THE SACRIFICIAL SHEPHERD: THE EFFECTS OF CRISIS ON EARLY CHRISTIAN PASTORALISM AND ECCLESIOLOGY AS SEEN IN IGNATIUS OF ANTIOCH

by

RYAN PATRICK SAVAGE

submitted in accordance with the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

in the subject of

BIBLICAL STUDIES (NEW TESTAMENT)

at the

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH AFRICA

SUPERVISOR: PROF. C. L. DE WET

2020

DECLARATION

I declare that THE SACRIFICIAL SHEPHERD: THE EFFECTS OF CRISIS ON EARLY CHRISTIAN PASTORALISM AND ECCLESIOLOGY AS SEEN IN IGNATIUS OF ANTIOCH is my own work and that all the sources that I have used or quoted have been indicated and acknowledged by means of complete references.

_____   February 22, 2021

SIGNATURE   DATE

R.P. SAVAGE

SUMMARY

At the beginning of the second century C.E., Christian churches exhibited varied and diverse ecclesiologies. Out of this diversity comes the voice of Ignatius of Antioch, whose seven letters to the churches in Asia Minor promote a single ecclesiology—the monepiscopacy. The language used by Ignatius is strong enough to warrant an investigation into why he was so adamant about his particular vision for ecclesiology.

Using the social theory of pastoral power, as presented by the twentieth-century French philosopher and social theorist, Michel Foucault, this study seeks to delineate the motivations behind Ignatius's call to the monepiscopacy. By examining Ignatius as a *pasteur*—in the Foucauldian sense—not only can his motivations be discovered, but important insight into the early institutionalization of pastoral power can be seen.

Chapter One attempts to clarify the significance of this study. There is also a brief investigation into the state of scholarship on Ignatius until present. Much work has been done by scholars regarding Ignatius of Antioch. Examining their work enables this study to explore different territory related to Ignatius and his commitment to the monepiscopacy.

Chapter Two begins to set a foundation for understanding pastoral power as both Foucault explained it and traces the ancient biblical roots of pastoral power. Looking at the biblical narrative from a macrocosmic view, a pattern of pastoral calls from God and from earthly leaders is prevalent. In addition, the internalization of the pastoral themes is also examined. The transition of these pastoral themes to the early Christians will also be studied.

Chapter Three investigates a major theme in Ignatius's writing, namely unity. This is done through the lens of the pastoral response to conflict. It is clear in Ignatius's epistles that there has been significant conflict to which he responds. Unity can be seen as safety in the context of both keeping the church together, but also keeping it safe from outside harm, whether ideological or physical.

Chapter Four then examines another force being exerted against Ignatius and his church, namely persecution. Persecution has always been the narrative of the early church. An examination into the

nature and scope of this persecution reveals that there was actually more leniency within the Roman Empire than the Christian discourse shows. In light of this, Ignatius's martyrdom takes on a different light than simply the casualty of rampant persecution. Instead, the martyrdom takes on salvific qualities for his flock. This is symbolized most prevalently in his discourse on the eucharist.

Chapter Five summarizes the work of this thesis. It also summarizes the conclusions drawn from the preceding chapters. Also, the limitations of this study are declared. Finally, suggested opportunities for further research based on the findings in this thesis are provided.

Particularly vibrant in this investigation is the effect of crisis on early Christian ecclesiology. By responding to the two greatest threats to the early church, namely heresy and persecution, Ignatius's pastoral instincts become the basis for his call for the monepiscopacy. This will become one of the dominant forms of church governance to this day.

KEY TERMS

Ecclesiology; Pastoral Power; Ignatius of Antioch; Apostolic Fathers; Michel Foucault; Persecution; Institutionalization; Monepiscopacy; Second Century C.E.; Asia Minor

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would wholeheartedly like to thank my supervisor, Professor Chris L. de Wet, whose patience, expertise, guidance, and gentle nudging along the way made this project possible.

I would also like to thank all the teachers, instructors, and fellow students who got me to the point where I could even take on a project of this size.

I would lastly like to thank my dad, Dr. Randy Savage for his willingness to read and edit a thesis that was most likely uninteresting to him.

DEDICATION

This project is dedicated to my family. My lovely wife, Christina, and our two girls, Avaliese and Annabel. Their patience and love throughout the writing of this thesis was nothing short of miraculous. Their support means everything to me, I could not have done this without you. Thank you so much, and I love you guys.

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

GENERAL ABBREVIATIONS

ANRW	*Aufstieg und Niedergang der Römischen Welt*
ARG	*Archiv für Religionsgeschichte*
BA	*Biblical Archaeologist*
Bib	*Biblica*
CBQ	*Catholic Biblical Quarterly*
DSD	*Dead Sea Discoveries*
ExpTim	*Expository Times*
HvTSt	*HTS Theological Studies*
HTR	*Harvard Theological Review*
JBL	*Journal of Biblical Literature*
JBQ	*Jewish Bible Quarterly*
JCRT	*Journal for Cultural and Religious Theory*
JES	*Journal of Ecumenical Studies*
JETS	*Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society*
JR	*Journal of Religion*
JRT	*Journal of Religious Thought*
JSNT	*Journal for the Study of the New Testament*
JTS	*Journal of Theological Studies*
NovTSup	Supplements to Novum Testamentum
RB	*Revue biblique*
RHPR	*Revue d'histoire et de philosophie religieuses*
TynBul	*Tyndale Bulletin*
VEcc	*Verbum et Ecclesia*
ZAW	*Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*
ZRGG	*Zeitschrift für Religions- und Geistesgeschichte*

BIBLICAL ABBREVIATIONS:

HEBREW BIBLE

HB	Hebrew Bible

Gen.	Genesis
Exod.	Exodus
1 Sam.	1 Samuel
1 Kgs.	1 Kings
1 Chr.	1 Chronicles
Ps.	Psalms
Isa.	Isaiah
Jer.	Jeremiah
Ezek.	Ezekiel
Hos.	Hosea
Mic.	Micah
Zech.	Zechariah
Mal.	Malakai

OLD TESTAMENT PSEUDEPIGRAPHA

1 En.	*1 Enoch*
An. Apoc.	*Animal Apocalypse*

NEW TESTAMENT

NT	New Testament
Matt.	Matthew
1 Cor.	1 Corinthians
2 Cor.	2 Corinthians
Gal.	Galatians
Eph.	Ephesians
Col.	Colossians
1 Thess.	1 Thessalonians
1 Pet.	1 Peter
Rev.	Revelation

APOSTOLIC FATHERS

Ign. *Eph.*	*Ignatius, To the Ephesians*
Ign. *Magn.*	*Ignatius, To the Magnesians*

Ign. *Phld.*	*Ignatius, To the Philadelphians*
Ign. *Pol.*	*Ignatius, To Polycarp*
Ign. *Rom.*	*Ignatius, To the Romans*
Ign. *Smyrn.*	*Ignatius, To the Smyrneans*
Ign. *Trall.*	*Ignatius, To the Trallians*
Mart. Pol.	*The Martyrdom of Polycarp*

ANCIENT AUTHORS:

EUSEBIUS OF CAESAREA

Hist. eccl.	*Ecclesiastical History*

JOSEPHUS

Ant.	*Jewish Antiquities*
J.W.	*Jewish Wars*

PHILO

Flacc.	*Flaccus*
Moses.	*On the Life of Moses*

PLINY THE YOUNGER

Ep.	*Epistles*

POLYBIUS

Hist.	*The Histories*

TACITUS

Ann.	*Annals*

TERTULLIAN

Apol.	*Apology*

CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Introduction

The purpose of this study is to examine the roles of pastoralism and crisis on the ecclesiology of Ignatius of Antioch. While much has been made over Ignatius's ecclesiology and theological opposition to those he considers heretical, examining Ignatius and his arguments from a socio-political perspective produces a very different reasoning behind his call to obedience to one bishop and what is now known as orthodoxy. As Caputo rightly remarks: "Theologians give words to revelation by means of the words theologians are given to speak, and these words are given by the world in which they live."[1] This study seeks to discover that which lies behind the theological expression of Ignatius of Antioch, and to ascertain which "words were given" for him to speak. It is therefore concerned with the discourse of leadership. Building on the analytical concepts of Michel Foucault, it will be suggested in this study that the mode of expression used by Ignatius is that of pastoral power.[2]

Out of the more generalized concept of pastoral power found in the traditions of the Hebrew Bible, especially the prophetic literature, the early church institutionalized and developed pastoral power into something much more sophisticated and absolute by the third century.[3] Foucault suggests the Christian pastorate is substantially different than that of the earlier Hebraic tradition.[4] While Ignatius operates in the early second century, he undoubtedly constitutes a middle point between the Hebraic pastoral ideas and that of the established third-century Christian church Foucault describes. If the church's ecclesiology or the "art of conducting, directing, leading, guiding, taking in hand, and

---

[1] John D. Caputo, *Philosophy and Theology* (Nashville: Abingdon, 2006), 44–45.

[2] Michel Foucault, *Security, Territory, Population: Lectures at the Collège de France 1977–1978,* ed. Michel Senellart and Arnold I. Davidson, trans. Graham Burchell (New York: Picador, 2009), 2.

[3] Ibid., 164.

[4] Ibid., 221; also see: Theodor Zahn, *Ignatius von Antiochen* (Gotha: Justice Perthes, 1873); Percy N. Harrison, *Polycarp's Two Epistles to the Phillipians* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1936); and John Lawson, *The Biblical Theology of Saint Irenaeus* (Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock, 2006).

manipulating men"[5] is pastoralism, and such pastoralism is vastly different from that understood in the Hebraic tradition, from which Christianity finds its foundation, then a critical question must be asked: why is there a change in the established understanding and practice of pastoral power? If the Christian church of the third century institutionalizes pastoral power to be "completely different" than its Hebraic counterpart, a response about why this change occurs must be provided. The response, this study suggests, is in a specific persecution leveled against the Christians in the second century. There are two opposing responses to persecution that shape Christian identity in the early church: acceptance and martyrdom, or avoidance and life. Perkins argues, in the case of the former, that martyrdom (and especially the discourse surrounding it) was instrumental in fashioning early Christian identity.[6] Helmut Koester suggests the early second-century Christians crafted their communities in order to avoid conflict with their neighbors and thus crafted their leadership schemes as well. Koester also questions how the communities could maintain their allegiance to a kingdom "not of this world" while maintaining an acceptable allegiance to the Roman Empire.[7] One possibility is evident in the role of *pasteur* as presented by Foucault, who suggests pastoral power is over a multiplicity not a territory.[8] The *pasteur* is also one who is willing to die for the community under his care. Ignatius's ecclesiology then combines aspects of the above responses to persecution. He desires to protect his church, and perpetuate that protection, but is willing, and perhaps even desires, to die for it. Ignatius advocates strongly for a form of church leadership that has the ability to avoid systematic localized persecution, watch and direct their adherents to do the same, and guide those adherents to form a specific spiritual identity. It is this concept of crafting a specific program of church organization and Christian identity for the purpose of protection and guidance that this study seeks to examine.

There was immense pressure applied to any leader of a sizable church in antiquity, with the greatest pressure coming from the Roman Empire and the persecution of Christians. A recent study suggests

---

[5] Foucault, *Security*, 165.

[6] Judith Perkins, *The Suffering Self: Pain and Narrative Representation in the Early Christian Era* (New York: Routledge, 1995), 104.

[7] Helmut Koester, "The Apostolic Fathers and the Struggle for Christian Identity," *ExpTim* 117 (2006): 133–39.

[8] Foucault, *Security*, 124–29. Pastoral power, for Foucault, was somewhat foreign to Greek and Roman thought. The themes of governing within pastoralism appear to be either wholly acceptable under the rule of Greek and Roman authority, or perhaps obscure enough to escape concern.

the persecution of early Christians is greatly exaggerated.[9] This may, in many cases, be correct. However, in the case of Ignatius, there can be little doubt he is on his way to be executed. By his accounts it is because of his faith. By the time of Ignatius, the legal persecution was for charges of *nomen Christianum*, for simply bearing the name "Christian." Ignatius himself suggests he is being taken to Rome because of the "name" of Christ.[10] If this is the case, the Christians of his time might have been easy to persecute. However, Roman law and the vague and passive language of Trajan in his instructions on handling Christian persecution complicated the situation.[11]

There was at least an unofficial policy of capital punishment for anyone confessing to be a Christian.[12] This is evidenced in the exchange of letters between Pliny the Younger, the governor of Bithynia on the northern coast of the Anatolian Peninsula opposite from Antioch, and the Emperor Trajan. Although not the governor of Antioch, Pliny's correspondence is highly valued in this instance as he is close to Ignatius both temporally, writing merely five years before Ignatius's execution, and geographically, being provincial neighbors. In response to Pliny's execution of Christians, Trajan writes: "You have followed the appropriate procedure, my *Secundus*, in examining the cases of those brought before you as Christians, for no general rule can be laid down which would establish a definite routine. Christians are not to be sought out. If brought before you and found guilty, they must be punished."[13]

Although Christianity was at this point illegal in the Roman Empire, Trajan persecutes or allows persecution for only those brought before the governors and who are officially charged by a private

---

[9] Candida Moss, *The Myth of Persecution: How Early Christians Invented a Story of Martyrdom* (New York: HarperOne, 2013). Moss suggests the early Christian persecution was exaggerated and is even spurious attempts to advance the strength of supposed eyewitness claims to the resurrection of Christ. While some of this is probable, it must be in Ignatius's case, as evidenced by his own hand and in light of the correspondence between Trajan and Pliny, that there is persecution at some level present in Syria, and by extension, other parts of Trajan's Empire.

[10] Ign. *Eph.* 1.2. All quotations from Ignatius's works are from Bart D. Ehrman, *The Apostolic Fathers*, Loeb Classical Library v. 2 (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2003).

[11] Geoffrey E. M. de Ste. Croix, *Christian Persecution, Martyrdom, and Orthodoxy,* eds. Michael Whitby and Joseph Streeter (New York: Oxford University Press, 2006), 110.

[12] This is not to say persecution was universal or constant. The correspondence of Pliny and Trajan allow for only concrete evidence of legal prosecution of Christians in Bithynia. Coupled with Ignatius's own testimony, there is then evidence this was happening in Syria as well. Such ambiguity suggests that Christianity was not actively pursued on an official prescribed schedule and annihilated, but rather looked upon as a "despised class for their abominations" (Tacitus, *Ann.* 15.44).

[13] Pliny, *Ep.* 10.97. Pliny the Younger, *Complete Letters* (Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2006).

and named prosecutor.[14] A church's ability to avoid trouble is seemingly tied to its level of ambiguity. Given the social status of the Christians, it is certain trouble will be a daily concern for any person in a church. Therefore, minimizing the level of scrutiny and attention placed on the church is of vital importance. Negative attention brought about by rival factions and infighting can presumably be avoided in Ignatius's proposed ecclesiology.

While some have argued Ignatius's martyrdom was the result of external persecution,[15] others suggest it was infighting and fundamental ideological differences in theology that nearly tore the church in Antioch apart.[16] This study presumes the latter as a cause for the former. Ignatius speaks multiple times in his letter to Smyrnaeans of "peace."[17] According to Brent, the term "peace" is always used to denote the cessation of internal conflict.[18] In this interpretation of peace one can begin to see Ignatius's plight and argument begin to form. He was arrested, possibly as the scapegoat for internal arguments that escalated to the necessity of political involvement.[19] As the leader of the church in Antioch, and presumably ultimately responsible for the fighting within, Ignatius was sentenced to death, as was the policy under Trajan. He writes to other churches beseeching them to follow a single bishop in order for unity to be established and to avoid similar situations. In the process of advocating

---

[14] De Ste. Croix, *Christian Persecution*, 111.

[15] These include: Zahn, *Ignatius;* Joseph B. Lightfoot, *The Apostolic Fathers: Clement, Ignatius, and Polycarp Part II*, Vol. 1 (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1989).

[16] These include: Harrison, *Polycarp's*; Allen Brent, *Ignatius of Antioch: A Martyr Bishop and the Origin of Episcopacy* (London: T&T Clark, 2007).

[17] Ign. *Smyrn.* 10.

[18] Brent, *A Martyr Bishop*, 21.

[19] Although this is arguably the most plausible scenario for Ignatius's arrest and martyrdom, there is no definitive evidence that this is what happened. Ignatius himself does write, "Give no occasion to the outsiders lest on account of a few foolish persons the entire congregation in God be slandered" (Ign. *Trall.* 8.2). This statement remains ambiguous. This study presumes this to be the most likely reason for Ignatius's predicament; see Christine Trevett, *A Study of Ignatius of Antioch in Syria and Asia* (Lewiston, NY: Edwin Mellen, 1992), 61.

for unity, he argues against those groups he sees as heretical, namely the Docetists[20] and the Judaizers.[21]

Ignatius's desire for unity, and by implication, safety, can then be understood better when viewing Ignatius in the classic pastoral role as presented in the theories of Foucault, namely as an agent and negotiator of pastoral power—a *pasteur*.[22] While Foucault's treatment of pastoral power in the Christian church deals with third-century ecclesiastic and societal procedures, Ignatius is regarded, at the very least, as an early advocate for the ecclesiology present in the third century, and at the most, the champion of many of those ecclesiological ideas.[23]

By viewing Ignatius in the role as *pasteur*, it becomes more likely he would use his power as a tool to both protect and lead his church where he believed it should be; a place of safety and growth. Foucault suggests the role of the *pasteur* is best seen as "someone who 'keeps watch' in the sense, of course, of keeping an eye out for possible evils, but above all in the sense of vigilance with regard to any possible misfortune."[24] Ignatius watches the church for the misfortune of localized persecution— perhaps a better term in light of Pliny's correspondence is prosecution. As Ignatius was a shepherd (*pasteur*) of the church in Antioch, the call in his epistles to unity and obedience to one bishop is easily understood to be a product of a natural protective response of the shepherd as much as a theological conviction and opposition to the heretical. In fact, one can view the martyrdom of Ignatius as the pastoral action of protection. The *pasteur* is willing to sacrifice himself for the flock, a theme strengthened by the example of Christ, "the Good Shepherd" (John 10:11). The *pasteur* looks after the sheep to see that none have strayed off course and brings those that have back to the fold. In

---

[20] The Docetists were a sect of Christianity that believed that Christ's physical appearance and suffering were only a semblance. In their view Christ was always spirit, and therefore could not have truly died on the cross, but only appeared to have died.

[21] The Judaizers were a group of Christians that were adhering to, and teaching, Jewish law, as necessary, even as gentile Jesus followers. In the most radical form, they saw this as a requirement for salvation.

[22] Foucault, *Security*. Along with using power-discourse analysis, this study will also incorporate Foucault's views on Christian pastoral power as discussed in his lectures compiled in this text. This study uses the French word, *pasteur*, to denote the use of Foucault's understanding of the role.

[23] Raymond E. Brown and John P. Meier, *Antioch and Rome: New Testament Cradles of Catholic Christianity* (Mahwah, NJ: Paulist, 1983), 85. Also see: Allen Brent, *Cultural Episcopacy and Ecumenism: Representative Ministry in Church History from the Age of Ignatius of Antioch to the Reformation, with Special Reference to Contemporary Ecumenism* (Leiden: Brill, 1992), 64.

[24] Foucault, *Security,* 127.

Ignatius's thought, this can be interpreted as concern for and control of souls, and a concern for the safety of those in the community. In the former, looking after the sheep can be seen in the discourses of heresy, which implies the need for obedience. In the latter, looking after the sheep is seen in the discourses of unity (and the relative safety it brings). For Ignatius then, the discursive formation created by local persecution (the watchful surveillance of the church as a community and as individuals) creates new categories of pastoral-power, namely the adherence to one ἐπίσκοπος (bishop) and the threefold ministry.

Ignatius of Antioch has been a subject of numerous studies in recent decades. Many scholars have examined Ignatius but have understandably focused on his theology alone. Despite the fact this is certainly of the utmost value, there is a lack of understanding of Ignatius ulterior to his theology.[25] By ignoring Ignatius as a leader of a sub-culture, an agent of a nascent and new pastoralism within Antioch, the understanding of his theology, especially concerning his most important theological contribution, his ecclesiology, is diminished. In order to understand fully the methods of church leadership espoused by Ignatius, a different enquiry must be made.

Although the church has had many instances of complete social, cultural, and theological dominance over Western society, it is easy to forget that it developed under the dominance of Roman society and religion. Theology does not develop in a vacuum. Ancient leaders developed church ecclesiology and leadership practices not only from scripture and theology, but from a mixture of cultures, political pressures, and community nuances. It is the examination of the effect of this ancient conglomeration of power-discourses and practices on Ignatius's ecclesiology that this study aspires to understand. Knowing how the culture at large affected the ecclesiology of Ignatius, and by extension the second-century church, can shed new light on the understanding of the formation of ancient Christian ecclesiology.

---

[25] With the exception of Allen Brent. Brent bases his interpretation on Ignatius adopting pagan religious cult practices of leadership. This, he assumes, is borrowed from the social and political ideas of the Second Sophistic. In a similar way, Katherine Shaner examines Ignatius through the power-paradigm of slaveholding, particularly that Ignatius seeks to organize the church in a similar way to the Roman household, including the subordinate relationship of slave to master. See Katherine A. Shaner, *Enslaved Leadership in Early Christianity* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2018).

1.2 Problem Statement

The formation of early church ecclesiology does not have an adequate theory to explain its heavy use of the monepiscopacy. From a preliminary and cursory look at Ignatius's writing and examining his circumstances, it appears likely Ignatius's call to unity was, while wrapped in theological reasoning, based on a more pragmatic solution to a serious problem in the church under his care. Since Ignatius was writing letters rapidly on his way to martyrdom in Rome, it is quite unlikely his words were the result of formal theological thinking and revision.[26] This is not to say he did not meditate upon his subjects with theological reflection, but it must be conceded that his writing did not constitute the same level of theological reflection as Paul a generation earlier or later theologians dealing with similar subjects. For example, a near contemporary of Ignatius, Irenaeus of Lugdunum, writes his most famous work, *Against Heresies,* "over a fair period of time."[27] While theological aims are certainly present in Ignatius's life and writings, his letters are most likely imbibed with more than theological thought. His writing can be seen as solutions to urgent problems he seeks to solve before his imminent death. Interpreting Ignatius in the role of *pasteur* can help interpret his church leadership without the influence of nearly two thousand years of other theological bias. Determining the rationale behind Ignatius's writing will provide more balanced and genuine understanding of the early formation of second-century ecclesiology.

