought to two questions. First, was he (or his amanuensis accusation accusation as a syntactical construction? This can be answered simply: no. In the seven letters there is no appearance of such a construction (except perhaps in Magnesians 9:1, the subject of the present study). This absence is especially noteworthy in connection with the frequent appearance of  $\kappa\alpha\tau\dot{\alpha}\ldots\zeta\tilde{\eta}\nu$  constructions parallel to the one under discussion. For example: "you all live according to truth," "you live according to God," "living not according to men but according to Jesus

<sup>42</sup> Zahn, loc. cit. et seq., footnote: "... nec vero ita explicari potest, ut vita nova in Christo orta (κυριακή ζωή) tamquam regula consideretur, secundum quam vivant Christiani."

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>43</sup> Burrhus of Ephesus may have traveled with Ignatius for this Purpose; cf. Ephesians 2:1; Philadelphians 11:2.

Christ," "to live according to men," "to be living according to Jesus Christ." <sup>44</sup> Such expressions also appear in the letter to the Magnesians itself, both before and after paragraph 9: "if we are living according to Judaizing law," "the prophets lived according to Christ Jesus," "let us learn to live according to Christianity." <sup>45</sup>

The second question concerns other stylistic evidence. tending to confirm κατά κυριακήν ζωήν ζώντες as a cognate accusative. A formula similar to a cognate accusative occurs in the introductory inscription to the letter to the Ephesians: γαρᾶ γαίρειν ("greetings in joy"); 46 this, however, is an elliptical construction comprising an infinitive and a noun, with both words coming from the same root. Two related words also occur together in δ χωρῶν χωρείτω ("let the one who understands, understand"),47 comprising a present participle and an imperative. And there is an occasional word play, such as ἐκκλησία οὐ καλείτε (the "church ['called out'] is not called"),48 or an alliterative construction, such as δπου πλείων κόπος πολύ κέρδος ("where the toil is greatest, the gain is great").49 While these examples are not directly parallel to ζωήν ζῶντες, they reflect the kind of interest in words that would also be reflected in the use of the cognate accusative "living a life."

Here again, therefore, the evidence is not decisive; all that can be said is that although the cognate-accusative construction does not appear anywhere else in the Ignatian letters, it would not be out of harmony with the general literary style of the letters for such a construction to appear in this setting.

<sup>44</sup> Ephesians 6:2; 8:1; Trallians 2:1; Romans 8:1; Philadelphians 3:2.

<sup>45</sup> Magnesians 8: 1, 2; 10: 1. The translation is based on the extant Greek rather than the Latin text.

 $<sup>^{46}</sup>$  Cf. Jn 3:29: δ δὲ φίλος τοῦ νυμφίου . . . χαρᾶ χαίρει διὰ τὴν φωνὴν τοῦ νυμφίου.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>47</sup> Smyrnaeans 6:1.

<sup>48</sup> Trallians 3:1.
49 Polycarp 1:3.

The theological interests expressed in the seven letters are generally practical rather than profound;  $^{50}$  it is therefore not surprising for the  $\kappa\alpha\tau\dot{\alpha}\ldots\zeta\eta\nu$  construction be used often. In each case, the expression involves a basis of references that could be considered a norm or principle in terms of which a person could choose to order his life: truth, God, men, Jesus Christ, Judaizing law, Christianity. Such a consistency of thought and expression suggests that Ignatius intended a similar implication in Magnesians 9:1; in that case, "the Lord's life" would perhaps be a more meaningful referent than "the Lord's day." In view, however, of the necessarily symbolic and broad connotation of "sabbatizing" in the same sentence, the idea of "the Lord's day" (with a similarly symbolic and broad connotation) can not be ruled out as a possibly correct interpretation.

It may be concluded that while the letter to the Magnesians should be treated as a generally authentic document of Ignatius, and although the original document probably included the word  $\zeta\omega\eta\nu$ , neither the actual words of the text nor their immediate and/or general setting within the letters of Ignatius provides the evidence necessary for certainty in interpreting his meaning. In the study of "the Lord's day" in the early Christian church, therefore, the statement of Ignatius can not at the present time properly be introduced as evidence indicating its observance; nor, on the other hand, can it be said with certainty that the statement does not allude to such a practice early in the 2<sup>nd</sup> century. The statement remains ambiguous.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>50</sup> See Corwin, op. cit., pp. 221-246, "Life According to the Lord"; cf. Johannes Quasten, *Patrology*, I (Westminster, Maryland, 1950), pp. 70-73, "Mysticism of St. Ignatius."