By placing Ignatius in his socio-political context and interpreting his work through the theory of pastoral power presented by Foucault, Ignatius's motives for his writing will shift from the theological to the practical. In light of the discourse between church and state (in this case the prosecution and sentencing of Ignatius), one can see the discursive practices of the church and its leadership shift. This study will interpret Ignatius as a *pasteur*, showing his desire for the protection, preservation, and advancement of his church in the midst of internal strife and persecution. In light of Ignatius's predicament of impending martyrdom, Ignatius has an intimate understanding of the importance for the church to remain as inconspicuous as possible concerning legal affairs. Ignatius's urgent and repeated call to unity in light of this will be interpreted as a discursive practice developed to protect, build, and lead the church in the most effective way, a primary role for the pastoral leader.

---

[26] Trevett, *A Study*, 16.

[27] Lawson, *Biblical Theology*, 4.

Understanding of Ignatius's two significant theological contributions, his ecclesiology and his call to orthodoxy against various heresies in light of these discursive formations will shed light on the formation of primitive churches and an intermediate pastoralism.

1.3 Significance of Study

This study will aid scholars in better understanding the development of early Christian ecclesiology. From the examples of church leadership in the New Testament to the monarchical episcopacy at the end of the second century, there is a drastic shift in ecclesiology and development of pastoral power. This study aims to find a viable practical reason to understand this shift. In doing so, this research may also lead to the development of theories related to other and later theological developments of the early church, especially regarding the role and formation of pastoral power. The ecclesiological shift over the first two centuries is drastic. While there are some vague allusions to church offices in Paul's pseudepigraphic Pastoral Epistles, there are no solid biblical bases for such a drastic shift in leadership model. Since little or no biblical theology for the monepiscopacy can be found, the ecclesiological change in the first two centuries may be understood as the first major shift in the church's beliefs that are external in its origin. Unlike shifts in other areas of theology, for example Christology—whose ideas are extrapolated from the scriptures themselves—there seems within this drastic shift in ecclesiology a catalyst of a different sort. Understanding the moving of the church in such a way in its infancy may go a long way in understanding the modern church in a world changing faster with each passing day. Understanding the discourse of early church leaders can shed light on the contemporary Christian church and the policies that are enacted in response to various cultural conditions. Discovering how theology is affected by social and political factors is vital to understand that same theology. For future researchers, this could be a completely new lens by which to examine other theological disciplines.

1.4 Literature Review

The study of Ignatius of Antioch has been inconsistent throughout history. The Apostolic Fathers in general have less scholarly attention than their preceding and proceeding generations of church leaders. Recently, there has been increased interest in Ignatius of Antioch. The following literature review starts with some of the first modern scholarly reviews of Ignatius in Lightfoot and Zahn, to whom nearly all Ignatian scholars are indebted. Also chosen for this review are the scholars whose work has made significant contributions to the study of Ignatius of Antioch.

1.4.1 Joseph B. Lightfoot and Theodore Zahn

Lightfoot and Zahn provided some of the first critical views of Ignatius's writings. It was the consensus of these two which established the widely accepted belief that the Middle Recension[28] of Ignatius's writings are authentic.[29] While there remains a flicker of a debate among a few, the near universality of Lightfoot's and Zahn's consensus allows for other examinations within Ignatius and his writings, this study included. Zahn's and Lightfoot's respective works have become the basis for much of the scholarship on Ignatius since their day. The importance of their contribution cannot be overstated.

Another contribution Lightfoot brings is his understanding of Christian persecution in Ignatius's lifetime. While it is often tempting to assume the few decades between Domitian and Trajan exhibited little progress in the persecution of Christians, Lightfoot suggests Trajan to be tolerant of law-abiding Christians.[30] This, Lightfoot suggests, is a distinct departure from the wanton destruction of Nero and Domitian before. For Lightfoot, the persecution of Christians came and went because of the attitudes of those in power. He suggests Christianity was, at least into the third century, an illegal religion. The law against the religion lay dormant for extended periods of time because there was no need to enforce it on many occasions or for long periods of time.[31] If Lightfoot is correct here, he bolsters the idea that rousing the wrath of a particular magistrate was a way to ensure localized persecution in the second and third centuries. While Lightfoot suggests Trajan to be lenient on Christians, it is clear from Pliny's correspondence with the Emperor that there were issues in which Pliny was dealing harshly with Christians brought before him. Lightfoot's work regarding the continued illegality of Christianity, coupled with the leniency of many in power, corroborate the claims I suppose in this study regarding the specific persecution Ignatius faced.

---

[28] There are three recensions of Ignatius's letters. These are the Long Recension, consisting of 13 books; the Short Recension, a collection of shorter versions of Ignatius's writings translated into Syriac; and the Middle Recension. The latter is nearly universally accepted as authentic.

[29] Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*; and Theodor Zahn, *Ignatius*.

[30] Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers,* 2–3.

[31] Ibid.*,* 6–18.

1.4.2 Walter Bauer

Walter Bauer also provides important background to Ignatius and Antioch that remains indispensable to scholars of early church history. Bauer's focus was on the heresy and orthodoxy within the early church. His treatment of Ignatius and his surroundings, particularly Syria and Asia Minor, lie within a broader study of the entire ancient church. The value of such a view is the presentation of Ignatius's views as distinct within the broader ecclesiastic programs of his day. Bauer, who again is focused on the rise of orthodoxy and how it was decided, sees Ignatius as less powerful than his proposed position suggests.[32] In his whole treatment of Ignatius, Bauer depicts a man who has some, but limited, influence in a few communities and it is to these places he chooses to write.[33] Even in the apostolic communities, where Bauer might suggest there lay orthodox believers, he believes Ignatius to be pleading for his own authority and influence.

If this is the case, Bauer's ideas raise even more questions regarding Ignatius's motivations. Since Ignatius is on his martyrdom journey, and if he is still seeking to exert influence, it must be concluded he does so for the very sake of the church, not for himself. Ignatius's great call to unity, or for Bauer, orthodoxy, is one he hopes will continue after his martyrdom. In fact, it is clear Ignatius believes his martyrdom to be a great catalyst for his cause. Orthodoxy, while clothed in theological rhetoric, is simply the adherence to a singular idea (or similar ideas). What Bauer does not answer is whether Ignatius's calls for obedience are theologically motivated, or a polemical tool to produce a unified church.

1.4.3 Cyril Richardson

Cyril Richardson's 1937 article, "The Church in Ignatius of Antioch," embraces this one subject, and sheds specific light on the nature of Ignatius's ecclesiology.[34] Richardson's focus lies on Ignatius's desire for unity. In this case his work finds common ground with this study. Like the later works of Corwin and Trevett, Richardson uses theology as the impetus for Ignatius's church organization.

---

[32] Walter Bauer, *Orthodoxy and Heresy*, eds. Robert A. Kraft and Gerhard Krodel (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1971), 66–69.

[33] Ibid., 77–79.

[34] Cyril Richardson, "Church in Ignatius of Antioch," *JR* 17.4 (1937): 428–43.

Richardson focuses heavily on how Ignatius infuses the identity of the Christian with the church. In this, Ignatius champions a catholic view of the church. This is to say, a universal fellowship of Christians called the church. For Richardson, when Ignatius does choose to combat either heresy or errant theology, he does so with this unified ecclesiology as his weapon. It does not take too much imagination to assume Richardson believes Ignatius to be one of the earliest proponents, if not the originator, of the idea of *extra ecclesiam nulla salus*.[35] Even when Richardson suggests multiple foci for Ignatius's writing, he tends to bring the idea of unity into the argument.[36] Also present in Richardson's analysis is the brief idea of the consolidation of power in the Ignatian doctrine of obedience and monepiscopacy, although he acknowledges the consolidation occurs after Ignatius's lifetime. Nonetheless, the discourse of Ignatius's ecclesiology, specifically in the role of the bishop and the specific duties of surveillance incorporated therein, provide a bridge between classic theological discussion on Ignatius and the social-political understanding of the *pasteur* adopted by this study.

In his book, *The Christianity of Ignatius of Antioch*, Richardson spends a few chapters comparing Ignatius to two New Testament writers, Paul and John. Particularly of use for this study are the divergences between Ignatius and his predecessors. Richardson especially acknowledges Ignatius's "indebtedness" to Paul.[37] With such indebtedness, there arises questions regarding Ignatius's omission of any of Paul's leadership language of apostles, prophets, evangelists, shepherds, and teachers (Eph. 4:11). Moreover, Paul's reasoning for such leadership is the same as Ignatius's, namely unity (Eph. 4:12). As such, Richardson's work here shines light on a significant question for which this study hopes to find answers: if Ignatius was indebted to Paul as a progenitor of his thought, why did Ignatius then appear to diverge from Paul's writing?

---

[35] Translation: "outside the church there is no salvation."

[36] Cyril Richardson, *Early Christian Fathers* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1953), 76–77.

[37] Cyril Richardson, *The Christianity of Ignatius of Antioch* (New York: AMS, 1967), 60.

1.4.4 Virginia Corwin

There is renewed interest in Antioch and Ignatius by modern scholars. Perhaps the consummate work on Ignatius remains Virginia Corwin's, *St. Ignatius and Christianity in Antioch*.[38] This work, like others written before and after it (e.g. Cyril Richardson, Christine Trevett),[39] does not recognize the theological shortcomings of Ignatius's admonishment of the heresies mentioned in his letters. Every aspect of the Ignatius's situation is evaluated by Corwin through the interpretation of Ignatius's theology. The chief concern of her work is certainly early Christian theology. Little space is given for the broader social concerns of Ignatius and the church at Antioch. For Corwin, Ignatius's ideas were "fully developed and his theology rounded out."[40] There is little, if any, treatment of the idea that the impending martyrdom had an impact on the bishop and his writings. Corwin does agree that Ignatius's primary objective is unity but does not delve into discovering why outside of theological conviction.

A unique feature of Corwin's work is her treatment of Antioch and its populace. An entire chapter in her work is dedicated to the city, its history, and the cultural milieu making up Antioch. This perspective is beneficial when attempting to understand the reasons for Ignatius's views and the manner by which he chooses to organize the church under his care. Corwin suggests the people of Antioch were both diverse in background and intense in their shifting loves and hatreds for ideas and various groups of people.[41] Such an insight proves vital when understanding the formation of a community, and Corwin uses this as her basis for understanding the Christians in Antioch at the beginning of the second century.

1.4.5 Christine Trevett

Even more recent is the work of Christine Trevett, *A Study of Ignatius of Antioch in Syria and Asia*.[42] Trevett devotes more effort to understanding Ignatius's circumstances. This work is very extensive in its treatment of various views, such as the differing opinions regarding the ambiguous "peace" in

---

[38] Virginia Corwin, *St. Ignatius and Christianity in Antioch* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1960).

[39] Cyril Richardson, *The Church in Ignatius of Antioch* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1958); and, Trevett, *A Study.*

[40] Corwin, *Ignatius*, 29.

[41] Corwin, *Ignatius,* 47.

[42] Trevett, *A Study.*

Antioch. Providing a summary of the scholarly opinions regarding the peace, she notes that there are three different interpretations that are most-viable: (a) peace as the end of persecution, (b) peace as the appointment of a like-minded bishop, and (c) peace as the end of conflict within the church in Antioch.[43] Most often, Trevett presents to the reader the state of scholarship and allows the reader to conclude for him- or herself what to believe. For Trevett, Ignatius interacts with his various surroundings and circumstances with a theological bend, but Trevett seeks to discover the reasons for the development of such theology. Trevett examines the nature of the churches Ignatius has command over and with which he has contact. By doing so, she begins the process of understanding some underlying cause for the doctrines he espouses.

Particularly in terms of Ignatian ecclesiology, Trevett acknowledges both similarities and differences with earlier Christian writings. Understandably comparing both Matthew's Gospel and the *Didache*, Trevett argues quite convincingly that there appears to be a progression from a Matthean ecclesiological structure consisting of teacher, prophets, and apostles, to Ignatius's monepiscopacy.[44] The *Didache* (15.1–2) provides a middle-ground by acknowledging the increasing roles of bishops and deacons, which suggests a progression. However, noting that the *Didache* might be contemporaneous to Ignatius's writing, the progression must not have been complete or even close to Ignatius's monepiscopacy by the early part of the second century.[45] The conclusion of Trevett is that the first-century model of prophets, teachers and apostles could easily "harden" into a threefold ministry of the Ignatian variety.[46]

1.4.6 William Schoedel

Also of note is William Schoedel's commentary on Ignatius's epistles.[47] Schoedel's work, regarding the man Ignatius, is much less detailed than Corwin and Trevett. His approach is reserved for the classical commentary, focusing primarily on the extant letters themselves more than the man and his

---

[43] Ibid., 56

[44] Trevett, *A Study*, 46–47.

[45] The *Didache* is generally considered to be a late first-century to early second-century work. If the latter date is considered, the date can be as late as 125 C.E. The most common date is around 100 C.E. placing the work less than two decades before Ignatius's writings.

[46] Trevett, *A Study*, 49.

[47] William R. Schoedel, *Ignatius of Antioch*, ed. Helmut Kloester (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1985).

surroundings. The epistles are, after all, the primary source of information on the bishop. Schoedel's work provides a good overview of Ignatius, his situation, and his writings. This is not to say Schoedel's work is not useful from an historical perspective. His introduction to the plethora of issues surrounding Ignatian scholarship is extensive and full of useful information regarding the modern state scholarship. Of particular use to the casual reader of Ignatius is his summary of the recensions of the Ignatian epistles. While Schoedel briefly treats the history of the Short, Middle, and Long Recensions, he establishes the credibility of the modern consensus in establishing the Middle Recension as authentic.[48] Schoedel also gives a brief discussion of some modern attacks to the Middle Recension, namely to those proposed by Weijenborg and Rius-Camps, but again dismisses such attacks as too speculative.[49]

Schoedel makes a convincing argument for Ignatius's primary goal, which is unity. Unlike some other scholars, he eschews the notion that Ignatius's unity is a mystical one between humanity and God, influenced heavily by the Gnostic perspectives often presumed in Ignatius's thought. Instead, Schoedel shows the relevance of Hellenistic thought above Gnostic or semi-Gnostic language.[50] Of particular interest is his discussion of the eucharist, the prominence it holds for Ignatius, and the relation of the eucharist to both the idea of solidarity between Christians and the advancement of pastoral power presented in such an understanding.[51] The eucharist in Ignatius is a central part of the Christian experience and an individual must be within the church in order to experience it.[52] The eucharist functions for Ignatius as both a sign of solidarity and a manner by which power is conveyed from God to the Christian. Where pastoral power and surveillance comes sharply into focus within such ideas relates to the control Ignatius prescribes the bishop to have over the eucharist. Ignatius suggests that the bishop, or at least one appointed by him, administers and oversees the eucharist.[53] In this control of the eucharist, since the eucharist is the center of worship and the source of heavenly

---

[48] Ibid., 4–5.

[49] Schoedel, *Ignatius*, 5–6; see also Reinold Weijenborg, *Les Letters d'Ignace d'Antioche* (Leiden: Brill, 1969) and Josep Rius-Camps, *The Four Authentic Letters of Ignatius, The Martyr* (Rome: Pontificium Institutum Orientalium Studiorum, 1980).

[50] Schoedel, *Ignatius*, 21–22.

[51] Ibid., 21.

[52] Ign. Eph. 5.2.

[53] Ign. *Smyrn*. 8:1–2.

power, the bishop becomes the purveyor of such power, thereby ensuring control of the entire congregation and ensuring that each congregant passes under the influence and watch of the bishop. Thus, Schoedel's discussion of the eucharist as a means of solidarity, is essentially also a discussion of the advancement of pastoral power, and so, relevant for the study at hand.

1.4.7 Magnus Zetterholm

A more recent addition to the discussion of Ignatius, and more precisely his city of Antioch, is that of Magnus Zetterholm.[54] Zetterholm specifically studies a social movement that presumably brought about separation between the Jews and the Christians. This idea provides a similar approach to this thesis. However, Zetterholm's subject is the split between Judaism and Christianity, an occurrence preceding the epistles of Ignatius. When dealing with ideas of persecution, Zetterholm mainly focuses on the negative effects of the Jewish Revolt more than on Christian persecution. He does briefly forward the idea that becoming a Christian convert made one liable to prosecution for not fulfilling the religious obligations of the *polis*.[55] The effects of the Jewish-Roman War played a significant role in the changing religious, social, and cultural landscape of the time.

The benefits of conversion to Jewish-Christianity and the benefits of Christians claiming to be Jewish diminished. While theologically speaking, the Pauline doctrines of freedom from the law was creating a best-of-both-worlds scenario for the gentile Christians, particularly since Zetterholm argues quite effectively for their free interaction, the political situation following the Jewish-Roman War makes Judaism a very unattractive option. Zetterholm argues that the rational human response is for the gentile Christians to separate themselves from their Jewish counterparts. While this process was difficult, Zetterholm nonetheless suggests this to be the case, and in some ways accomplished by the time of Ignatius in Antioch.[56]

For this study, understanding the social context with which Ignatius finds himself, particularly regarding the position of the church within Roman society is vital. The negative reputation of Judaism

---

[54] Magnus Zetterholm, *The Formation of Christianity in Antioch: A Social-Scientific Approach to the Separation of Judaism and Christianity* (New York: Routledge, 2003).

[55] Ibid., 195.

[56] Ibid., 202–3.

among the Romans, perpetuated and exacerbated by the Jewish-Roman War, may have an impact on Ignatius's attitude toward the Judaizers. By understanding the social context laid out by Zetterholm, Ignatius's response to the Judaizers can be more completely examined.

1.4.8 Thomas A. Robinson

A similar voice in the study of Jewish-Christian relations in Antioch during the time of Ignatius is Thomas A. Robinson. His work on the "parting of the ways" between Judaism and Christianity again answers some questions that have puzzled Ignatian and early church scholars for years. Since Ignatius is considered roughly a second-generation Christian, in a city where Judaism was more than tolerated, why does his writing deal so harshly with Judaism? Like Zetterholm, Robinson seeks to address this question by suggesting a split with Judaism has been largely accomplished by Ignatius's day. He argues that Christianity actively defined itself in contrast to Judaism.[57] He suggests this contrast to begin even as early as Paul's time in Antioch citing the incident in Antioch recorded in Acts 15:1–35 and Gal. 2:1–10.[58] The general understanding in Robinson's work is that this parting of the ways began quite early, and the reciprocities from both groups were catalogued in the New Testament. If such distinctions were being made in the first century, it makes sense why the distinctions would be much more defined in the second, especially after the Jewish revolt in 70 C.E. For this study, Ignatius's understanding of the church's relationship to Judaism is vital to his call for unity apart from Judaism.

1.4.9 Allen Brent

Allen Brent's work on Ignatius is quite unique in its approach. His various studies speak to the ecclesiology of Ignatius.[59] Brent approaches Ignatius in a similar way to this study, namely from a cultural-historical perspective. Brent does explain persecution in Antioch and in the whole of Rome and presumes this as a catalyst for Ignatius's ecclesiology. However, Brent moves his study toward the idea of Ignatius purposefully reordering the church by "radical secularization."[60] This cultural

---

[57] Thomas A. Robinson, *Ignatius of Antioch and the Parting of the Ways: Early Jewish Christian Relations* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2009), 142.

[58] Ibid., 147.

[59] Allen Brent, *Ignatius of Antioch and the Second Sophistic: A Study of an Early Christian Transformation of Pagan Culture* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006); Allen Brent, *A Martyr Bishop*.

[60] Brent, *A Martyr Bishop*, 160.

approach, while not entirely removed from the focus of this study, interprets Ignatius as assimilating contemporary leadership schemas into his ecclesiology.

Brent assumes Ignatius is "creating social reality and not merely reflecting it."[61] Brent also assumes the theological reasoning within Ignatius's writings are either lacking in sophistication or so nascent that underlying social and historical schemas must be informing any of his ecclesiastical ideas. Brent suggests one scheme to be the Second Sophistic, a political movement of Greek city-states located in Asia-Minor which asserted their unity in culture above that of the Roman government while still espousing fealty to it.[62] For Brent, the similarities to this movement and Ignatius's call to unity among Christians is seen as more than coincidental. This is where the similarities between Brent's work and this study end.

As opposed to Brent's work, the present study assumes political reasoning as an impetus of Ignatius's ideas, but pastoralism, not contemporary secular political ideas, guides his ecclesiology. Perhaps most glaring is the idea that the Second Sophistic does not explain Ignatius's style of creating unity. The Second Sophistic espouses a type of unity that can easily be attainable through the established forms of leadership presented by Paul and the other apostles. The equation of Ignatian leadership models to secular forms of government is a unique take on the threefold ministry, or monepiscopacy. Even if Brent's theory is correct at all points, the monepiscopacy is clearly something of an oddity. And one must not forget that the amiableness of the Greeks toward the Roman Empire was not echoed in the attitude of the early Christians, whose entire existence was often at odds with the political policies of the day. With these concerns and others, it seems another solution could be possible, which this study seeks.

1.4.10 Gregory Vall

Lastly, Gregory Vall's work, *Learning Christ: Ignatius of Antioch and the Mystery of Redemption*, provides yet another theological approach to Ignatius.[63] While the current study agrees with the ideas Vall presents, namely that Ignatius was familiar with some of the writings eventually included in the

---

[61] Brent, *A Martyr Bishop*, 13.

[62] Ibid.

[63] Gregory Vall, *Learning Christ: Ignatius of Antioch & the Mystery of Redemption* (Washington, DC: The Catholic University of America Press, 2013).

New Testament canon, Vall's approach once again presumes a theological motive for his arguments. Vall believes Ignatius's pastoral need was for correct doctrine and he goes about his work in a manner that can be loosely described as an Ignatian systematic theology.

One of Vall's most significant differences to this and other studies mentioned above is his belief in the careful construction of the Ignatian letters. By asserting that Ignatius was adept at synthesizing the works he knew of that were eventually included in the New Testament canon, Vall argues that Ignatius skillfully and thoughtfully composes letters both imbued with careful theological reflection and with pastoral vigor for correcting errors in the church. This stands in direct contrast to the claims of this study, which assume a hastily written series of letters, composed while under duress and traveling to the author's imminent death. Even more of a distinction is Vall's belief that, "[i]t is in the area of ecclesiology that Ignatius most actively takes up the role of theologian and teacher…."[64] This is once again in stark contrast to the claims of this study.

1.5 Methodology and Structure

This study will use analytical concepts from Michel Foucault, notably that of power-discourse analysis, as the primary tool to interpret the works of Ignatius of Antioch. While it is assumed Ignatius was a theologian (if only a lay theologian, by modern standards), it is also true that theology was not the only factor in his repeated call to unity and obedience to a single bishop. This approach will focus on these other trajectories, as well as aim to understand the power language associated with the culture of the day.

It is important to note that, although Foucault frequently converses with and uses theology to construct his theories of Pastoral Power, there is a distinct difference between conversing with theology and developing a particular theology. After all, Foucault was not a theologian. Instead, as Tran writes, "Foucault thinks the world belongs to power. Christians think the world belongs to God."[65] While this is not an exact representation of Foucault's relationship to theology, as theology is not exclusive to the Christian, what it does show is Foucault's bearing. In contrast to creating a theory of understanding God or classifying belief, Foucault is using his conversation with theology to understand and classify

---

[64] Vall, *Learning Christ*, 301.

[65] Jonathan Tran, *Foucault and Theology* (New York: T & T Clark, 2011), 3.

power. As such, Foucault does not take on anything of a systematic theology by which he writes, or interacts, but uses the larger socio-historical analysis of a people to understand their power-relationship to their deity.

Schuld voices this dynamic very succinctly, saying: "Foucault's harshest critics charge that by investigating truth, reason, and knowledge as historically generated and socially malleable constructions, he flippantly relativizes the conceptual underpinnings of modern progressive societies."[66] While Schuld goes on to question this particular critique, the critique itself shows the methodology of Foucault as he interacted with truth, reason, knowledge, and to this could be added theology. Foucault interacts with theology, or perhaps a better word would be theologies in the plural, as resulting from historical analysis of the people or topic he studies. Schuld goes on to show the immense value of examining Christianity via Foucault's methodology writing:

> Foucault renders what we could call "dissociated" visages by drawing disjointed sketches of a given culture from contrasting temporal perspectives. Analytical tools that provide different angles of vision afford an essential critical service because they can both distance scholars from circumstances they have come to take for granted and assist them in reflecting on their behavior as cultural creatures over a particular stretch of history.[67]

For Foucault, theology is part of his historical investigation of thought in his pursuit of discovering some form of objective truth hidden behind the unfortunate veil of subjectivity.

One must remember that Foucault investigated very distinct ideas throughout his career. His chief concerns were power and knowledge. His dialogue with theology was in service to understanding these two themes. Foucault uses his investigation into religion in service to his true subjects. One such example is Foucualt's self-imposed limitation of his religious investigation into demonic possession in his work *Religion and Culture*. Foucault did not set out to discover a theology regarding demons and how they are believed to interact with the physical world. Foucault's study was focused on how a

---

[66] J. Joyce Schuld, "Augustine, Foucault, and the Politics of Imperfection," *The Journal of Religion* 80.1 (2000): 1–22.

[67] Schuld, "Augustine," 5.

belief in demonic possession effects certain aspects of society.[68] In a similar manner, Foucault acknowledges that he is not "competent" in all the areas in which his social theories interacted.[69]

This thesis uses, in part, the methodology of Foucault because he decided to investigate pastoral power. In that investigation, what Foucault did was to use historical broad strokes to suppose a common thread of idea of pastoral leadership that shifted and was built upon over time. In some cases Foucault's theory breaks into religious investigation while in others he uses political history and observance. That thread, according to Foucault, would become the basis of modern government and he traces it through historical analysis of thought through millennia.[70]

Foucault does not analyze a people for any sort of systematic theology. His goal was not to understand anything of a deity, or even to investigate fully what people through history believed about a deity, but to investigate how people think about power and government. His analysis of any sort of theology was therefore contained to the analysis of what theology, in its broadest and historical context, might have to say about his subject.

For this thesis, Foucault's investigation into government owes a debt of gratitude. It was Foucault's analysis of government which led him to theorize the notion of pastoralism as a distinct form of power and governance. To this end, Foucault investigates pastoralism as distinctly rising out of an Ancient Near Eastern view of a pastoral god. As Foucault traces this theme through the Ancient Hebrew and early Christian traditions, he uncovers a pastoral theology which informs the cultural and historic leadership and governance of various people through time.

The methodology of this thesis is similar. By viewing pastoral power and Ignatius in a manner similar to Foucault, this thesis will theorize a pastoral theology present in the early second century that was transformed by historical events and cultural responses evidenced by Ignatius and his writing. This focus on pastoral theology does not deny that there are other areas of theology that are present in both Foucault's work, or in Ignatius' letters. The focus of this thesis, however, will remain limited to pastoral theology and its prevalence in the formation of early ecclesiology.

---

[68] Michel Foucault, *Religion and Culture*, ed. Jeremy R. Carrette (Manchester, UK: Manchester University Press, 1999).

[69] Foucault, *Security*, 201.

[70] Ibid., 169.

Foucault's work is unique inasmuch as he rejects the classical approach to established disciplines, which for this study include history and theology in favor of a more critical and basic understanding of the dynamics of power and its influence on bodies both individual and corporate. Foucault's ideas appear almost specifically designed to interpret the writings of a man whose goal appears to be the consolidation of power for the corporate body for which he is a part: the church. What is even more fascinating is how profoundly ancient and contemporary forms of power appear to influence the bishop. Particularly impactful to Ignatius's ecclesiology is the ancient form of pastoral power handed down to the Christians from the Judaic understanding of God. Also, the contemporary effects of persecution by the Roman Empire on the Christians impacts Ignatius as an external force on his ecclesiology. In the case of the former, Ignatius appears to embody the leadership role akin to the ancient Hebraic shepherd-God or shepherd-king as presented by Foucault. In the case of the latter, the ecclesiology Ignatius teaches is clearly in response to the established forms of leadership of the day, and more importantly, the discursive response to crisis both within and outside the church. Foucault's understanding of the *pasteur* and his detailed discussion of the modes of pastoral-power align greatly with the attitudes and teachings of Ignatius. Consequently, the use of the term *pasteur* throughout this thesis refers specifically to Foucault's understanding of the power dynamics present within pastoral power.

Using the social theories first presented by Foucault, the aim is to discover a more nuanced understanding of the formation of the early churches. If Ignatius was a pioneer of monepiscopacy, and if the church adopted this as its ecclesiastical model of leadership, what is the significance of both the words used by Ignatius to describe these church positions, and those exerted on Ignatius himself? Addressing these questions will play a significant role in understanding the formation of the early church in the second century.

More specifically, this thesis will primarily focus on pastoral power. As stated above, Ignatius is a perfect subject for the study of power-discourse. Particularly a power discourse focusing on surveillance and the governing of subjects is useful in relation to Ignatius, whose goals were to bring a seemingly disparate group of Christians under the influence of one or a few individuals. That his ideas would prevail in the end is a fascinating question, and one that should be examined for the shifts in power they cause.

Just as important as the power consolidation is the governmentality and surveillance Ignatius helps to establish. Using Foucault's theories to examine the ecclesiology of the early church may assist in separating what the church has gleaned from theological understanding of leadership and that which is non-Christian or "pagan". It is clear that Foucault's ideas of surveillance are particularly embodied in Ignatius's call for the bishop to preside over all ecclesiastical activities, particularly the eucharist. Such micromanaging is clearly in-line with a leadership style bent on monitoring and correcting subjects on an individual level.

Ignatius makes his case very clear, writing: "Let no one do anything involving the church without the bishop."[71] This level of control and presence illustrates the need for the bishop to not only determine what is happening, but to be present in what is happening. The only reason for such presence is so that the bishop might see and monitor his subjects. This trend in Ignatius's rhetoric is evidence of the surveillance and correction with which Foucault is so concerned.

 One should not confuse this idea of power consolidation with a self-serving notion of power grabbing. Since Ignatius was in the final days of his life, there are two basic and very distinct probabilities that can be assumed in his writing. The first is that what he has to say is of the utmost importance to him. It is understood this will probably be his last correspondence to the churches to which he writes, therefore the contents of his letters must be considered his most important messages he thought to convey. Regardless of the interpretation of his theology or ecclesiology, it seems more than reasonable to assume the contents are considered vital by the author. Second, since Ignatius was clearly on his way to imminent death, the power he suggests be given to bishops was not going to be for personal gain. In the words of a dying man, altruism is generally a conceded point. So, within the epistles, in their most basic sense, the first two observations to be made are that Ignatius feels his message to be important, and it is for the benefit of those he is leaving behind.

Using Foucault's ideas about the nature and dynamics of power, particularly relating to governmentality, this study will seek to show the pressures exerted on Ignatius and the discourse of power and leadership thrust upon him create the need to form a leadership model that is, above all else, designed to watch over the church and protect it from harm. It will be argued that in its most basic sense, this is a pastoral model of leadership. Viewing Ignatius through the lens of pastoral power provides significant evidence to his motives for writing to the churches on his way to martyrdom.

---

[71] Ign. *Smyn.* 10.1.

Whether cognizant of his decisions or not, Ignatius develops a scheme of leadership that increasingly allows for the surveillance of individuals, allowing for more significant individual spiritual guidance and manipulation. This exercise of pastoral initiative, as one can assume, leads to greater unity, as any radical theology or heretical ideas can be addressed at an individual level. Being under the control and surveillance of an individual, for better or for worse, produces a high level of unity. By looking beyond both the theological statements of Ignatius and the theological bias of the last twenty centuries, a different interpretation of Ignatius's writing and ecclesiology may be proposed.

Foucault's analysis of pastoral power suggests that there is more to pastoral power than simple surveillance. While the increased ability to see and influence the individual within the body is certainly the mode of the *pasteur*, the protection and salvation of the flock is the main goal.[72] Some have suggested that Ignatius was fanatical about becoming a martyr. However, there are again practical reasons for Ignatius to be, at least partially, glad about his situation. Foucault's theories suggest the role of the *pasteur* to be self-sacrificing at its core. Foucault states:

> [T]he good shepherd thinks only of his flock and nothing else. He does not even consider his own advantage in the well-being of his flock. I think we see here the appearance, the outline, of a power with an essentially selfless and, as it were, transitional character. The shepherd (*pasteur*) serves the flock and must be an intermediary between the flock and pasture, food, and salvation, which implies that pastoral power is always a good in itself. All the dimensions of terror and of force or fearful violence, all these disturbing powers that make men tremble before the power of kings and gods, disappear in the case of the shepherd (*pasteur*), whether it is the king-shepherd or the god-shepherd.[73]

There is an element of juxtaposition between the role of a Roman leader and that of the *pasteur*. The pressure exerted against a subject from a Roman or Greek ruler stands in great contrast to the

---

[72] Foucault, *Security*, 172–73.

[73] Ibid., 173.

sacrificial and benevolent leadership of the *pasteur*. Ignatius understands this role and willingly seeks to become, as Christ did, the sacrificial lamb for his church. The suffering and martyrdom of Ignatius, after all, legitimizes and strengthens his arguments. This response to martyrdom creates specificities within the early church and empowers its leaders through suffering.[74] Ignatius is not concerned with himself or for the advancement of his position. He is concerned with the church. By dying a martyr's death, he proves to his detractors his altruistic motives and emboldens his supporters to continue his ecclesiastic program. Ignatius goes to great lengths to equate the role of bishop to that of God (or Christ), and in martyrdom he gets another chance to dramatically do so.

In response to the above problem statement and using the methodology explained here, an outline of this study may be provided. Ignatius's main theme for writing is unity. His answer for unity is to be obedient to one bishop. Further, Ignatius writes: "Since it has been reported to me that the church of God in Antioch of Syria is at peace."[75] Even more, Ignatius spends a great deal of time arguing against heretical sects of Christians in his letters. This suggests a certain amount of discord within the second century church. Chapter 2 will begin by examining pastoral power, focusing on Foucault's analysis of the Christian pastoral power's themes regarding teaching, observation, supervision and "direction exercised at every moment."[76] Ignatius does not write his letters as theological treatises against heretical belief. His mention of heresy, and his arguments against them are brief enough that one could argue they are the second thoughts of a man attempting to get a different result than theological correctness. Ignatius's theological arguments are almost always in service to the idea that the believer should be under the supervision of the bishop and therefore be in harmony with each other.[77]

While there is no doubt movement in emphasis and thought in church leadership from the ministries contained in the New Testament to those found in the writings of Ignatius and eventually established towards the end of the second century, there is no less a need to address questions regarding the chronology and purpose of the shift. One of the main queries, especially in light of Ignatius's fondness

---

[74] Perkins, *Suffering Self*, 104–5.

[75] Ign. *Phil.* 10.

[76] Foucault, *Security*, 181.

[77] Ign. *Eph*. 3.2

for the Pauline Epistles[78] and their style, is why Ignatius abandons the more democratic and pneumatological approach to church leadership found in 1 Corinthians 12.[79] Here is another subtle push towards Ignatius the pragmatist. If, as so many claim, Ignatius was an admirer of Paul, it makes little sense that he would abandon the pneumatological ecclesiology present in Paul's writings without some specific cause. If Ignatius was truly making theological arguments, one might expect at least some interpretation as to why he is choosing a different form of leadership. Again, the best solution is found in a need to gain unity at all cost.

When crisis arrives, many leaders throughout history have sought to consolidate power for the safety of the population. In almost all cases, the results are terrible. What then is different about the monepisopacy in the second century? This question has been addressed numerous times. Pastoral power is one of benevolence and self-sacrifice. It is not the crushing of democracy for personal gain, but for protection. It is the exerting of power in a manner by which an individual or body monitors or watches and can direct other individuals for the sole purpose of their safety and salvation.

Chapter 3 of this study will investigate the pastoral response to internal conflict. Although it is not known for certain if Ignatius was actually condemned to die because of an internal conflict, there are indications that this is the case. Even if the reality is somewhat softer than this theory suggests, conflict of significant proportions is evidenced in Ignatius's writing. Those conflicts are presented by Ignatius, in particular, as a discourse between those that "belong" and those that are "othered."

Ignatius uses specific language of those that are either "inside" or "outside" the sanctuary. He specifically states that what makes one "inside" or "outside" the sanctuary is whether or not one is either doing things with the bishop or without him.[80] Ignatius uses this discourse as a means by which to "other" those he sees as heretical. Further, he employs the use of the eucharist as his primary tool to measure the belonging of a believer. The eucharist constitutes a means by which Ignatius can gather and individualize the believer, by enabling a mechanism by which the whole congregation must pass

---

[78] Ign. *Eph*. 12.2

[79] Richardson, *Christianity*, 60–63. Richardson not only argues that Ignatius is indebted to Paul in both style and content, he also affirms 1 Corinthians as a letter by which Ignatius must have been influenced.

[80] Ign. *Trall.* 7

before the bishop or an appointee. By using such a tool, Ignatius is able to observe the whole congregation and make the necessary corrections to errant beliefs as he sees fit.

The other great challenge Ignatius faces is persecution and its effect on the individual believer, namely the possibility of martyrdom. Chapter 4 seeks to investigate Ignatius as a martyr. No one can be sure why Ignatius was sent to be executed. Ignatius's letters never reveal a specific reason. Some argue Ignatius goes to his death more than willingly, even wanting to be martyred.[81] This thesis espouses the view that Ignatius was acting as the scapegoat for a confrontation involving various sects of Christianity within Antioch. Ignatius makes much of his procession towards martyrdom, even asking the Roman church not to attempt to save him from his fate.[82] As already stated, the role of *pasteur* is one willing to sacrifice himself for the flock. Ignatius understands this role and willingly seeks to become, as Christ did, the sacrificial lamb for his church. This thesis will also examine the discourse of martyrdom, namely its changed meaning from witness to one who dies for his or her beliefs. It will also examine the use of martyrdom as a power-discourse in light of pastoral power's sacrificial nature. The suffering and martyrdom of Ignatius, after all, legitimizes and strengthens his arguments. This response to martyrdom creates specificities within the early church and empowers its leaders through suffering.[83]

1.6 Conclusion

The approach of this study is not to discredit Ignatius's theology, or to assume he used no theological thought in his work. Many previous studies have examined Ignatius from a theological perspective, whose theories may in fact be correct. What this study seeks to show is that there is more to Ignatius and his ecclesiology than theological conviction. There is a broader story working on the eventual theology of one of the earliest and influential leaders of the church. The catalyst of persecution brings the deep seeded notions of pastoralism into a full scheme of church leadership, wholly distinct from both the Pauline model and the traditional notions of pastoralism of the Hebraic tradition.

---

[81] Ruben L. Ivan, "The Connection Between Salvation, Martyrdom and Suffering According to St. Ignatius of Antioch," *Kairos: Evangelical Journal of Theology* 7.2 (2013): 167–82.

[82] Ign. *Rom.*

[83] Perkins, *Suffering Self*, 104–5.

Although there have been many theories regarding Ignatius and his ecclesiology, none adequately account for the uniqueness of Ignatius's push for the monepiscopacy. If, for example, one were to assume there is a progression from the Pauline offices to that of the threefold ministry, there is still the unique manner by which Ignatius demands obedience to, and participation of, the bishop in all ecclesiastical activities. Further, the near exclusive use of ἐπίσκοπος in its singular form is a distinct feature of Ignatian ecclesiology. These oddities have a reason, and the theories presented by Michel Foucault on pastoral power might assist us in making sense of these Ignatian distinctives. Furthermore, some of the other themes within Ignatius's works, such as martyrdom, can also be satisfactorily analyzed through the lens of pastoralism.

CHAPTER 2

PASTORAL POWER FROM THE ANCIENT HEBREWS TO THE EARLY CHRISTIANS

2.1 Introduction

Pastoral power forms the foundation of leadership in the ancient church, particularly as the subsequent generations after the apostles begin to require leadership for their established congregations.[84] As Foucault suggests, this form of power not only blossoms alongside other models of governance and leadership, but it actually "envelops" all of the other power schemes and becomes the essential form of church leadership, which will be institutionalized and formalized by the fourth century.[85] Another distinction that Foucault suggests is that this power relationship, although built upon the themes most prevalent in the Hebrew Bible, is significantly changed in early Christianity.[86] If Ignatius, who is seen to be one of the earliest and most outspoken proponents of the monepiscopacy, is the one who first changes the form of church order from those forms of leadership found in the New Testament period

---

[84] It should be noted from the beginning that the local church leadership model presented by these second- and third-generation leaders was in tension with the itinerant nature of Paul. Even more, Paul's vision of charismatic leadership which spread among various leadership nodes in the church is also at odds with the burgeoning ecclesiology of the second century onward. According to Meeks, this conflict was a part of the church even in Paul's day, as his itinerancy came in conflict with local leaders tasked with leading the individual communities established by Paul; see Wayne A. Meeks, *The First Urban Christians: The Social World of the Apostle Paul* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2003), 111–39.

[85] Foucault, *Security*, 152.

[86] Ibid.

to what will be seen in the fourth century,[87] it is vital to discover how pastoral power was handed to Ignatius, and how he negotiated with and transformed pastoral power in order to establish his ecclesiology.

Discussing the basis of pastoral power, Foucault writes:

> Obviously the theme of pastorship is especially developed and intensified with the Hebrews, with the particular characteristic that in the Hebrews the shepherd-flock relationship is essentially, fundamentally, and almost exclusively a religious relationship.[88]

If pastoral power has its strongest roots in the Hebrew Bible, which is also the foundation of early Christianity, and finds its most developed expression in later formative Christianity, the evolution of pastoralism must be traceable through the first centuries of Christian power practices. Therefore, an understanding of pastoral power's historical themes found in the Hebraic expression, and how these themes translated to and changed within early Christianity, must be examined. Foucault himself states that this is a task which he avoided, as his focus was the eventual transition from the sacred power of the fourth and fifth centuries to the secular models of government in more contemporary times.[89] Attention to the formation of pastoral power within the historical development of the Hebrews and thus the early Christians is in order. While the shepherd metaphor is not limited to the HB traditions in the ancient world, the prevalence of the theme throughout this segment of history is more robust than in the other contemporaneous power traditions among the surrounding cultures.[90] This chapter

---

[87] Brent, *A Martyr Bishop*, 160. While Brent suggests Ignatius is the man who most radically seeks to change the organization of the church, he claims this is on the basis of incorporating "pagan" traditions into the ecclesiology of the church. Robinson suggests both the reasoning and the date are ambiguous and no claims can be made regarding the timeline or the ubiquity of the monepiscopacy; see, Robinson, *Ignatius*, 95.

[88] Foucault, *Security,* 124.

[89] Ibid., 163.

[90] Niehaus provides a more in-depth study regarding the shepherd motif in the ancient cultures surrounding the ancient Hebrews. The Egyptians, Assyrians, Babylonians, and Sumerians all used shepherd imagery for both God and for their monarchs. This is paralleled in many of the ancient Hebrew narratives; Jeffery J. Niehaus, *Ancient Near Eastern Themes in Biblical Theology* (Grand Rapids, MI: Kregel, 2008) 34–55. Laniak's study is perhaps a more thorough treatment of the shepherd motif in Mesopotamia and Egypt, noting both the culture's effects on pastoral traditions, as well as studying the leaders within those cultures and their pastoral themes; Timothy Laniak, *Shepherds after My Own Heart: Pastoral Traditions and Leadership in the Bible* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 2006), 42–72. Also see Aubert's background study of the shepherd motif in the Miletus discourse found in Acts 20. His background to the shepherd motif is limited to the Mesopotamian cultures of Sumer, Babylonia, and Syria, eschewing the Egyptian usage of the motif; Bernard Aubert,

will give an overview of the pastoral traditions, including their development and transformations which would eventually be available to the early second-century church, and will particularly examine the main themes and dynamics of pastoral power suggested by Foucault. This analysis will begin with an overview of pastoral power by examining very broad themes found in the HB and NT. Following this overview, an introduction to the issues facing Ignatius in Antioch will be provided and it will be explained how the pastoral power paradigms he inherited were present in the early second century.

2.2 The Shepherd's Need to Direct the "Whole Flock"

Foucault notes the defining characteristic of pastoral power is the exercising thereof "over a multiplicity in movement."[91] This is the fundamental attribute of pastoral power. In this section, the Hebrew scriptures will be examined cursorily in order to reveal the repetition and prevalence of this pastoral-power theme. The hope here is to see the overarching understanding of God and leadership handed down from the Hebrews to the early church. The basic understanding of this idea is necessary in order for Ignatius's motives to be clear.

The formation of pastoral power is most fully developed in the theology of the HB, whose nomadic lifestyle echoed their beliefs in God, namely the idea that pastoral power is a power in movement.[92] In order to understand the power structures of the Judeo-Christian pastoralism of the early second century, it is once again helpful to understand the particularity of the Jewish understanding of God. This is even more pronounced due to Ignatius's insistence that "we are clearly obliged to look upon the bishop as the Lord himself."[93] What then, does this obedience to the Lord look like from an historical perspective? What type of leadership does the model from the Hebrew Bible hand over to Ignatius and the early Christians? While the so-called parting of the ways is certainly already beginning in the early second century, there is ambiguity in the timeline.[94] Therefore, for early

---

The Shepherd-Flock Motif in the Miletus Discourse (Acts 20:17–38) against Its Historical Background (New York: Peter Lang, 2009), 127–32.

[91] Foucault, *Security*, 125.

[92] Ibid., 170.

[93] Ign. Eph. 6.1.

[94] Judith Lieu, *Christian Identity in the Jewish and Graeco-Roman World* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004). See also Daniel Boyarin, *Border Lines: The Partition of Judaeo-Christianity* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2004), 1–35. Ferguson discusses the importance of tradition, or παράδοσις, to the ancients. See Everett Ferguson, "*Paradosis* and *Traditio*: A Word Study," in *Tradition & The Rule of Faith in the Early Church: Essays in Honor of Joseph T. Lienhard S.J.*, eds. Ronnie J. Rombs and Alexander Y. Hwang, Washington, DC: Catholic University of

Christians, their ideology and understanding of history and their understanding of God rest in the ideas presented through the ancient ideas given to them by their Jewish predecessors. For this reason, to understand more fully the early Christian understanding of pastoralism, an examination of the Jewish heritage is vital. Understanding where the Jews came from, especially in regard to their understanding of God and his role in their lives, provides necessary context for the leadership Ignatius is asking in the above command to the Ephesian church.

The Hebrews' dedication to the theme of the shepherd, or *pasteur*, as Foucault calls it, is recurring and ever-present in the broad scope of their story.[95] When viewing the story on a macro scale, the repetitious themes regarding the affirmation of the rural wandering of the Hebrews and their shepherd-heroes versus the condemnations of the sedentary metropolis is evident.[96] One such example is the Exodus narrative, particularly the need for the people to wander in the desert for 40 years before entering Canaan. These ideas regarding leadership are profoundly integrated into the thought processes of early first-century Jews and Christians, with certain caveats that will be addressed below.

Philo, writing just a century and a half before Ignatius, writes of Moses:

> [B]eing thus instructed in the lessons proper to qualify him for becoming the leader of a people, for the business of a shepherd is a preparation for the office of a king to anyone who is destined to preside over that most manageable of all flocks, mankind…[97]

It is clear that the pastoral traditions of the Ancient Hebrews were carried into first-century Jewish-Hellenistic thought, which makes it the basis for first-century Christian leadership formulations.[98] Therefore, understanding the depth to which the shepherd motif runs within the psyche of first-century

---

America Press, 2010. Ferguson notes the use of παράδοσις in many of the ancient writings surrounding the first centuries of Christianity. The importance of tradition, even across the two religions, is evident.

[95] K. Thomas Resane, "Leadership for the Church: The Shepherd Model," *HvTSt* 70.1 (2014): 1–6.

[96] James K. Hoffmeier, *Ancient Israel in Sinai: The Evidence for the Authenticity of the Wilderness Tradition* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2005), 3–22.

[97] Philo, *Moses* 11. C. D. Yonge, trans., *The Works of Philo Judaeus* (London: Henry G. Bohn, 1855).

[98] Laniak, *Shepherds*, 21–27.

Jewish and Christian leaders speaks highly to the motives of those individuals. What follows in the following sections is an attempt to view the history of the pastoral traditions of the Hebrews and early Christians in broad perspective. What will be included in this excursus is an overview of the main themes of the shepherd motif found in the canons of both Hebrew and Christian scriptures in order to gain an understanding of the nuances and the pervasiveness of the shepherd theme throughout the Judeo-Christian tradition.

2.3 The God of Abraham: Pastoral Power over a Nomadic People

If one is to gain insight into the particularity of ancient Hebrew culture, one must focus on their origins, which present a significant shift in mindset from many other ancient cultures with regard to religion and power.[99] While there are certainly artifacts of the early Israelite religion that bear some similarities to other surrounding religions of the day,[100] the ideas of monotheism, the type of God worshipped, and the exclusive relationship to God, represent a noteworthy shift in the ancient world.[101] While some, like Freud, suggest there is a predecessor to biblical monotheism that can be found in the religion of Aten in Egypt, others, such as Assmann, hold there is a distinction between the two that is notable.[102] Assmann suggests the Mosaic distinction in the Bible creates a political religion that specifically produces a command-and-obey relationship between the one true God and his people.[103] If this is the case, such a distinction is as revolutionary as the idea of monotheism itself, which may or may not have originated with the Israelites. Nowhere is the particularity of the Israelite religion seen more striking than in this relationship between God and his people, which constitutes the essence of pastoral power.

There is an ancient tradition which can serve as precedent for the supremacy of the shepherd found in the creation account of Genesis (Gen. 1:26–28, 4:1–4). According to the account of creation in Genesis, Adam is inherently given dominion over the creatures of the earth. Conversely, it is only after his sin that he is condemned to work the earth for food. This difference between the farmer and the shepherd is further exacerbated by the story of Cain and Abel found in Gen. 4. Here, God accepts

---

[99] There are some similarities to other Mesopotamian, Syrian, and Egyptian ideas, but they are far from the fully developed shepherd-God of the Hebrews.

[100] Graham Davies, "Comparative Aspects of the History of Israelite Religion," *ZAW* 125.1 (2013): 177–97.

[101] This is by no means a consensus. While the longstanding interpretation of the Ancient Near East has assumed an Israelite origin to true monotheism, this has been challenged in modern scholarship. For a full treatment see Beate Pongratz-Leisten, *Reconsidering the Concept of Revolutionary Monotheism* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2011). See also Gwinyai H. Muzorewa and Ralph C. Watkins, *African Origins of Monotheism: Challenging the Eurocentric Interpretation of God Concepts on the Continent and in Diaspora* (Eugene, OR: Pickwick, 2014).

[102] For a state of the discussion see Pongratz-Leisten, *Reconsidering*, 3-11 and Jan Assmann, *The Price of Monotheism* (Stanford, Calif: Stanford University Press, 2009).

[103] It should be noted that monotheism is more complicated than presented here in this broad summation. Although Judaism will eventually become what is now referred to as monotheistic, it was a process to move from a God above other gods to only one God; see Christian Frevel, "Beyond Monotheism?: Some Remarks and Questions on Conceptualising 'Monotheism' in Biblical Studies," *VEcc* 34.2 (2013): 1–7.

the offering of the shepherd, Abel, but rejects that of the farmer, Cain. Even in the foundational stories of the Hebrew faith there is evidence of a preference for the shepherd. This preference for the shepherd continues into the narrative of the Hebrews' founding family, namely that of Abraham.[104]

Abraham came out of ancient Sumer, who along with the surrounding cultures of Babylonia and Assyria, all have shepherd traditions in their leadership structures, as is particularly evident in the ancient myths of Sumer.[105] These traditions acknowledge the separation between the hoarding grounds of the surrounding wilderness and the civilization of the agrarian city, even going so far as to believe the former to be the realm of the gods.[106]

One of the unique features of the Hebrew tradition is that they actively leave civilization for the express purpose of existing in the realm associated with the gods, or from another perspective, the uncouth wilderness of the hoarding grounds. The call of Abraham out into the wilderness was, presumably, a call into a land populated by wild-men and the gods.[107] Even the very first action of the Hebrew story in which Abraham is called by God is permeated with pastoral ramifications and theological implications. However, these nuances, whose discussion would be beneficial in a different context, are not vital to the current study. The concern here is the traditions that form the overarching theology handed down to the early church. The Hebrew and Christian scriptures constitute the best insight into what the early Christians believed about their traditions, God, and pastoral power. The focus here is, as Gillingham states, more concerned with the reception history of the Hebrew scriptures in the second century.[108] The shepherd tradition inherited by the early Christians is paramount. By looking, generally, at the story of the Hebrews, a pattern begins to emerge that is vitally important for the understanding of pastoral power. In essence, viewing the history of the Hebrews as a history of

---

[105] These include the *Epic of Gilgamesh, Creation Epic, Lipit-Ishtar Law Code,* and the *Code of Hammurabi*; see, Aubert, *The Shepherd-Flock*, 127–32.

[106] David Halperin, *Before Pastoral: Theocritus and the Ancient Tradition of Bucolic Poetry* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1983), 91–95.

[107] This study presumes monotheism to be undeveloped at the very beginning of the Hebrews' story. For a more detailed treatment, see Mark S. Smith, *The Origins of Biblical Monotheism: Israel's Polytheistic Background and the Ugaritic Texts* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2001). Smith's focus is on the cultural background of Canaanite religious traditions and their transmission into the Hebrew traditions.

[108] Susan Gillingham, *The Image, the Depths and the Surface: Multivalent Approaches to Biblical Study* (New York: Sheffield Academic, 2002), 8.

the pastorate reveals a recurring theme and a cycle to the Hebraic understanding of both God and the earthly leaders chosen to guide his people. This begins, as noted, with the call of Abraham into the pasturelands of the wilderness surrounding the ancient city-states of Sumer.

Genesis records the movement of Abraham's family from Ur to Haran (Gen. 11:27–32). Ur and Haran were both cities within the ancient Sumerian cultures of the third millennium B.C.E. Such a migration of a family between these cities would not have fundamentally changed their understanding of God, as they were not markedly different in their general belief systems. The remarkable story begins in the next chapter when God calls Abraham to leave his land and venture into a place God will reveal to him at a later date. God calls Abraham out of the relatively sophisticated and ordered life of the cities of one of the most established cultures of the day and into the wilderness. This is the first, but certainly not the last, of God's call to the Hebrews into the wilderness.

Abraham's obedience here is important to this study for two reasons. First, the religious understanding of God is forever altered for the Hebrews as God becomes not a stationary deity whose wrath is to be appeased, but a God whose relationship is about call and response. This is a fundamental shift in the understanding of God, and this will be a fundamental shift in how leadership is portrayed in the Hebraic tradition as well.[109] From the very beginning, the Hebrew understanding of God is one of personal relationship, movement, following, and care. These are the themes Foucault suggests being the hallmarks of pastoral power.[110] Second, the wilderness to which God calls Abraham is a blank canvas where new theological revelations are not intruded upon by established traditions. There is a creation of something entirely new in the wilderness. Feldt writes of the impact of the wilderness for the Hebrews by saying: "The use of wilderness space in the Torah is special in that it is so explicitly used for identity formation and pedagogic purposes—it assists in the religious identity formation of those belonging to 'Israel.'"[111] These new theological revelations are the result of this movement, another theme that will be repeated many times in this particular historical view of the Hebrews' story.

---

[109] Pangle notes that Abraham is seen as righteous because of his devotion and obedience to God. As a result, God blesses Abraham for that obedience. Thus, the archetypal hero for the Hebrews is one that follows this pattern of response to the desire of God. See Thomas L. Pangle, *Political Philosophy and the God of Abraham* (Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2007), 127–53.

[110] Foucault, *Security*, 125–30.

[111] Laura Feldt, "Ancient Wilderness Mythologies—The Case of Space and Religious Identity Formation in the Gospel of Matthew," *ARG* 16.1 (2015): 163–92.

For the Hebrews, God no longer requires constant ritual to appease Him, as nearly all ancient cultures did, but requires that his people follow Him.[112]

The covenant between God and Abraham is one that immediately gives the impression of God's ownership of "his people." As the understanding of God as shepherd continues to strengthen, there is a natural sign of ownership of his "sheep" that must be undertaken, namely circumcision. Livestock in the ancient world, as it is today, were branded by the owner as a sign of belonging.[113] Like any good flock-owner, God decides the Hebrews must have a physical sign that denotes his ownership; the people must be branded.[114] God commands Abraham and his descendants to circumcise themselves in order to show their belonging and to ratify the covenant he makes with Abraham. God says to Abraham:

> Now as for you, you shall keep My covenant, you and your descendants after you throughout their generations. This is My covenant, which you shall keep, between Me and you and your descendants after you: every male among you shall be circumcised. And you shall be circumcised in the flesh of your foreskin, and it shall be the sign of the covenant between Me and you. And every male among you who is eight days old shall be circumcised throughout your generations, a servant who is born in the house or who is bought with money from any foreigner, who is not of your descendants. A servant who is born in your house or who is bought with your money shall surely be circumcised; thus shall My covenant be in your flesh for an everlasting covenant. But an uncircumcised male who is not circumcised in the flesh of his foreskin, that person shall be cut off from his people; he has broken My covenant (Gen. 17:9–14).

---

[112] This is not to say that appeasement was altogether absent from the Hebrews, as the Priestly tradition that rose within the Torah would be a type of ritual appeasement.

[113] Victoria Pitts-Taylor, *Cultural Encyclopedia of the Body* (Westport, CT: Greenwood, 2008).

[114] Matthew Thiessen suggests the language in Gen. 17 is atypical to the narrative style of the rest of Genesis. By his reasoning, this is due to the legal ramification of belonging to God, of which circumcision, and more particularly infant circumcision, is an irrefutable sign of belonging; see Matthew Thiessen, *Contesting Conversion: Genealogy, Circumcision, and Identity in Ancient Judaism and Christianity* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2011), 31.

The branding of the people of God differentiates between those whom God will lead, and those who will be left behind. There is an otherness to the Hebrews, and it is a requirement that everyone follow or they will be cut off.

Again, the theme of population advanced by Foucault is presented uniquely in Abraham's people. This is not a country, or a nation, but a population that differentiates itself, not by owning a territory, but by claiming belonging to a shepherd-God. Schneidau suggests that this sense of belonging to God is a source of pride for the Hebrews. He writes, "[T]he shepherd could become a potent signifier of independence, austerity, loyalty, and content."[115] The shepherd motif is powerfully linked to the very identity of the Hebrews, and in this act of willful branding, they become distinctly set apart from the surrounding cultures and civilizations, solidifying their identities as a population bent on following their shepherd-God.

Within the story of Abraham, the very identity of the Hebrew people and the archetype of leadership for the Hebrews is founded. Even as God is the shepherd, Abraham is following as an earthly shepherd. The archetypal leader, then, assumes the role of a shepherd.[116] This pastoral leadership, at least in its nascent stages, can be seen in the following summary. First, there is the obvious call of Abraham to leave the city and travel into the wilderness. This wilderness is the typical domain of the shepherds. Then there is a call to follow, as sheep would follow a shepherd. Abraham is not given his location, a real vision for his future, or a map. What he is asked to do is to trust the shepherd-God and follow his constant leading. Finally, as a symbol of belonging, Abraham and his descendants are asked to mark, or brand, themselves as belonging to the shepherd-God.[117] Thus, the "mold" of the relationship between God and his people is set. It is a shepherd-flock relationship. What follows in the Hebrew scriptures are, in broad strokes, repeated stories where this relationship is affirmed. The common themes of shepherding, leading, and the wilderness are found in many major

---

[115] Herbert N. Schneidau, *Sacred Discontent: The Bible and Western Tradition* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1976), 125.

[116] Oelschlaeger writes that Abraham and all the patriarchs saw themselves as shepherds. This theme continues through the entire book of Genesis, setting up the archetype and providing a deep psychological fondness for the shepherd motif. See Max Oelschlaeger, *The Idea of Wilderness: From Prehistory to the Age of Ecology* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1991).

[117] Whether the biblical account of circumcision, or any of the Abraham narrative is historically accurate is of little importance to this study. The centrality of the Abraham narrative to the Hebrew faith is of vital importance to this study.

theological, societal, and geographical shifts in the scriptural narrative[118]

While it is possible, and even tempting, to extrapolate story after story in the Bible to illustrate the shepherd-God and its corresponding earthly form of leadership, it is not practical to do so here. What is more beneficial is to briefly summarize the ancient Israelites' movements in the centuries between Abraham and his journeys up to the establishment of the Davidic Kingdom. In so doing, the aforementioned themes of the shepherd relationship between God and his people will be seen more vividly, as the shepherding leadership theme is repeatedly represented as the superior and "archetypal" form of leadership.[119]

Abraham and his descendants continuously wander the land of the Canaanites for hundreds of years, eventually finding themselves in Egypt under the most favorable conditions.[120] In later traditions, the benefits of living in Egypt are also made clear by the redactors of the stories (Gen. 41:41–44). Joseph brings his father and brothers to live in Egypt. But Egypt eventually affords a different representation in the tradition. As generations in Egypt come and go, they find themselves in slavery. Even this early in the Hebrew narrative, the settlement in Egypt is given a negative outcome, another theme that will be repeated throughout the HB. The Exodus story ensues.

As one of the most influential narratives in Jewish tradition unfolds, there are some unique features that can be extrapolated to continue to bolster the Hebraic shepherd motif. According to later Midrashic interpretation, which is in continuity with the aforementioned writing of Philo, the shepherding background suggests that the wilderness serves as the proving ground for Israelite leaders.[121] First, there is the story's main character, Moses. The prince-turned-shepherd becomes another archetypal leader of the Hebrews and takes them from a place of sadness, bondage, and suffering, to a land of "milk and honey." Along the way, Moses will go from a reluctant and timid leader, to a confident and powerful one, shaped and prepared for this calling, as it were, during his

---

[118] The term "major shifts" is meant to differentiate individual stories in the Hebrew Scriptures from the larger societal, and resulting theological, shifts that occur in response to distinct episodes in Israelite history, such as: the Exodus, the establishment of a kingdom, or the destruction of that kingdom and subsequent exile.

[119] Laniak, *Shepherds*, 78.

[120] This is referring to the narrative of Joseph in Genesis, whose rise to power within the ranks of the Egyptians signifies, at least in the narrative itself, a beneficial existence at the onset of the Hebrew settlement in Egypt.

[121] Gerald Aranoff, "Shepherding as a Metaphor," *JBQ* 42.1 (2014): 36–38.

exile as a shepherd. Second, the Hebrews themselves will be changed through a remarkable series of events. This change, in a similar fashion to the calling of Abraham, is one that is brought about by a call out into the wilderness to be led by God and his shepherd-leader Moses.

With regard to Moses, there is much that could be said of him and his character. Broadly speaking, the overarching themes of his story reveal a unique hero, whose journey to leadership is almost comically backwards. Moses, after being adopted by a princess of Egypt, is raised as royalty, and no doubt groomed to be a leader within the kingdom. But in the Exodus saga, this type of leadership is not enough. While still a prince in Egypt, Moses is eventually found to be a Hebrew and is exiled into the wilderness.[122] In this wilderness, Moses finds a home in Midian, and he marries the daughter of Jethro, who happens to be a shepherd. Moses, in turn, becomes a shepherd. In the wilderness, Moses must undergo a transformation to become a much better leader, and the events leading to this transformation carry the already repetitious theme of growth in the wilderness and the development into a shepherd-leader.

The famous encounter between God and Moses at the burning bush takes place while, as the scriptures say, "Moses was pasturing the flock of his father-in-law Midian" (Exod. 3:1). In this encounter, God instructs Moses to once again go, this time back to Egypt, to free the Hebrews. The repetition of the call, movement, and the obedience to follow God are present in this second great Hebrew shepherd, Abraham being the first. This form of leadership, and the image of the shepherd were, as Hahn suggests, typical of the representation of Hebrew leaders, especially the most notable ones in the Davidic Kingdom, and is uniquely bestowed upon only the greatest leaders, such as David.[123] Moses's quest to free the Hebrews is successful. The shepherd motif then shifts to the entire population of Hebrew ex-slaves, who takes on the role of a flock.

 As the Hebrews exit Egypt, God again commands a wandering in the wilderness to take place. There is a 40-year wilderness journey that takes place before the conquest of Canaan can occur. Stuart

---

[122] There is little information in Exodus regarding the circumstances of Moses's exile into the wilderness. Cole uses the term "escape," giving Moses the action in the story; see Diane Cole, "Moses, The Egyptian Hebrew: Adoption as Archetype," *Mythosphere* 2.4 (2000): 369–70.

[123] Scott W. Hahn, "Liturgy and Empire: Prophetic Historiography and Faith in Exile in 1–2 Chronicles," in *Liturgy and Empire: Faith in Exile and Political Theology*, eds. Scott W. Hahn and David Scott (Steubenville, OH: Emmaus Road, 2009), 13–50. Hahn suggests this typology of shepherd leader is a reflection of the leadership of God.

interprets this as a learning experience for the recently subjugated people.[124] There is a sense of both helplessness and an unfamiliarity with God among the freed Hebrews that must be corrected before the gift of the promised land can be given. In many ways this can be interpreted as familiarity with the shepherd. Only a well-trained flock could be taken into a land filled with danger (in this case other tribes of people). Cahill suggests that this wandering is necessary in order for a new generation to colonize Canaan; a generation that is "born nomads who expect to always journey on."[125] Both Stuart and Cahill are suggesting a similar idea. The freed Hebrews are not yet ready to occupy Canaan. What this wilderness journey also suggests is that movement is essential to the leadership of God and his relationship to his sheep. Even as the Exodus story proceeds to the conquest of Canaan, there is a sense of constant movement in this national procession. Joshua and his conquerors do not stay in Jericho, they press on to other cities throughout the area. They remain a people in constant flux.

A few generations later, as the Israelites desire to establish a kingdom, there is a heavenly warning, showing the attitude of the biblical writers toward the cessation of movement and emulating the leadership common in surrounding peoples. This heavenly warning shows the disdain the scripture writers had for any form of sedentary stagnation. Polzin's work on the subject is quite illuminating. By arguing for the presence of the Deuteronomist as redactor or author of the monarchical narrative found in 1 and 2 Sam. and 1 and 2 Kgs., Polzin makes a point similar to what this study is proposing, that the reception and interpretation of the Hebrew narratives though history is as important as the history itself. By acknowledging the Deuteronomist's contributions to the story, the shepherd motif is seen not only to be an accidental historical theme, but one that is ingrained in the psyche of later generations who find its expressions vital to the stories they record.[126] In their request for a king, the Israelites appear to have abandoned the type of leadership and the type of existence that set them apart. When the Hebrews decided they want a king, 1 Sam. 8 records not only Samuel's discontent, but God's warning as well. This heavenly warning illustrates the tension of a nation moving from a pastoralist lifestyle to a sedentary one.

---

[124] Douglas K. Stuart, *Exodus* (Nashville: B&H, 2006), 320–21.

[125] Thomas Cahill, *The Gifts of the Jews: How a Tribe of Desert Nomads Changed the Way Everyone Thinks and Feels* (New York: Nan A. Talese, 1998), 160.

[126] Robert Polzin, *Samuel and the Deuteronomist: A Literary Study of the Deuteronomic History Part Two: 1 Samuel* (Bloomingdale, IN: Indiana University Press, 1993), 80–88.

The discontent here is not that the people desire a leader, but the type of leader they seek. The cautionary narrative is about regressing to an inferior way of thinking.[127] The Hebrew people from the time of Abraham to this turning point have been unique among their contemporaries. Now the popular consensus is for a king, the reason for which is given in 1 Sam. 8:20, "that we [Hebrews] also may be like all the nations." Again, the biblical writers show disdain for this type of leadership. It is, as they write, against God's will. The point the biblical redactors appear to return to is this: there is a superior form of leadership that is predicated on following God.[128] This form of leadership is inherently more innocent, void of the hubris that often turns kings into tyrants.

Thus, it is no surprise that as the biblical story continues, the first king in this system of leadership is an eventual failure, approaching tyranny. The first few years are marked by universal fervor and success, but the whole experience takes a turn for the worst, as the king becomes ever more power-hungry and fears for his status as ruler. The discursive turn of the narrative is increasingly negative about Saul. Saul is thus portrayed in scripture as an unsuitable ruler, whose rising obsession with power will lead to madness and ruin. Rising up to eventually take his place is a new king, one who would become the most beloved in all of Hebrew history. Not surprisingly, it is a young shepherd named David.

God told Samuel he was looking for a "man after my own heart" (1 Sam. 13:13–14). It is not unreasonable to understand this to be due to David's profession as shepherd, as he will become the ideal shepherd-king. The biblical writers are clearly focused on a singular form of leadership, one that shows itself not only in the affirmations of its great leaders, but in the disdain or indifference for its mediocre ones as well. Brueggemann makes a clear distinction between the manner by which Saul is made king, and the way David is anointed. Interpreting 1 Sam. 16:1–13, he acknowledges the significance of the shepherd metaphor used by God and makes the point emphatically by writing: "The important point is that David's kingship is presented and understood not as a human political

---

[127] Shepherding was seen by many as a precursor to a more sophisticated agrarian society, and therefore the former is sometimes referred to as the "old way of thinking." However, Oelschlaeger suggests the Hebrews specifically move out of the agrarian city into the wilderness, thus doing something unique among ancient cultures; see Oelschlaeger, *Wilderness*, 48.

[128] It must be noted that it is more nuanced than simple disdain for kingship. There are clear signs, as is the Davidic saga, that kingship as acceptable. Also, the reign of the judges was, for example, a mix of chaos and peace as well. But in their treatment of kingship, the redactors are predominantly negative; see Ian D. Wilson, *Kingship and Memory in Ancient Judah* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2017), 18–22.

decision, but as a decree of Yahweh."[129] It is clearly the preference of God, according to Hebrew tradition, for a leader to possess the qualities of a shepherd. With this in mind, it is easy to read David as being after God's own heart because God's heart is that of a shepherd.[130]

But something begins to happen in David's kingdom that is unique in the history of the Israelite people up to this time; the kingship of David becomes the Davidic dynasty. As the greatest of the Hebrew kings' descendants assume the throne, there is increasing turmoil among the Israelites. As the stories of the Davidic dynasty unfold, the stagnation of the people into a sedentary kingdom increases the prevalence of idolatry. Cohn writes that the kings following David are characterized at best as "inadequate,"[131] with the Northern Kingdom of Israel's monarchs doing what was "displeasing in God's sight."[132] In contrast to the North, Cohn continues, the Southern Kingdom of Judah's monarchs are "judged faithful to Yhwh but deficient in allowing false worship to continue."[133] After the shepherd-king David dies, the people revert ever-increasingly to the religious sensibilities of their neighbors, eschewing the relationship-religion that characterized the Abraham and Moses traditions. Stagnation and complacency have many negative spiritual, and eventually, physical and political, consequences.[134]

In response to the generations of continued idolatry, God does something that is becoming commonplace and repetitive in the Hebrew scriptures. He sends Amos, a shepherd, to try and make things right. Once again, this is no figurative shepherd, but an actual herder of sheep, like Abraham, Moses, and David before him. His words ring with the theme that has been perpetuated throughout the HB, that the stagnant city-life has become evil, and made the Hebrews wicked. Hosea, a

---

[129] Walter Brueggemann, *First and Second Samuel* (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox, 1990), 237.

[130] This is echoed in Jer. 3:15, "Then I will give you shepherds after My own heart."

[131] Robert L. Cohn, "Characterization in Kings," in *The Books of Kings: Sources, Composition, Historiography and Reception*, eds. Andre Lemaire, Baruch Halpern, and Matthew J. Adams (Leiden: Brill, 2010), 92. Also see Alison L. Joseph, "Who Is like David? Was David like David? Good Kings in the Book of Kings," *CBQ* 77.1 (2015): 20–41. Joseph's view, like Polzin's, is the Deuteronomist had much to do with the crafting of the Davidic archetype of king. In doing so, the comparisons of the other kings are, most often, not a favorable.

[132] Cohn, *Characterization*, 92.

[133] Ibid., 93.

[134] This is referring to the destruction of the Northern Kingdom of Israel and the lost tribes, and the subsequent Babylonian exile of the Southern Kingdom of Judah.

contemporary of Amos, is recorded as using this metaphor in reference to God and the Hebrews' restoration after exile (Hos. 2:14–15):

> Therefore, behold, I will allure her,
> Bring her into the wilderness
> And speak kindly to her.

> Then I will give her her vineyards from there,
> And the valley of Achor as a door of hope.
> And she will sing there as in the days of her youth,
> As in the day when she came up from the land of Egypt.

Again, there is a return to the wilderness and a restoration of the people. Moreover, there is the leadership of God over a people in motion. But the people of both kingdoms do not listen. The results of their religious betrayal, as the biblical writers suggest, is the devastation of Israel first and then Judah at the hands of successive powerful societies; the Assyrians first, followed by the Babylonians. It is again in this movement, as the Hebrews find themselves moving to Babylon, that they rediscover their faith in God.[135] God is once more revealed in the movement and forgotten in the stagnation. For the authors of the prophetic literature of the HB, political stability for the Hebrews often comes at the expense of their relationship with God. In exile, and into the Second Temple period, the theme of shepherd will become the description of the messianic ruler who will usher in the eschaton.

---

[135] Kraabel develops a similar, although not precisely so, theory regarding the attitude of the Jews to the notion of "exile." While noting the original negative view of the Babylonian captivity and resulting Diaspora, the attitudes of the Jewish people shifted considerably, as the importance of the promised land diminished, especially in light of the destruction of the Second Temple. The resulting theology is one that focused on the positive effects of the diaspora community as a result of the exile; see, Alf T. Kraabel, "Unity and Diversity among Diaspora Synagogues," in *The Synagogue in Late Antiquity*, ed. Lee I. Levine (Philadelphia: American Schools of Oriental Research, 1987), 49–60.

2.4 The Messianic Shepherd

It is in this time of exile that the shepherd motif begins to become directly representative of God's shepherding of his people. It is the discourse found in the prophets of the HB where the Messiah will begin to metaphorically lead.[136] This is the beginning of the messianic hope, and the mantle of the shepherd will be thrust upon this future messiah. It is in these prophets, particularly Jeremiah and Isaiah, that God himself will be the shepherd of the people instead of sending representative shepherds.[137] The prophet Isaiah writes:

> Like a shepherd He will tend His flock,
> In His arms He will gather the lambs,
> And carry them in His bosom;
> He will gently lead the nursing ewes (Isa. 40:11).

Furthermore, Isaiah prophesies the coming of God into humanity with a child named Immanuel.[138] In a later reference to this child, Isaiah says that he will reign on David's throne.[139] The connection of Immanuel to the idyllic shepherd-king David presents the former with clear pastoral connotations. Combining this with Isaiah's proclamation that God will directly shepherd his people, it is clear the messiah will be a shepherd for his people.

Like Isaiah, and even more so, Jeremiah uses the shepherd motif prolifically in his writing.[140] Jeremiah uses pastoral imagery throughout his writing to both castigate the bad shepherds of Israel's past,[141] as well as look hopefully to the future of the good shepherd to come.[142] Similar to Isaiah, there is a

---

[136] Joel Willitts, *Matthew's Messianic Shepherd-King: In Search of "The Lost Sheep of the House of Israel"* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2007), 55–67.

[137] Laniak, *Shepherds,* 122.

[138] Isa. 7:14.

[139] Isa. 9:1–7.

[140] Willitts, *Matthew's*, 58; see Jer. 23, 31:10, 43:12, 49:19, 50:44, 51:23.

[141] Jer. 2:5–9, 23:1–2.

[142] Jer. 3:15, 23:3–8.

promised messianic connection that includes the direct shepherding of the Hebrews by God himself.[143] This is a theme found throughout the major and minor prophets of the Hebrew scriptures.[144] There is such a preponderance of these references that it becomes impractical to examine them all here. What is intended instead is to show the common theme of the shepherd not only finding continuity among the generations leading up to the Second Temple period, but a blossoming of the shepherd motif into a messianic and eschatological hope. For one last piece of evidence, consider the words of the prophet Micah:

> I will surely assemble all of you, Jacob,
> I will surely gather the remnant of Israel.
> I will put them together like sheep in the fold;
> Like a flock in the midst of its pasture
> They will be noisy with men.

> The breaker goes up before them;
> They break out, pass through the gate and go out by it.
> So their king goes on before them,
> And the Lord at their head (Mic. 2:12–13).

Throughout the writings of the prophets, the understanding of the messiah as shepherd was solidified. The pastoral imagery used throughout these writings advances the theme of the shepherd-hero to become the shepherd-savior. Along with this advancement is another advancement of the shepherd-motif, that of the need for the shepherd to suffer as the means by which salvation can occur. This discursive turn has profound implications into the NT and beyond.

2.4.1 The Suffering Shepherd

The suffering shepherd is seen most keenly exhibited in the Book of Zechariah. Particularly in Zech. 9–14 there is a portrayal of a "meek king" that is contrasted with the earlier images of David. Zech. 9:9 portrays this new shepherd-king arriving, not on a kingly horse, but on a lowly donkey. The

---

[143] Jeremiah is extraordinarily full of pastoral imagery, far beyond what can be covered in this space. For a detailed analysis see Laniak, *Shepherds*, 131–44.

[144] Jer. 23, 31:10, 43:12, 49:19, 50:44, 51:23; Mic. 2:12–13; Isa. 7:14, 9:1–7, 40:11; Ezek. 37; Zech. 11, 13. This is not an exhaustive list, but represents the prevalence of the motif within the various prophets of the HB.

distinction between the classic conquering image and this different approach is clear and is echoed throughout Zech. 9–14.[145] This distinction is especially true when comparing Ezek. 37 and Zech. 11. Both passages use the metaphor of the two staffs. In the former, there is a victorious ending saying (Ezek. 37:24; 26): "My servant David will be king over them, and they will all have one shepherd… I will establish them and increase their numbers, and I will put my sanctuary among them forever." In contrast, the same metaphor is used in Zechariah and takes a very bleak interpretation. The good shepherd of Zechariah is rejected by the people. Therefore, the two staffs are used, not as tools of restoration, but tools of punishment. In Zech. 11:10 and 11:14 God speaks of breaking the staffs of "Favor" and "Union" signifying a break, not only with the favor of God in the Israelites, but on the union of the two kingdoms of Judah and Israel.[146]

The motif of the suffering shepherd(s) is not saved for the good shepherd alone. In Zech. 12:10, for example, it is YHWH himself as the good shepherd that is being "pierced" and causing Jerusalem to weep over him. However, in Zech. 13:7 God states:

> "Awake, O sword, against My Shepherd,
> And against the man, My Associate,"
> Declares the Lord of hosts.
> "Strike the Shepherd that the sheep may be scattered;
> And I will turn My hand against the little ones."

This slightly shifted persona of the shepherd must be seen as being different from the character of chapter 12. The exact identity of the various suffering shepherds is of less concern for this study. Instead the very notion of the suffering of the shepherds is a key addition to the shepherd motif, which is in itself varied and complex in the HB. One can see the unique contribution to the shepherd motif that Zechariah brings. The prodigious suffering of the shepherds in Zechariah are contrasted to those found in many of the other writers.[147] Zechariah takes the mounting belief in the restoration of the

---

[145] Young S. Chae, *Jesus as the Eschatological Davidic Shepherd: Studies in the Old Testament, Second Temple Judaism, and in the Gospel of Matthew* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006), 76–77.

[146] Ibid., 79–82.

[147] Philip Asura Nggada, "Shepherd Motif in the Old Testament and its Implications for Leadership in Nigeria," (PhD diss., University of Jos, 2012), 80.

Davidic dynasty and thereby the restoration of Israel, and shows that the cost of this will be the piercing of shepherds, both good and wicked.[148] If this summation of Zechariah is correct, then the nature of leadership and the role which they play in the restoration of Israel will be profound. Israel's true shepherd, in other words, will be a suffering shepherd.

Moving from canonical references into Apocryphal Second Temple literature, there is no better work than 1 Enoch 85–90, otherwise known as the *Animal Apocalypse* [*An. Apoc.*] to find "incredible evidence for the continuing validity of the shepherd imagery in the Second Temple period."[149] This is especially true in that 1 En. is one of the most influential writings in the inter-testamental period.[150] The *An. Apoc.* is unique because it seeks to tell the entire history of the Israel in the form of an allegory.[151] In this allegorical account, the Israelites are depicted, from Jacob onward, as sheep, God is frequently referred to as "the Lord of the flock," and every major event and most of the leading figures in the HB can be discerned in it.[152] First Enoch evidences in stark terms the continuity of the shepherd motif between the HB and the NT period. There is even evidence that it functions as a bridge between the two. Notably in 1 En. 90:37–38, the author views in the *eschaton*, not only the redemption of Israel, but the redemption of all people.[153] He writes:

> And I saw that a certain white bull was born, and its horns were large. And all the beasts of the field and all the birds of the sky were afraid of it and making petition to it at all times. And I watched until all of their species were transformed, and they became all of them white cattle.[154]

Such imagery and its interpretation are echoed in John's Revelation. He writes (Rev. 5:9): "Worthy

---

[148] Chae, *Jesus*, 95.

[149] Ibid., 97.

[150] Matthew Black, *The Book of Enoch, or, I Enoch: A New English Edition: With Commentary and Textual Notes* (Leiden: Brill, 1985), 1–8.

[151] The allegorical nature of the *An. Apoc.* Has never been questioned and is universally accepted among scholars; see Daniel C. Olson, *A New Reading of the Animal Apocalypse of 1 Enoch: "All Nations Shall Be Blessed"* (Leiden: Brill, 2013), 1–16.

[152] Gary T. Manning, Jr., "Shepherd, Vine and Bones: The Use of Ezekiel in the Gospel of John," in *After Ezekiel: Essays on the Reception of a Difficult Prophet*, eds. Andrew Mein and Paul Joyce (New York: Bloomsbury, 2014), 25–44.

[153] Olson, *Reading,* 19–56.

[154] Ibid., 228.

are You to take the book and to break its seals; for You were slain, and purchased for God with Your blood men from every tribe and tongue and people and nation." The similar theme of redemption from other tribes in Revelation, are allegorically referred to as other species in *An. Apoc.* This shift from the centrality of the Israelite salvation to the universal salvific work of God is a fundamental shift in the Christian belief as they begin to emerge out of the Jewish faith. Here, in 1 En., a continuity of thought can be seen, even if briefly. Thus, the shepherd motif remains constant throughout with a subtle shift towards sacrifice that will become a vital one in its NT treatment.

What makes the Hebrew treatment of pastoral power so engaging is not that the leadership within these ancient stories possess pastoral qualities, but that the ancient scriptural heroes were so often shepherds themselves. The motif of the shepherd-ruler or the shepherd-savior is found throughout the entirety of the ancient scriptures. This is especially vibrant when the people of God are in movement. The challenge then becomes how to reconcile this form of leadership and this understanding of God within an established and stationary society like the ones in which the early Christians found themselves. How can a shepherd lead a people whose society has become stationary? This is the question facing any Jewish and Christian leader in the beginning of the second century.

2.5 The Shift Inward: The Movement of the Soul Becoming Individualized

To fully grasp how the Jews and then the Christians understood the shift in pastoral leadership for a stationary society, the later parts of the Jewish pastoral narrative must be readdressed. While looking at the whole story, the benefit of keeping the theme of physical movement is helpful in order to ground the Hebrew understanding of pastoral power. However, to understand the shift between the physical movement and the spiritual, a slightly different approach is necessary. Looking at the latter half of the above narrative of the Israelites, starting with the shepherd-king David, and especially in the development of the Wisdom tradition of the HB, the focus on movement begins to turn inward. Terrien describes the Psalms, many of which are attributed, at least according to tradition,[155] to David, thus:

> The poet-musicians of Israel cultivated the art of "contacting the immensities" and
> probed the secret of tempering human character. Pure poetry leads from the

---

[155] Again, the focus here will not be on the Davidic authorship of the Psalms. The tradition of Davidic authorship is sufficient for understanding the reception of these ideas in the second century C.E. The tradition of attributing Davidic authorship to many of the Psalms was particularly vibrant in the early Second Temple period; see Benjamin J. Segal, *A New Psalm: The Psalms as Literature* (Lawrenceville, NY: Gefen, 2013).

psychology of being to theology properly speaking, not the object observation and examination of divine spirituality but to the consciousness of being known by God.[156]

While the beginning of the story of Israel is characterized by obedience, particularly tied to actions (Abraham went, Moses obeyed and so on), the writings attributed to David point to a different measurement by which Israel must be subjected. David writes, quite distinctively, of the inner condition of his heart. This inward shift is noteworthy. Consider, for instance, the difference between the responses of Abraham and that of David. For the former, God spoke, and Abraham moved. The call of Abraham shows this tendency (Gen. 12:1–4):

> Now the Lord said to Abram,
> "Go forth from your country,
> And from your relatives
> And from your father's house,
> To the land which I will show you;
>
> And I will make you a great nation,
> And I will bless you,
> And make your name great;
> And so you shall be a blessing;
>
> And I will bless those who bless you,
> And the one who curses you I will curse.
> And in you all the families of the earth will be blessed."
> So Abram went forth as the Lord had spoken to him;
> and Lot went with him.

For Abraham, the relationship was of complete obedience. There is no mention of the heart, or spirit, in Abraham's relationship with God. For David, the situation is more internal. Rice calls the internal

---

[156] Samuel L. Terrien, *The Psalms: Strophic Structure and Theological Commentary* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2003), 61.

movement of the Psalms the "internal odyssey," a journey that he suggests requires the constant leadership of God to undertake.[157] The Psalmist writes (Ps. 51:6–10):

> Behold, I was brought forth in iniquity,
> And in sin my mother conceived me.
>
> Behold, You desire truth in the innermost being,
> And in the hidden part You will make me know wisdom.
>
> Purify me with hyssop, and I shall be clean;
> Wash me, and I shall be whiter than snow.
>
> Make me to hear joy and gladness,
> Let the bones which You have broken rejoice.
>
> Hide Your face from my sins
> And blot out all my iniquities.
>
> Create in me a clean heart, O God,
> And renew a steadfast spirit within me.

The movement for David was not in his obedience to relocate his physical being, the movement was this constant command to be the man God wanted of him. David suggests he was born with this sin. His natural state is to be wicked. The movement then is from this wicked state into a state that is pleasing to God. This is the beginning of a new kind of movement; a movement of the soul.[158] As the Hebrews physically stagnate, they are required to begin to move their hearts. Nowhere is this evidenced more strongly than in Psalm 23:1–3, which states:

> The Lord is my shepherd,

---

[157] Gene Rice, "Psalm 139: A Diary of the Inward Odyssey," *JRT* 37.2 (1980): 63–67.

[158] This notion led Calvin to famously note in his commentary on the Psalms that they were, "an anatomy of all parts of the soul"; see John Calvin, *Commentary on the Book of Psalms* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 1979), xxxvii.

I shall not want.

He makes me lie down in green pastures;

He leads me beside quiet waters.

He restores my soul;

He guides me in the paths of righteousness

For His name's sake.

The Psalmist here makes the concept of the shepherd's leadership applying to the spiritual quite explicit. This makes clear the reinterpretation of the shepherd motif to a spiritual reality.

2.6 The Early Christian Movement

The notion of an internal movement of the soul helps with the problem of the urban setting for the early Christian churches. As pastoral power transitions from a nomadic Hebraic understanding to an urban Christian understanding, the latter must interpret the leadership of movement for non-nomadic people. The internal movement of the soul is one of the ways in which the early church reimagines the act of movement so prevalent in the HB. Another way to see movement is in the rapid expansion of Christians and churches.[159] The sheer number of people involved would suggest the instances of idea assimilation would be quite high. Evidence for this can be found in the scriptures and has been affirmed by scholars like Campbell and Sampley. As the last addition to the apostles, Paul introduces significantly new ideas, founded on past religious traditions, into the earliest Christian congregations.[160]

---

[159] Stark suggests a growth rate of around forty percent. With this number, the number of Christians in the first part of the second century would be up to around 40,000 people. This number would rise to over 200,000 by the end of the second century, and around 6 million at the beginning of the third century. This number is close to what both MacMullen and Von Harnack presume. Rodney Stark, *The Rise of Christianity: How the Obscure, Marginal Jesus Movement Became the Dominant Religious Force in the Western World in a Few Centuries* (New York: HarperCollins, 1997), 6–7; Ramsay MacMullen, *Christianizing the Roman Empire: (A.D. 100–400)* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1984), 32; and Adolf von Harnack, *The Expansion of Christianity in the First Three Centuries: Book III. The Names of Christian Believers. The Organization of the Christian Community. Counter-Movements. Book IV. The Spread of the Christian Religion* (New York: Williams & Norgate, 1905).

[160] William S. Campbell, *Paul and the Creation of Christian Identity* (New York: T&T Clark, 2008), 54–57. Campbell calls Paul an innovator, taking the gospel message specifically to the gentiles. This created a unique expression of Christianity that was not very nuanced, and which Paul often worded very strongly. Sampley shows this in the form of argumentation. Particularly, Paul sets his gospel message in contrast to actions of other apostles; especially in Galatians 1–2 the actions of Peter and the attitude of James; see J. Paul Sampley, *Paul in the Greco-Roman World: A Handbook* (Harrisburg, PA: Trinity, 2003), 440–44. The "Antioch Incident" alluded to by Sampley is an important example of Pauline additions to the gospel message that will become dominant in the second century. Understanding the conflicts and their resolutions in the earliest church provides a clear example of the fluidity of early church theology. For a detailed analysis of the conflict between Peter and Paul in Antioch see, James D. G. Dunn, "The Incident at Antioch (Gal 2:11–18)," *JSNT* 18 (1983): 3–57.

Overwhelmingly, the early Christians were metropolitan, something very incongruous with the situation found in the beginnings of the HB. Noted previously, the urban culture was extrapolated, literarily, with hostility by the writers of the HB. The stagnation of sedentary bodies in population centers presents a problem, at least on the surface, for Foucault's theories for the Christian pastorate. This is especially true with the suggestion of continuity between the Hebrew and Christian pastorate. The way to reconcile the differences between the two groups can be seen in two similar concepts. Pastoral power is, as Foucault suggests, not over a territory, but over a population.[161] But since Foucault amends this by saying, "more exactly, over the flock in its movement from one place to another,"[162] there must be a distinct interpretation of movement for the Christian adoption of this form of power. This can be understood within Christianity not in the physical movement from one place to another, but in the moving of the congregation from small to large, and the moving of the individual soul from death to eternal life. Earliest Christianity was a missionary movement in particular, whose population was constantly changing as a result of its call to gain converts to its beliefs and communities. This constitutes a significant movement of bodies. The early Christian leader's charge as *pasteur* is in essence the same as the understanding suggested by Foucault, namely the power which is "exercised over a multiplicity in movement."[163] The Christian movement is simply a different kind of movement from that of the more archaic HB traditions.

There are inherent dangers in both types of movement. While the dangers to the nomadic peoples of the ancient Hebrews are found in encountering various other people groups, whose own claims to power create conflict, the early Christians actively assimilated various worldviews and cultures, creating certain levels of conflict internally.[164] For example, the early development of Christology

---

[161] Foucault, *Security,* 125.

[162] Ibid.

[163] Ibid.

[164] Barrett suggests that Paul's very mission brought about conflicts. Even at an early date, Paul was forced to reconcile new ideas, whether those that were too liberal, like those that denied the resurrection, or those that were too conservative, like those of the Judaizers. In either case, the very existence of a thinker like Paul who is spreading Christianity, begat the need to address new ideas being propagated about Christianity that he did not agree with; see Charles K. Barrett, "Paul: Councils and Controversies," in *Conflicts and Challenges in Early Christianity*, ed. Donald A. Hagner (Harrisburg, PA: Trinity, 1999), 42–74.

occurs as a synthesis of various Jewish and Hellenistic soteriological models.[165] As Christianity spread, it naturally added various opinions and ideas regarding the faith.[166] These outside opinions oftentimes lead to conflicts of varying degrees of severity.[167] These new ideas constitute, in more than one way, a threat. Spiritually, new ideas present theological and ideological dangers. Physically, the resulting conflicts between ideologies can have, as later chapters will explore, severe and often mortal consequences.

As Christians spread their message into the Hellenized world, the assimilation of the gentiles, with their Greek and Roman religions and philosophies, also took place. The divergence of Christianity among other religions comes from its roots in the monotheism and theology of the Jews *and* its radical ideas regarding Christ. The latter ideas placed Christianity somewhat close to the Platonic philosophies present within Greek culture.[168] As Christianity spread, educated converts to the faith made connections with these philosophies, ultimately adding to the religious and theological expression of second-century Christianity.[169] Thus a movement of ideas is almost assured.

Taking this further, Christianity is a religion almost designed to allow these varied forms of theological expression to exist.[170] From its inception, or at least since the time the Epistles of Paul were written, one of early Christianity's hallmarks was freedom. The assimilation of new thinkers and the freedom to express ideas within the framework of Christianity made for a combination primed to

---

[165] Charles H. Talbert, *The Development of Christology during the First Hundred Years, and Other Essays on Early Christian Christology* (Leiden: Brill, 2011), 1–6.

[166] This is seen most keenly in its formation of doctrine in the first centuries of Christianity's existence. Having to wrestle with and affirm or reject various ideas and, to one extent or another, define orthodoxy and heresy, suggest in itself that Christianity often dealt with an influx of ideas; see John N. D. Kelly, *Early Christian Doctrines* (London: Continuum, 2006), 1–28.

[167] This is seen even early on in the conflict between Paul and the men sent by James in Antioch. New ideas, in this case Paul's, even if not in direct conflict with established views produced tension between different groups of Christians; see Ian J. Elmer, "Setting the Record Straight at Galatia: Paul's Narratio (Gal 1:13–2:14) as Response to the Galatian Conflict," in *Religious Conflict from Early Christianity to the Rise of Islam*, ed. Wendy Mayer and Bronwen Neil (Boston: De Gruyter, 2013), 21–38.

[168] Karen Armstrong, *A History of God: The 4,000-Year Quest of Judaism, Christianity, and Islam* (New York: A. A. Knopf, 2004), 92–94.

[169] Ibid. Armstrong uses the example of Justin of Martyr a contemporary of Ignatius of Antioch.

[170] James M. Robinson and Helmut Koester, *Trajectories through Early Christianity* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1971), 114–57. Again, in reference to both the Jerusalem Council and the Antioch Incident, Koester acknowledges the fluidity of early Christian belief and the discourses present to shape it. This is a view championed earlier by Bauer; see Bauer, *Orthodoxy*.

create differing and even radical theologies. Christianity, being a very urban religion from its outset, assimilated large numbers of believers of varied backgrounds into the faith, producing a wide variety of interpretation and expressions.[171] Again, returning to the idea that at this point the church had not established an orthodoxy, and proper theological treatises were centuries away, the roles of church leaders of the early centuries C.E. were to direct the people through this movement of ideas. This is very literally the shepherd finding ways to lead the flock to the best possible outcome or "pasture."

2.6.1 The Good Shepherd

As the story of Israel becomes the assimilated story of the Christians, the theme of shepherding continues, and even increases, in all of the Gospels, the Apostolic Epistles, and into the Apostolic Fathers of the second century. Each of these categories of literature imbue the motif of shepherding with its own interpretation, giving the Christian understanding of shepherding subtle points of diversion from the HB discourses, even while maintaining the general understanding of the Hebraic themes.

There is a distinct addition to the Christian understanding of the *pasteur* that is one of its defining, if not the defining, characteristic, which sets it apart from the Hebrew conception, namely sacrifice. In Foucault's treatment of the *pasteur*, while noting both the benevolence and the individualization of pastoral power, a misclassification of the Hebrew concept of *pasteur* is made.[172] Foucault says first, "The bad shepherd only thinks of good pastures for his own profit, for fattening the flock that he will be able to sell and scatter, whereas the good shepherd thinks only of his flock and nothing else."[173] This in itself is not without HB scriptural backing. Both Ezekiel and Jeremiah make similar distinctions between the bad shepherds of Israel and either God or his representative good shepherd.[174] However, Foucault goes on to say,

> And then, in an even more intense manner, the second form taken by the

---

[171] Larry Hurtado, "Interactive Diversity: A Proposed Model of Christian Origins," *JTS* 64.2 (2013): 445–62.

[172] This study is in agreement with Mayes, who suggests Foucault used the "Good Shepherd" motif found in John 10 and applied it to his treatment of the Hebrew concepts of pastoralism. Foucault himself suggested his overview of the pastorate lacked a robust history and there may be a need for someone to trace the history of the concept more completely; see Christopher Mayes, "The Violence of Care: An Analysis of Foucault's Pastor," *JCRT* 11.1 (2010): 111–26.

[173] Foucault, *Security*, 128.

[174] Ezra 34 and Jer. 23:1–7.

paradox of the shepherd is the problem of the sacrifice of the shepherd for his flock, the sacrifice of himself for the whole of his flock, and the sacrifice of the whole of the flock for each of the sheep. What I mean is that, in this Hebrew theme of the flock, the shepherd owes everything to his flock to the extent of agreeing to sacrifice himself for its salvation.[175]

The problem here is that the HB never gives a self-sacrificing attribute to the shepherd. It is certainly true that the other attributes of the shepherd Foucault suggest hold true; his power exercised in movement, his benevolence, and his willingness to sacrifice the whole of the flock for the individual. Self-sacrifice, however, is not included in the scriptures of the HB. When returning to the shepherd-leaders of the ancient Hebrews this becomes exceedingly evident. Abraham, Isaac, Jacob and Joseph all lived long lives, according to Genesis.[176] Their trials, though significant, never included dying for the flock. Moses is also recorded as living a long life.[177] The same is true for King David, who dies a natural death as an old man (1 Kgs. 1:1; 1 Chr. 29:28). He was recorded as ruling for 40 years, with not a mention of self-sacrifice in his narrative (1 Kgs 2:11).

In all of these instances, and in the treatments of God as shepherd, most notably in Psalm 23, there is a constant undercurrent of the benevolence of these leaders, especially when juxtaposed against other leaders of the day. The chief concern for the Hebrew shepherd is the salvation and preservation of the flock. And while, if taken to its end, may logically lead to the notion of self-sacrifice as the ultimate benevolent act, it is not found prevalently in the Hebrew scriptures. Where the shepherd becomes a potential sacrifice is in the unique reinterpretation of the shepherd found in the Gospel of John. Mayes writes:

> The text to which Foucault appeals to support the claim that the Hebrew shepherd will "sacrifice himself for the flock" is John 10. In this text, John reinterprets rather than describes the Hebrew tradition of the pastor. Foucault's use of this early Christian text as representative of the Hebrew shepherd is

---

[175] Foucault, *Security*, 128.

[176] Gen. 25, 35, 49:29–50:14, 50:22–26.

[177] Deut. 34:7.

peculiar and results in a misunderstanding of both the Hebrew and Christian shepherds. John's definition of Jesus as the "good shepherd" who lays down his life for the flock is a feature unique to the Christ-shepherd that cannot be generalized to describe the Hebrew pastor. The theme of sacrifice is repeated throughout the Hebrew Scriptures, but never attributed to the figure of the shepherd. The shepherd is called to feed and maintain the life of the flock by leading them (Ezek. 34: 1–11), but the shepherd is not called to sacrifice himself for the flock. It is not until John's reinterpretation that sacrifice becomes attributed to the shepherd.[178]

The Gospel of John's reinterpretation of the shepherd motif brings a completely different understanding that propels the Christian understanding of the *pasteur* into something, if not altogether different, then at the very least, distinct from the Hebraic understanding. The "Good Shepherd" analogy for Christ provides both a point of continuity with the messianic promises of the prophets, but also acts as a separation point. Christ-as-shepherd goes far beyond the benevolence of the leaders of the early Hebrews. However, the gospel writers set up the Christ-narrative similar to the ancient stories, providing constant points of reference that show the leadership of Jesus is in continuity with the ancient stories.

Not only do the NT writers go to great pains to establish a connection between Jesus and David,[179] the now legendary shepherd-king of the Hebrews, but this connection is made in the context of a journey. Even before Jesus's birth, a journey must be undertaken (Luke 2:4–5). After Jesus's birth, even in infancy, there is yet another journey recorded, this one to escape the wrath of Herod (Matt. 2:13–15). Without Jesus ever uttering a word, this theme of itinerancy is perpetuated in the early life of Jesus, strengthening the pastoral undertones of Christ. Even in adulthood Jesus is compelled by the Holy Spirit to wander into the wilderness for 40 days.[180] This event is recorded in each of the Synoptic Gospels. Before the public ministry of Christ begins, the movement motif championed by the HB is

---

[178] Mayes, "The Violence of Care," 115.

[179] Matt. 1:1, 12:23, 15:22, 21:9; Mark 10:48, 12:35; John 7:42.

[180] This is often seen in comparison to the Hebrews wandering in the desert. The 40 days may be representative of the 40 years in the Exodus narrative; see Gregory K. Beale and Donald A. Carson, *Commentary on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 2007), 286.

manifested in the life of Christ. The writers of the Gospels "introduced Jesus of Nazareth as a messianic figure in a variety of ways, but consistently in terms of ancient pastoral prototypes and in dialogue with the interpretive traditions that evolved from them."[181]

The writers of the various Gospels show the teachings of Christ rich in pastoral imagery. Christ uses the metaphor of both shepherd and sheep often in his teachings. From the parable of the lost sheep (Matt. 18:12–14 and Luke 15:3–7) to Christ's declaration of himself as the "Good Shepherd" (John 10:1–16), the metaphor of Jesus as the shepherd and humanity as the sheep is a major theme in the teachings of Jesus. These teachings will be repeated and expounded upon throughout the writings of the NT and will be the foundational principles upon which the early church will build its ecclesiology. This study will now briefly examine the writings of the NT to show the continued use of the Hebraic pastoral themes in the Christian movement. The purpose of this examination is not to show the progression of thought used by the writers of the NT per se, but rather to show the fact that they had varied expression of pastoral leadership. These varied views are then synthesized by later readers who would use them in their variety as a foundation for their leadership.

2.6.1.1 Mark

Each gospel writer uses the shepherd motif in his gospel in strategic ways. Their unique expressions show the richness of the pastoral theme present in the first century C.E. Pastoral themes were so prevalent that each gospel writer was able to express them in a particular manner. In Mark's case, the writer uses the wilderness as a recurring shepherd theme.[182] This is in clear continuity with the already established wilderness theme examined in the HB. Mark uses the term ἔρημος (wilderness or desert) often in his Gospel. Mauser claims that the varied forms Mark uses correlate to the various "strata" of the wilderness tradition.[183] It is not just a simple allusion to the traditions of the past, but a rich and complicated anchoring of the Jesus story with the leadership of God found in the ancient Hebrew

---

[181] Laniak, *Shepherds*, 172.

[182] Ibid., 173–75.

[183] Ulrich W. Mauser, *Christ in the Wilderness: The Wilderness Theme in the Second Gospel and Its Basis in the Biblical Tradition* (Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2009), 104. This view is shared by Watts as well, although he expounds this to include Exod. 23:20, Mal. 3:1, and Isa. 40:3; see Rikki E. Watts, *Isaiah's New Exodus in Mark* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 1997), 24. A different interpretation was presented by Funk, who suggested Mark's use of ἔρημος was in reference to the Sinai or Judean wilderness with which messianic hopes and apocalyptic traditions had been associated; see Robert W. Funk, "The Wilderness," *JBL* 78.3 (1959): 205–14.

writings.[184] Connecting further to the shepherd motif, Mark's author continually uses ἔρημος in chapter 6. It is in this chapter that Mark brings his treatment of the wilderness and the Jesus-as-shepherd theme to its point of convergence. Mark writes: "When Jesus went ashore, He saw a large crowd, and He felt compassion for them because they were like sheep without a shepherd; and He began to teach them many things" (Mark 6:34). While Mark's Gospel ultimately uses the shepherd motif, it is from the context of the wilderness, inexorably linking the ancient shepherd traditions to the spiritual wandering of the people.[185] It is the aimless and helpless spiritual wandering of the people that draws Jesus's compassion. The context points then to Jesus as the answer, the one who is able to recognize the people's helplessness and who is the one in a position to remedy it; he is the spiritual shepherd of his sheep. In the oldest Gospel, it is seen that the motif of the physical wandering of the ancient people is substituted for the spiritual wandering of the now stationary people.

As others begin to add to the gospel narrative with their own version, using the Gospel of Mark as a guide for their compositions, it is not surprising that the shepherd motif arises in each of the later gospels. What is interesting is not the ways in which they are similar, but in the subtleties of their differences.[186] While each of the writers use the shepherd motif, like Mark, the subsequent gospels choose unique ways to interpret the theme of the shepherd. For the modern reader, this is how one can begin to see the depth of the shepherd motif, as each individual takes the words of Jesus and interprets them with variety. This prevalent variety is again a testament to the richness of the shepherd imagery for the Christians of the first century C.E.

2.6.1.2 Matthew

In contrast to Mark's wandering sheep approach, Matthew uses multiple images of the shepherd to allude to Christ. The author of Matthew utilizes shepherd language by referring to Jesus as "the Son of David,"[187] linking him immediately to the shepherd-king of Israel in his very first sentence. Making the connection to one of the most famous shepherds in Israel's history goes far beyond simply

---

[184] Willard M. Swartley, *Mark: The Way for All Nations* (Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 1999), 113.

[185] Andreas J. Köstenberger, "Shepherds and Shepherding in the Gospels," in *Shepherding God's Flock: Biblical Leadership in the New Testament and Beyond*, eds. Benjamin L. Merkle and Thomas R. Schreiner (Grand Rapids, MI: Kregel, 2014), 54–55.

[186] Pheme Perkins, *Introduction to the Synoptic Gospels* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2009).

[187] Matt. 1:1.

establishing a birthright of leadership, but rather signifies the message that will be perpetuated throughout the NT regarding Jesus's leadership of the Jews. This is evidenced clearly in the next chapter when scholars reveal to Herod the birthplace of Jesus as Bethlehem and using the shepherd motif to describe the Messiah's reign.[188] This is at once a clear statement of Jesus's Davidic heritage and his role as shepherd of the Jews.

Matthew goes on to equate Jesus with a compassionate shepherd, a healer, and a judge.[189] To varying degrees, these images are in continuity with the values of benevolence and individualization that Foucault's analysis of the pastorate highlight. The compassion of Christ, which is often the root of his healing ministry, is benevolent. He is looking after the sheep with no selfish motives, but only to do good. As Foucault said of pastoral power: "It's only *raison d'être* is to do good."[190] Matthew's use of compassion echoes Mark's statement in his chapter 6, but Matthew takes this theme much further. Again, in the different treatments on the same theme, the complexities of pastoral power and the understanding of the shepherd are continuously revealed.

2.6.1.3 Luke

Moving to the third Gospel, Luke begins his attenuation to the shepherd motif from yet another perspective. In his narrative of the birth of Christ, Luke includes the story of the announcement of the birth of Christ to the shepherds, something that seems odd in the context of the larger story. Actual shepherds, that is to say those who made a living tending to the flocks of sheep, did not have a great reputation in the Second Temple period. The Jews thought lowly of them due to their lifestyle.[191] They were, after all, often out in the field, with no medium for the ritual purification so important to the Jews of the day. The inclusion of the shepherd story signifies something for the Jesus narrative. Similar to the interpretation of David's shepherding profession as a reason for Samuel's statement that he was a "man after God's own heart" (1 Sam. 13:14), the telling of the shepherds can easily be interpreted as a special blessing for those whose profession pleased God. Even more, the lowly status

---

[188] Matt. 2:6–6.

[189] Laniak, *Shepherds*, 182–94.

[190] Foucault, *Security*, 126.

[191] Joachim Jeremias, *Jerusalem in the Time of Jesus: An Investigation into Economic and Social Conditions during the New Testament Period* (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 1969), 306. Jeremias based his views on the interpretation of the Midrash to Psalm 23:2. This view is shared by William Barclay, *The Gospel of Luke* (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox, 1956), 27.

of the shepherds foreshadows the type of persons to whom Jesus would eventually preach and minister.[192] Even if these foreshadowing interpretations of the shepherds is inaccurate, the shepherds of Luke's nativity can be analogously attributed to the themes already present in the Jewish histories. This is especially probable in the shadow of Matthew's Gospel which goes to great lengths connecting the Jesus tradition with the ancient traditions.

There are other interpretations regarding the shepherds in Bethlehem of which Luke writes. The Bethlehem shepherds were specifically hired by the Temple to raise the lambs for the Passover slaughter.[193] This is a unique foreshadowing of the crucifixion. Luke was a gentile, but he had an impressive command of the Jewish scriptures and often used the ancient stories in veiled references in his own Gospel and in Acts.[194] This is not to say the shepherd story did not function as a foreshadowing. It is not unlike Luke to use devices such as this to draw attention to his overall goal.[195] The foreshadowing of Jesus as the sacrificial lamb, juxtaposed against the later understanding of Jesus as shepherd, skillfully weaves this ironic relationship together to foreshadow what will be the one of the great ironies of Christian pastoral power—its self-sacrifice.

Luke's detailed nativity account uses actual shepherds to tie the Christ-story to the imagery of shepherds found in the other Synoptic Gospels. This second interpretation of Luke's story, that Jesus is being foreshadowed as the sacrificial lamb for all of the people, is a theme that will be explored more completely in the Fourth Gospel. In John, pastoral power will take on more completely the self-sacrificing attribute, Foucault suggests.[196]

The Synoptic Gospels do much to continue the shepherd motif into the discourse regarding Christ. But the focus of this study will now shift to the fourth Gospel, the one attributed to John. This gospel will be given lengthier treatment than its counterparts due to the profound implications of the alterations to the shepherd motif contained within. The Gospel of John uses the shepherd theme most

---

[192] Luke 4:18. Jesus says he was sent to preach the good news to the poor.

[193] Darrell L. Bock, *Luke* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 1996), 213.

[194] Fred B. Craddock, *Luke* (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox, 2009), 7–9.

[195] John J. Kilgallen, "Luke 2,41–50: Foreshadowing of Jesus, Teacher," *Bib* 66.4 (1985): 553–59.

[196] Foucault, *Security*, 128.

effectively. And while Ignatius never quotes John directly, his writing is clearly influenced by the Fourth Gospel.[197] It is in this Gospel that the high Christology of John propels the shepherd into a new category, and with it, defines the expectation of future *pasteurs* for the church. The pastoral imagery found in the Fourth Gospel is the most pervasive in its continued use, and the "Good Shepherd" discourse creates the most dramatic change in pastoral power for the Christian church.[198]

2.6.1.4 John

Of all the shepherd imagery regarding Christ, the most enduring is that of the "Good Shepherd." The Gospel of John produces the richest pastoral imagery of all the Gospels.[199] This is, again, where Foucault, probably errantly, finds his language regarding the sacrificial nature of the Hebrew shepherd. John's Gospel goes farther than all the others, not only setting Jesus as the Shepherd in connection with the HB, but also arguing for the superiority of Jesus over these ancient heroes.

According to Brown, the Gospel of John can be divided into four parts: the Prologue (1:1–18); Part One: The Book of Signs (1:19–12:50); Part Two: The Book of Glory (13:1–20:31); and, the Epilogue (21:1–25).[200] This division of the book provides a simple outline of the overarching themes present within the text. What this division also reveals, which is beneficial for this study, is the presence of the shepherd motif in each section of the Gospel.

Beginning with the prologue, John alludes to the wilderness journey saying: "And the Word became flesh, and dwelt [ἐσκήνωσεν] among us" (John 1:14). The term σκηνόω carries the sense of not only "dwelling", but to "dwell in a tent", or to "tabernacle". When combined with the Mosaic reference in verse 17, the translation of ἐσκήνωσεν in this passage is clearly that Jesus "made his tabernacle among us." With this in mind, the reception history of this section of John's prologue (John 1:14–18) can be understood as connecting Jesus to the wilderness traditions of the Hebrews, associating Jesus with the very presence and guidance of the God (John 1:14),[201] and declaring the superiority of Jesus over

---

[197] Charles E. Hill, *The Johannine Corpus in the Early Church* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), 421–41.

[198] The "Good Shepherd" discourse is found in John 10.

[199] Laniak, *Shepherds*, 207.

[200] Raymond E. Brown, *The Gospel and Epistles of John: A Concise Commentary* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1988), 15–16.

[201] Herman Ridderbos, *The Gospel of John: A Theological Commentary* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1997), 50.

Moses (John 1:17). Even in these first verses of John, there is a connecting to, but also going beyond, the shepherd traditions of the HB. Unlike the dwelling of Yahweh, which was shrouded in mystery and whose presence carried the visual prohibition exemplified in the words, "for no man can see Me and live" (Exod. 33:20), the *Logos* made his dwelling among humanity and "we saw[202] his glory" (John 1:14).[203] This is made even more apparent when viewing the Book of Signs section of John.

Nowhere is there a clearer indication of the superiority of Jesus-as-shepherd image than in John 6. As Jesus is teaching the people by the Sea of Galilee, the day after the feeding of the 5,000 (John 6:1–14), seeking another sign (or perhaps more food), they ask Jesus for another miracle. This is the exchange written in John's Gospel (John 6:28–36):

> "What then do You do for a sign, so that we may see, and believe You? What work do You perform? Our fathers ate the manna in the wilderness; as it is written, 'He gave them bread out of heaven to eat.'" Jesus then said to them, "Truly, truly, I say to you, it is not Moses who has given you the bread out of heaven, but it is My Father who gives you the true bread out of heaven. For the bread of God is that which comes down out of heaven, and gives life to the world." Then they said to Him, "Lord, always give us this bread." Jesus said to them, "I am the bread of life; he who comes to Me will not hunger, and he who believes in Me will never thirst."

Here the line between Jesus and Moses is clearly defined, and the inexorable connection between Jesus and God the Father solidified.[204] Perhaps the most revolutionary event, from the perspective of pastoral power, is the last public teaching recorded in the Gospel of John. Not only is John 9–10 the end of Jesus's public ministry, but it constitutes the moment of transition from the stories regarding Jesus's ministry to the passion narrative that will follow.[205] As Jesus makes the bold statements

---

[202] The text reads ἐθεασάμεθα, "we beheld."

[203] Ridderbos, *John*, 52.

[204] Thomas G. Weinandy, "The Son's Filial Relationship to the Father: Jesus as the New Moses," *Nova et Vetera* 11.1 (2013): 253–64.

[205] In a similar way to Weinandy, Neyrey suggests there is a focus in John on the connection between Jesus and the Father. However, Neyrey's context is in the Shepherd Discourse of John 10. Neyrey suggests Jesus has a duty to the sheep to be sacrificial, and this is mirrored by the piety of Jesus to his Father; see Jerome H. Neyrey, "The 'Noble Shepherd' in John 10: Cultural and Rhetorical Background," *JBL* 120.2 (2001): 267.

contained in the shepherd discourse (John 10:1–18), he ultimately provides an interpretive lens for the events that will follow in the Book of Glory. Jesus says (John 10:11–18):

> I am the good shepherd; the good shepherd lays down His life for the sheep. He who is a hired hand, and not a shepherd, who is not the owner of the sheep, sees the wolf coming, and leaves the sheep and flees, and the wolf snatches them and scatters them. He flees because he is a hired hand and is not concerned about the sheep. I am the good shepherd, and I know My own and My own know Me, even as the Father knows Me and I know the Father; and I lay down My life for the sheep. I have other sheep, which are not of this fold; I must bring them also, and they will hear My voice; and they will become one flock with one shepherd. For this reason the Father loves Me, because I lay down My life so that I may take it again. No one has taken it away from Me, but I lay it down on My own initiative. I have authority to lay it down, and I have authority to take it up again. This commandment I received from My Father.

The sacrificial theme in Jesus statement goes far beyond alluding to the good shepherds of the ancient shepherd traditions. Those shepherds were certainly out to do good, but as already discussed, they lack the self-sacrificing notion Jesus speaks of in his Good Shepherd discourse. What the above scripture points to is, as Laniak says, "The truly innovative motif in the Gospel shepherd traditions: the shepherd's intention to die for his sheep."[206] Not only does this discourse add the unique aspect of self-sacrifice to the shepherd tradition, it also provides the interpretive lens by which to understand the passion narrative of the following chapters in John.[207]

In John's passion narrative there is the culmination of the themes presented in the first half of the Gospel.[208] While the Gospel writer did not continue the exact shepherd language presented in the

---

[206] Laniak, *Shepherds*, 216.

[207] Ball suggests the shepherd motif in John 10 provides a framework to understanding some of the main themes of the entire Gospel of John. Particularly by stating that Jesus willingly sacrifices his life and has the power to take it back up again, the meaning of the passion narrative is undeniably changed; see David M. Ball, *I Am in John's Gospel: Literary Function, Background and Theological Implications* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1996), 97–100.

[208] Donald Senior, *The Passion of Jesus in the Gospel of John* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1991).

Good Shepherd discourse, the pastoral theme is still present due to the language already supplied in the earlier portions of the Gospel. The same sacrifice attributed to the shepherd in the earlier texts is presented in narrative form through John's passion account. This is why the Good Shepherd discourse functions as both a discourse on the final miracles of Christ's ministry, but as a transitional and interpretive discourse of the events that followed. The Gospel of John goes beyond the changes made to the shepherd motif in terms of Christ. It establishes a new interpretation of the shepherd motif as a model for the disciples and subsequent leaders of the church.

2.6.2 The Good Disciples: From Jesus as Shepherd to the Apostles as Shepherds
There are a number of uses of the pastoral themes that can be found in the rest of the NT canon. As the Christ-narrative shifts to the story of the Christ-followers, the pastoral themes are carried along. Beginning with the epilogue of the Gospel of John, the mantle of shepherd, and the mantle of sacrifice, is handed over to the earliest Christians. The literal following in the footsteps of Christ, even unto death, will increasingly occupy much of early Christian identity.[209]

2.6.2.1 Epilogue of John
Moving to John's epilogue, the pastoral theme re-emerges as a central point in the story. The epilogue or postscript to John is considered to be an additive work.[210] John's Gospel effectively ends at John 20. Chapter 21 adds a story onto what appears to be a finished work. This is odd, even if from a later redactional standpoint. There must have been something important, either to the original Gospel writer, or a later compiler that added chapter 21 to the end of John.[211] One addition found in this portion of scripture that is missing from the other gospels is the call to imitate Christ as a shepherd.

As a parallel to John's use of the Shepherd discourse at end of the public teaching of Jesus, the use of yet more shepherd language is found in John's final recorded conversation between Jesus and his

---

[209] Moss, *Myth*.

[210] Rudolf Bultmann, *The Gospel of John: A Commentary*, trans. G. R. Beasley-Murray, R. W. N. Hoare, and J. K. Riches (Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2014), 700–701.

[211] There is little need for this study to differentiate between a redaction by the original author or a later one. The fact that the epilogue is such a distinct piece of literature illustrates the same point: the content therein is important enough to add into a completed work. The main theme of the Epilogue is the pastoral tradition of Peter's commission and the discussion regarding the manner in which he will die. Thus, the pastoral call and nature of Peter's death constitute a distinctly important detail for the redactor; see William Barclay, *The Gospel of John, Volume Two* (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox, 2001), 326.

disciples.[212] The conversation between Jesus and Peter in this passage takes the sacrificial shepherd theme used earlier and applies it to the disciples of Jesus.[213] The exchange between Peter and Jesus is recorded thus (John 21:15–18):

> So when they had finished breakfast, Jesus said to Simon Peter, "Simon, son of John, do you love Me more than these?" He said to Him, "Yes, Lord; You know that I love You." He said to him, "Tend My lambs." He said to him again a second time, "Simon, son of John, do you love Me?" He said to Him, "Yes, Lord; You know that I love You." He said to him, "Shepherd My sheep." He said to him the third time, "Simon, son of John, do you love Me?" Peter was grieved because He said to him the third time, "Do you love Me?" And he said to Him, "Lord, You know all things; You know that I love You." Jesus said to him, "Tend My sheep."

Jesus essentially asks Peter to be the shepherd of Jesus's flock, a revolutionary idea, to be sure. Peter was going to, in many ways, take the place of Jesus for a time.[214] This substitutionary scheme is found extensively in the thought of Ignatius.[215] This is perhaps the second revolutionary change to the shepherd motif found in the Fourth Gospel. More so than spreading the gospel, here is a different commission, one that commits the apostles to more than just the preaching of the word, but to the care of the community.[216] Put another way, the apostles, at least some of them, will not only be evangelists, but also shepherds.

Unlike the final commissions found in the conclusions of the Synoptic Gospels, whose messages

---

[212] John 21:15–17.

[213] According to Bruce, this is the moment when the "evangelist's hook" is partnered with the "pastor's crook." This is the moment that affirms not only the call to make disciples and evangelize but also to care for, tend to, and watch over those who become believers; see Frederick F. Bruce, *The Gospel of John: Introduction, Exposition* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1994), 405.

[214] Little uses the comparison of the Greek language for shepherd found throughout John's Gospel to show the significant connection between the work of Jesus and the commission of Peter found in the epilogue; see Edmund Little, "Peter and the Beloved Disciple: Unfinished Business in John 21," *Stimulus: The New Zealand Journal of Christian Thought and Practice* 18.4 (2010): 36–43.

[215] Ign. *Magn.* 2, 13.2; Ign. *Trall.* 2.1–3, 3:1–2; Ign. *Smyrn.* 8.1–2.

[216] Bultmann, *John*, 713.

consist primarily of witnessing, the Fourth Gospel makes bold and specific statements, at least to Peter, of a different task to be undertaken—the emulation and perpetuation of the care and sacrifice of Jesus.[217] The sacrificial shepherd becomes the model by which the apostles will conduct their lives, and will eventually find their demise.[218] With the added Epilogue, the Gospel of John transfers the shepherd motif from the person of Jesus to his followers, ensuring a new understanding of care, leadership, and even martyrdom in service of following Christ.

In these final verses of John's Gospel, the mantle of shepherd is passed from Christ to Peter (and by extension all of those who would follow). It is not unreasonable to imagine a very different leadership paradigm in the early church were it not for these verses at the end of John. The other traditional commissions, as already noted, focus on evangelism.[219] No one can say if many of the disciples would have been so willingly martyred for their cause without these verses, but the ramifications of these words certainly caused martyrdom to have a special place among the early Christians, particularly in the second century.[220]

2.6.2.2 Acts

One of the difficulties of piecing together a narrative of the transmission of the pastoral themes found in the Gospels through the disciples of Jesus and into the second century is the fact that, although Acts' narrative about the apostles occurs chronologically later, it was written before John's Gospel, whose pastoral themes are so robust. The fundamental struggle then is to try and differentiate between what ideas spring from the narrative itself, versus what are presented by the author. However, the concern here is not which came first, but what is contained within these writings that would have been available to early church leaders. What proceeds is a discussion of Acts from the chronological view that the events contained within Acts happened after the events found in John. While the chronology of the writing has bearing on its themes, it is the belief of this study that the actions of the players within the narrative is of greater importance in showing the transmission and alteration of the shepherd motif. Since Ignatius most likely had access to both, his synthesis of the information requires no

---

[217] Richard Bauckham and Carl Mosser, *The Gospel of John and Christian Theology* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2008), 130.

[218] John 21:18–19.

[219] Bultmann, *John*, 713.

[220] Perkins, *Suffering Self*, 104.

concrete timeline.

It is possible to interpret all of the martyr stories in the book of Acts through the Johannine lens of sacrificial-shepherd, if one assumes that the disciples themselves were either present for the episode recorded in John's Epilogue, or perhaps more likely, the episode was shared among the disciples. The case for viewing the events of Acts through a similar lens as the Johannine understanding of sacrifice lay not in Acts's reliance on John as source material, but that they were both written from material that had a common source: the teaching of Jesus. The actions of the disciples themselves contained within Acts show an understanding of Christ-imitation that is echoed the teaching in John's Epilogue. For example: the first martyr, Stephen, echoes the words of Christ when he says first: "Lord Jesus, receive my spirit!" (Acts 7:59),[221] and then: "Lord, do not hold this sin against them!" (Acts 7:60).[222] Making claims here that Stephen understands he is perpetuating the sacrifice of Christ is not stretching reality. The use of similar language is understandable due to authorship.[223] The immediate connection between Jesus's words and those of Stephen is evident. The fact that this is the account of the first martyr of the Christian faith lends even more weight to the similarities. It is entirely plausible that by understanding the martyrdom of Stephen in connection with the death of Christ on the cross, the mold is set for those that will follow. If Moss is correct in suggesting that it is not possible to distinguish a precise moment when "not-martyrdom becomes martyrdom,"[224] then perhaps the martyrdom of Stephen is the beginning of the movement toward Christian understanding of martyrdom.[225] Certainly these connections between Jesus as the Good Shepherd who sacrifices himself for the sheep, and the martyrdom of believers in the first century of the common era will synthesize themselves into an ideology of martyrdom that will find its continued expression into the second and third centuries, where they will be championed, particularly, by Ignatius.

---

[221] Luke 23:34

[222] Luke 23:46

[223] This study is content to use the traditional attribution of Luke as the author of Acts. Like much of the New Testament canon, this is disputed. However, there is enough evidence to suggest this is a probability; see, I. Howard Marshall, *The Acts of the Apostles: An Introduction and Commentary* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1980), 44–46.

[224] Candida Moss, *Ancient Christian Martyrdom: Diverse Practices, Theologies, and Traditions* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2012), 2.

[225] Ibid.

Admittedly, the shepherd motif is not expressly present throughout the entirety of Acts. What can be found in terms of direct language does a great deal to advance the role of pastoral power for the early church. Acts 20:17–38 records Paul's farewell address to the Ephesian church. While doing so, the shepherd-flock motif once again surfaces.[226] Here there is a new group of shepherds that arise from the leadership of the Ephesian church—the bishops. Up until this point, again assuming the chronological order of the narrative, not the date of authorship or the ideas presented by the author, one could only infer the probability that Peter was not the last of whom God would ask to act as shepherd for the church. In acts, Paul makes a clear case for a new generation to continue the pastoral tradition. Paul, addressing the leadership of the church says (Acts 20:28): "among which the Holy Spirit has made you overseers, to shepherd the church of God."[227]

Paul's farewell address is useful for this study for multiple reasons. First, there is the perpetuation of shepherd motif by his use of the word ποιμαίνειν (to shepherd). As already noted, there was not, as far as is known, a directive from Jesus regarding the shepherding of the flock outside of Peter. And the church was not entirely prepared for leadership beyond the activity of the apostles.[228] The discourse here by Paul regarding a new group of shepherds help drive the formation of church leadership into the latter parts of the first century and into the next. By using the shepherd theme, Paul endows the leaders of the Ephesian church with pastoral authority. Later Christians understood this type of leadership to emulate that of Christ himself, the Good Shepherd. This understanding of passing the apostolic charge on to a group of successors will be vital in the following decades as the apostles begin to die, either by martyrdom or old age. But Paul's statement will also have profound impacts due to other language used in Acts 20:28.

Paul refers here to the leaders as ἐπισκόπους (bishops or overseers) in conjunction with his pastoral reference ("watch over the flock" and "to shepherd the church of God"). It is not that Paul was, at such an early date, advocating the leadership of a single bishop.[229] The language here makes it clear

---

[226] Acts 20:28–30.

[227] In Greek: "ἐν ᾧ ὑμᾶς τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ἔθετο ἐπισκόπους, ποιμαίνειν τὴν ἐκκλησίαν τοῦ θεοῦ."

[228] Roger E. Olson, *The Story of Christian Theology: Twenty Centuries of Tradition & Reform* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 1999), 25.

[229] The consensus view of New Testament church history holds that the earliest churches "had no offices and ecclesiastical organization." See Benjamin L. Merkle, "Ecclesiology in the Pastoral Epistles," in *Entrusted with the Gospel: Paul's Theology in the Pastoral Epistles*, eds. Andreas J. Köstenberger and Terry L. Wilder (Nashville, TN: B&H Academic, 2010), 173–98. Merkle contends, however, that all of the Pauline Epistles contain elements of a more structured church

there is no single bishop, but a number of overseers. What this language does for the study of pastoral power is to inexorably link the office of bishop, which will be established and solidified later, with the function and authority of the shepherd. As the bishops will begin to consolidate power, their self-awareness will be rooted in these scriptures. Clearly there is a link here between the actions of Jesus, his charge to the disciples, and in turn their charge to the next group in succession. In this passage it becomes clear that anyone understanding the office of bishop will have to view it as a form of pastoral power. When later bishops, such as Ignatius, use the title, they understand their role to be that of Christ's, ultimately acknowledging the possibility of martyrdom.

2.6.2.3 Pauline and Deutero-Pauline Epistles

Curiously absent in the Pauline Epistles are references to the pastorate in any of its forms.[230] In Ephesians 4:11 Paul is reported to have written: "And He gave some as apostles, and some as prophets, and some as evangelists, and some as pastors and teachers."[231] Ephesians, however, is considered by many to be pseudepigraphic (or Deutero-Pauline). Pseudo-Paul's use of ποιμένας (shepherds) therefore may not fully constitute a commitment to the pastoral traditions found elsewhere in the NT. This does not altogether disqualify Pseudo-Paul from the understanding of pastoral care. It is possible that the writer is self-fashioning as an ἀπόστολος that accounts for his lack of pastoral references. It is also helpful to remember here that Paul was not the typical ἀπόστολος since he did not spend time with Christ. Paul's apostolic claim rested solely in his conversion experience on the road to Damascus.

Further, the biography of Paul is often skewed by the lack of information regarding the time immediately following his conversion. While it is most certainly true that Paul's faith, missionary prowess, and theological sophistication on the matter of Christ were, as Wilson states, a "maturing

---

organization. In a similar vein, Bourke notes that it may be highly plausible that Paul's earlier language found in 1 Corinthians of the spiritual *charism* of church administration (κυβέρνησις; 12:28) can be equated with the language used in Philippians 1:1 (ἐπίσκοποι); see, Miles M. Bourke, "Reflections on Church Order in the New Testament," *CBQ* 30.4 (1968): 493–511. While Wilder argues that despite an increase in ecclesiastical organization within the Pauline Epistles over time, it does "not reflect the monarchial church government that began to develop in the second century"; see Terry L. Wilder, "Pseudonymity, the New Testament, and the Pastoral Epistles," in *Entrusted with the Gospel: The Theology of Paul in the Pastoral Epistles*, eds. Andreas J. Köstenberger and Terry L. Wilder (Nashville, TN: B&H Academic, 2010), 35.

[230] Mika Ojakangas, *On the Greek Origins of Biopolitics: A Reinterpretation of the History of Biopower* (New York: Routledge, 2016), 84.

[231] In Greek: "καὶ αὐτὸς ἔδωκεν τοὺς μὲν ἀποστόλους, τοὺς δὲ προφήτας, τοὺς δὲ εὐαγγελιστάς, τοὺς δὲ ποιμένας καὶ διδασκάλους."

process,"[232] it is only after his time in Antioch that Paul begins his most earnest and effective missionary work. The situation in Antioch with regards to Paul does not go exceedingly well.[233] Although this is the realm of conjecture, it is not unreasonable to assume that such an experience as his time in Antioch would place Paul's self-understanding firmly as an evangelizer as opposed to a pastor. His identity as one who continues to venture into new areas of theology in light of Christ may have, in his mind, precluded him as an effective pastor or shepherd. This also aligns fairly well with the modern understanding of Paul as a singular innovator of the Christian faith.[234] Paul's message of Jesus was one that was less concerned with leading people and more concerned with changing people. Christ was, as Campbell writes, "the inaugurator of a new creation."[235] It could simply be that Paul saw little need for instruction regarding the shepherd motif in his own correspondence, as his focus was on something entirely new and mostly concerned with soteriological concepts.

It may be folly to read too heavily into Paul's lack of pastoral language. Paul's understanding of the teachings of Jesus were not based on the written Gospel accounts, but in studying with the disciples. Paul's letters, written before the Gospels in some cases, and before their wide circulation in most, may omit pastoral language because of this fact. Also, this logic ignores the contributions of Paul to the general understanding of a sacrificial shepherd for the early second century church. One of Paul's central messages is the identity of believers in Christ. Plummer notes: "It is due to this fact—the fundamental Christological grounding of Christian suffering—that Paul frequently refers to his or other believers' suffering in direct relation to Christ's suffering."[236] While the shepherd motif is not necessarily present, ideology regarding the suffering for the Christian is. Paul writes (2 Cor. 4:9–10):

> We are afflicted in every way, but not crushed; perplexed, but not despairing; persecuted, but not forsaken; struck down, but not destroyed; always carrying about in the body the dying of Jesus, so that the life of Jesus also may be manifested in our body.

---

[232] Mark W. Wilson, "Cilicia: The First Christian Churches in Anatolia," *TynBul* 54.1 (2003): 15–30.

[233] Dunn, "The Incident," 3–57.

[234] Campbell, *Paul*, 54.

[235] Ibid.

[236] Robert L. Plummer, *Paul's Understanding of the Church's Mission: Did the Apostle Paul Expect the Early Christian Communities to Evangelize?* (Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2006), 124.

This is but one reference to the multiple times Paul links the suffering of the Christian with the suffering of Christ.[237] Paul's theological implications for the suffering of the believer provide an understanding of Christian persecution and martyrdom for the later reader as a reflection of Christ as the Good Shepherd. If Christ was the Good Shepherd and his crucifixion was his "laying down his life for the sheep," and this sacrifice is echoed in the persecution of the believer, then the believer's persecution, suffering, and martyrdom become, to the later readers who possessed both Paul's and John's writing, intrinsically linked to the Good Shepherd motif.

2.6.2.4 First Peter

First Peter spends a great deal of time dealing with the suffering of the believer for the sake of following Christ. Although highly unlikely to have written the letter himself, the probability of pseudonymous authorship by a member, or members, of a Petrine community in Rome still provide the letter with an appropriate amount of *gravitas* in the early church.[238] It is clear by the possible citation in 1 Clement, and the probable citation in Polycarp's Epistle to the Philippians, that the letter was considered authoritative, even in early circulation.[239]

What 1 Peter does is present the Christian duty as one that will emulate the sacrifice of Christ.[240] The theme of suffering is understandable as tradition holds Peter as awaiting his own execution in Rome when writing 1 Peter.[241] But it also helps solidify the concept of Christ as the "shepherd and guardian of your souls" (1 Pet. 2:25). Once more this helps the understanding the role of shepherd in a relatively stagnant society, as opposed to the ancient nomadic one from which the motif sprang. The very fact

---

[237] Rom. 8:17; 2 Cor. 1:5; 2:14–15; 4:10; Gal. 6:12; Phil. 3:10.

[238] The general consensus is that the epistle was written recently after the martyrdom of Peter, whose death is reported to be in the mid-sixties under the persecution of Nero. There is evidence of post-temple language and other clues that suggest a posthumous publication for 1 Peter. However, the inclusion in some of the Apostolic Fathers' writings suggest the letter's circulation to be contained at the very least in the first century. For more see, Donald Senior, "1 Peter." *Sacra Pagina: 1 Peter, Jude and 2 Peter*, ed. Daniel J. Harrington (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2008), 4–7.

[239] Senior, "1 Peter," 7.

[240] John N. D. Kelly, *Epistles of Peter and Jude* (London: A&C Black, 1969), 5.

[241] Understandably, this study sees parallels between the suffering in 1 Peter with that of the suffering Good Shepherd. Another interpretation lays in the suffering slave, a motif that links Christs identity to that of a suffering slave, which then begets Christian identity. The two interpretations, even in their diversity, show the prevalence of the suffering theme in 1 Peter; see Chris L. de Wet, "The Discourse of the Suffering Slave in 1 Peter," *Ekklesiastikos Pharos* 95 (2013): 15–24.

that 1 Peter was written to various communities, to be circulated among them, points significantly to the stationary nature of both the author and the recipients. Grudem calls these locations "the major centers of Christian influence in Asia Minor."[242] There were established groups of Christians in locations in which a letter could be addressed, not a wandering nomadic group. Therefore, the shepherd motif, with its deeply rooted traditions on movement, is clearly understood in this ever-increasing internal analogy.

But it was Peter's statements regarding the suffering of the believers that furthers the understanding of martyrdom in the early church, which reads (1 Pet. 4:12–16):

> Beloved, do not be surprised at the fiery ordeal among you, which comes upon you for your testing, as though some strange thing were happening to you; but to the degree that you share the sufferings of Christ, keep on rejoicing, so that also at the revelation of His glory you may rejoice with exultation. If you are reviled for the name of Christ, you are blessed, because the Spirit of glory and of God rests on you. Make sure that none of you suffers as a murderer, or thief, or evildoer, or a troublesome meddler; but if anyone suffers as a Christian, he is not to be ashamed, but is to glorify God in this name.

The understanding of martyrdom at the end of the first century was beginning to become presumed, at least in the writings of the early church. As such, it is only natural that its leaders develop a discourse on suffering and martyrdom, even for their own lives.[243] This process will be developed further as the church gains access to all the writings that will eventually be canonized. Even as canonization was centuries away, the proliferation of these early letters along with the gospels begins to craft within Christianity the discourse that, just as Christ was sacrificed for people, so would those leaders

---

[242] Wayne A. Grudem, *The First Epistle of Peter: An Introduction and Commentary* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1988), 37–38.

[243] Even the martyrdoms of Peter and Paul found in the Apocryphal Acts of the Apostles constitute a tradition of suffering leadership. While the redaction of the Apocryphal Acts is a possibility, a historical core is still presumed. Therefore, the understanding of Christianity at the end of the first century, in light of the persecution recorded in the Apocryphal Acts shows that being a Christian was often equated with being persecuted. Even if these were a work of pure fiction, something few are willing to suggest, the stories speak to the mindset of the early church. Therefore, the martyrdom stories of both Peter and Paul function, at the very least, as a glimpse into the value system and power traditions of the early church; see, Bryan M. Litfin, *Early Christian Martyr Stories: An Evangelical Introduction with New Translations* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 2014), 29–30; David L. Eastman, *The Ancient Martyrdom Accounts of Peter and Paul* (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2015).

attempting to establish the church in the first centuries C.E. be sacrificed.[244] Again, the focus here is not whether the Christians were persecuted in broad strokes from the Roman government. That investigation will be resumed in a later chapter. The importance here is what the early church believed was the case, and what discourse arose because of it—as this will have as much to do with the ecclesiology of early leaders as actual historical persecution. First Peter shows the belief that persecution and suffering were a distinct reality for the church in the last quarter of the first century, even if only a perceived reality.

There is some consensus that the persecution spoken of in 1 Peter was localized and sporadic.[245] Whether this is accurate or not has very little bearing on the shifting symbolism of pastoral power. First Peter synthesizes the life of Christ and again espouses these ideals for the life of the Christian. In terms of pastoral power, the significance here is the now fully realized pastoral power, as Foucault suggested. Foucault errantly made the assumption that the self-sacrifice attributed to Jesus in the Gospel of John and in this epistle was part of the ancient Hebrew expression. It was not until these later treatments of pastoralism that Foucault's pastor was fully realized[246] First Peter itself may not call leaders to become "suffering shepherds," but the emulation of Christ plays a significant role in later leaders as they synthesize these writings that become authoritative in the church.

2.6.2.5 Revelation

Of all the books on the NT, the Revelation of John focuses heavily on the themes of suffering, martyrdom, and the ironic victory these two negative themes produce in the Christian life. The imagery of Revelation is so rich, and the pastoral themes (mostly in the form of the image of Christ as the Lamb), are so prevalent and numerous,[247] it would be unfitting to attempt to sort through these references here. Of interest to this study is, once again, the addition to the pastoral themes handed to the church in the second century contained within Revelation. If John's Gospel established the transference of the shepherd theme from Christ to the Apostles,[248] Acts transfers it from the Apostles

---

[244] Moss, *Ancient Christian Martyrdom*, 13.

[245] Travis B. Williams, *Persecution in 1 Peter: Differentiating and Contextualizing Early Christian Suffering* (Leiden: Brill, 2012), 3–4.

[246] Foucault, *Security*, 124–29. Also see Mayes, "The Violence of Care," 115.

[247] Laniak, *Shepherds*, 235–36.

[248] John 21:15–17.

to early church leaders,[249] and 1 Peter presumes the suffering of these shepherds as an almost universal occurrence for the church,[250] the addition in Revelation is the victory that ultimately comes from the suffering.[251] Again, this is not necessarily the historical progression, but the logical synthesis of the NT writings possibly available to Ignatius.

The martyrdom tradition therefore finds in Revelation one more progression. Witherington writes, "Though we have not yet arrived at the equation *martus* = martyr in Revelation… all the texts in Revelation imply martyrdom or death as the context. The term 'faithful' along with the term 'witness' means faithful unto death."[252] But there is more to it than death. The imagery of Revelation points to victory, even for the sacrificial lamb (Rev. 4:14–17):

> These are the ones who come out of the great tribulation, and they have washed their robes and made them white in the blood of the Lamb. For this reason, they are before the throne of God; and they serve Him day and night in His temple; and He who sits on the throne will spread His tabernacle over them. They will hunger no longer, nor thirst anymore; nor will the sun beat down on them, nor any heat; for the Lamb in the center of the throne will be their shepherd, and will guide them to springs of the water of life; and God will wipe every tear from their eyes.

It is in this passage that Christ-as-shepherd and Christ-as-lamb converge. While John's Gospel went to great lengths to show the sacrifice of Christ, it is in John's Revelation that the pastoral imagery comes full circle. The sacrifice of the shepherd makes him a lamb. However, paradoxically the lamb will become the shepherd. It is the sacrifice that creates the shepherd, while at the same time making him the lamb. Foucault believed that "the essential objective of pastoral power is the salvation (*salut*) of the flock."[253] Thus by becoming the very sacrifice that provides salvation (the lamb), the shepherds

---

[249] Acts 20:28–30.

[250] 1 Pet. 4:12–16.

[251] Laniak, *Shepherds*, 241–43.

[252] Ben Witherington, *Revelation* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 67.

[253] Foucault, *Security*, 172.

power is actually complete. While it may be going too far to say that a shepherd always must become a lamb in order to actually be a shepherd, he ultimately often has to within the course of his life, to fulfill the purpose of protection of the flock. At least this is the understanding among the ancient Christians.

Both for the sacrificial Lamb, whose blood washes the robes, and for those who have been washed, there is victory after the tribulation, after the suffering, and after martyrdom. Aune suggests that victory for the 144,000 mentioned above is only possible by defeat and death, which is the consequence of following Christ.[254] But it is precisely those who "follow the Lamb wherever He goes" (Rev. 14:4) who are given victory. Aune calls this "the paradoxical meaning of victory."[255]

From Revelation, the understanding of martyrdom is given an eschatological hope, one of victory instead of defeat. In light of the presumed oppressor, Rome, this is welcome news to the early Christians. As the turn of the century approaches and then passes, the understanding of the shepherd motif, of pastoral power, is in many ways completely changed. From the Hebraic traditions associated with patriarchs, rulers, and kings, to the sacrifice of Christ and the martyrdom of apostles, pastoral power is transformed. The New Testament bears witness to a shift from a beneficent form of leadership to a self-sacrificing one. This is a pastoral power that has its greatest claim to power not in its exertion *over* the individual, but in its sacrificing *for* the individual.

2.6.3 The Apostolic Fathers

The above progression of pastoral themes, both in the HB and NT writings, can be seen in synthesis within the work of Ignatius. Ignatius will be studied in detail in the following chapters, but for the current discussion, it is useful to note the Apostolic Fathers', and particularly Ignatius's, continued use of the shepherd motif. By acknowledging the pastoral tradition in the Apostolic Fathers, it can be shown that the leadership traditions of the HB, along with the Christian additions and transformations, form the basis of Christian power in the second century. Throughout the writings of the Apostolic Fathers, one can see the perpetuation of shepherd traditions. The most circulated of these writings was *The Shepherd of Hermas*, which was copied and circulated more than any other non-canonical writing

---

[254] David E. Aune, "Following the Lamb: Discipleship in the Apocalypse," in *Patterns of Discipleship in the New Testament*, ed. Richard N. Longenecker (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1996), 269–84.

[255] Ibid., 278.

in the second and third centuries.[256] *The Shepherd* uses the pastoral theme in the form of an angel, a "mediator and protector", who takes the form of a shepherd.[257] At the very least, the title of Hermas's writing continues the awareness of the pastoral traditions out of which Christianity sprung.

But it is Ignatius who wields the pastoral theme more fervently in his writings, and, in the process, creates an ecclesiological paradigm out of which, if Foucault is correct, forms the basis of not only church governance down through the ages, but of political governance into the modern era.[258] Ignatius presents the shepherd theme multiple times in his writing. In his Epistle to the Philadelphians he writes: "ὅπου δὲ ὁ ποιμήν ἐστιν, ἐκει ὡς πρόβατα ἀκολουθεῖτε" ("Where the shepherd is, there you should follow as sheep").[259] He writes this with reference to the bishop. Here is evidence enough to declare the pastoral theme present in Ignatius, as he sees the bishop as a shepherd.[260] This is furthered by his declaration of God as shepherd as well. In his epistle to the Romans, Ignatius writes of the church in Antioch that he has recently left, by saying it has "God as its Shepherd" and Jesus will be its bishop.[261] These passages reveal the nature of Ignatius's beliefs regarding the office he holds, and the manner in which he should conduct himself in this office. By acknowledging that God is Shepherd of the church, and doing the same for a bishop in Philadelphia, Ignatius reveals the role he feels the bishop has over the church in his care.

Ignatius was singular in his focus for obedience to the bishop, and he frequently espouses the idea of complete representation of God in the person of the bishop. He writes: "[I] urge you to hasten to do all things in the harmony of God, with the bishop presiding in the place of God (ἐν ὁμονοίᾳ θεοῦ σπουδάζετε πάντα πράσσειν, προκαθεμένου τοῦ ἐπισκόπου εἰς τόπον θεοῦ)."[262] Ignatius believed God to be the invisible bishop, while the ἐπίσκοπος is his earthly visible representative.[263] Ignatius viewed

---

[256] Bart D. Ehrman, *The Apostolic Fathers*, vol. 2 (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2003), 162.

[257] Ibid.

[258] Foucault, *Security*, 123.

[259] Ign. *Phil.* 2.1.

[260] Vall, *Learning Christ*, 345.

[261] Ign. *Rom.* 9.1.

[262] Ign. *Magn.* 6.1.

[263] Vall, *Learning Christ*, 345.

God as a bishop, and viewed the earthly office as "ἐν σαρκὶ ἐπισκόπου."[264] For Ignatius, his role was not to lord over the church under his care, but to lead and care for it, like Christ would, as the visible representation of the invisible God. For Ignatius, this often meant discussing how Christ would lay down his life for the flock.

Ignatius's language of martyrdom in his letters led Frend to write: "His letters display a state of exaltation bordering on mania."[265] Ignatius treatment of martyrdom, particularly noting it as his duty as a disciple of Christ, is most evident in his *Epistle to the Romans*. He writes: "Allow me to be bread for the wild beasts; through them I am able to attain to God."[266] After stating that dying for Christ's sake will allow him to fully attain to God, he goes on to clarify: "Then I will truly be a disciple of Jesus Christ, when the world does not see my body."[267] In stark and fervent language, Ignatius suggests that for him to truly follow Christ he will have to die for his church. The goal for Ignatius is to become a truly sacrificial shepherd, whose life, given in service and care of the flock, will end with a salvific sacrifice. In this connection with the pastoral tradition expressly laid out in the earliest Christians writings, and based on the ancient Hebrew concepts on which they were written, Ignatius fashions for himself, and subsequent church leaders, a paradigm of leadership that will be significant for the early church.

2.7 Conclusion

In conclusion, this chapter's expressed goal was to give an overview of the pastoral traditions, and their development and transformations, which would eventually be available to the early second-century church, particularly examining the main themes suggested by Foucault. The focus was on scriptural traditions given to the early church, limited to what will eventually become the HB and New Testament canon. While this is by no means an exhaustive examination of pastoral leadership in the ancient world, the overview shows the pervasiveness and persistence of the shepherd motif, and its various garbs, through the millennium leading up to the second century C.E.

---

[264] English: "bishop in the flesh"

[265] William H. C. Frend, *Martyrdom and Persecution in the Early Church: A Study of Conflict from the Maccabees to Donatus* (Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2014).

[266] Ign. *Rom.* 4.1.

[267] Ign. *Rom.* 4.2.

From the brief overview above it is clear the scriptures fully integrate the imagery of shepherd. From the beginning of the Hebrew biblical traditions, ideas regarding movement form the foundation of the pastoral scheme. The calling of Abraham and the nomadic lifestyle of the patriarchs of Israel display a clear preference for movement and itinerancy. This is displayed most emphatically by the negative view of the sedentary agrarian and urban lifestyles, and the championing of the wilderness tradition. On numerous occasions the writings in the HB return to the notion of the wilderness as a place where God calls his people, and where the people experience his presence—the wilderness is where the people become a flock. In the earliest stories, or the ones recorded as such, the sedentary stagnation of ancient Israel is treated with suspicion and even recorded as dangerous.

The Exodus narrative shows most completely the dangers of city life. When the Hebrews settle, even under the most favorable conditions, the city life becomes immediately (within the narrative context) a symbol of oppression. Movement, even in the early part of the scriptural tradition is seen as vital to the flourishing of God's people. In the midst of the stagnation, the Hebrews become oppressed, and their faith, while never abolished, is diminished. From this story arises the figure of shepherd as a hero/leader. Though Foucault states that only the relationship between God and his people is defined as that of a shepherd and his flock,[268] the Hebrew stories allude heavily to the early leaders of the Hebrews as shepherds. While not completely theologized into the status of representative of the shepherd-God, the early stories' inclusion (and narrative fashioning) of these shepherds suggests that leadership is most intrinsically linked to the shepherd. One such example from the Exodus story is the shepherd figure, Moses, whose biography includes some years as an actual shepherd.

From the Exodus story, the next leader given prominence in the scriptural tradition is David, who also fits the mold of actual shepherd as leader/king. In the story of the Davidic dynasty, there is yet another cautionary discourse regarding leadership. Before the establishment of the monarchy, a heavenly warning is given regarding an earthly king. David's predecessor, Saul, is chosen as the Hebrews' first king despite this warning—with disastrous results. Then the story focuses on a shepherd boy, who would rise to become Israel's greatest earthly leader. In the David saga, the shepherd-hero-leader is perpetuated, and the connection between shepherd and leader is strengthened. Along with the strengthening of this theme in the Wisdom literature, are the first notions of an inward shift of the movement established in the patriarchal and Mosaic traditions. This shift will be realized in its fullness

---

[268] Foucault, *Security*, 124.

in the stories of Christ.

The fullness of the shepherd motif as we will encounter it in the second century, established as it was in the HB, is not developed in its entirety until the writings regarding Jesus. In the Jesus movement, the teachings of Christ reflect much of the Hebraic language regarding the shepherd. The Christian understanding, however, points not only to the shepherd-God theme of movement (although now an internal movement), or the shepherd-hero/king motif of the most recognized leaders of Israel, but to two new additions to the shepherd motif—the self-sacrificing nature of the shepherd, and the individualization of the shepherd.

In the teachings of Jesus, most notably the Good Shepherd discourse in the Gospel of John, Jesus uses the shepherd-flock language to shift the focus of power from not only leading but also to salvific sacrifice. In doing so, pastoral power lies not only in its attempt to lead people to safety but also to save the soul. This internalization and individualization become the standard by which the early church is measured and changes the goal of pastoral power.

The concern for Israel, as imagined in the earliest writings of the HB, was to be a people who would be safe as the people of God while on earth. For Christians, the goal becomes soteriological and eschatological. The physical becomes less important than the spiritual. A further addition to pastoral power in the teachings of Jesus is a full realization of the individualizing theme presented by Foucault. Unlike Israel, whose stories often revolve around a single hero-shepherd preserving the whole community, the teaching of Jesus and his early disciples becomes one of specific individual salvation. Unlike the shepherd representatives in the HB tradition, Jesus represents a shepherd that is to be emulated. The salvation afforded by the Good Shepherd is for the individual, and the results focus on the changed life.

The emulation of the person of Jesus Christ is perpetuated through the writings attributed to the disciples of Christ and persists into the theology of the second century church, as will be noted. This is specifically seen in the consistent theme of martyrdom, and the affection these early Christians had for it. Nowhere is this seen more fervently than in the writings of Ignatius, who takes the emulation of Christ to seemingly obsessive levels, both in his conception of his duty as ἐπίσκοπος, but also in his preoccupation with martyrdom and sacrifice.

Having established an understanding of the pastoral traditions of the Hebrews and early Christians, this study will now focus on the writings of Ignatius of Antioch, who saw his role as ἐπίσκοπος in close relation to these pastoral themes. The pastoral traditions handed to Ignatius by the generations before him produce a unique leader whose strong advocacy for the monepiscopacy merits examination. Since Ignatius both adheres to the pastoral themes of the past and advances the monepiscopacy that will dominate the church of the future, the possibility that his ecclesiology is rooted in the past but influenced by the situations in which he finds himself will be addressed. Therefore, this study will now focus on Ignatius as *pasteur*, beginning with his response to the divisions in the church near the beginning of the second century.

UNITY AND THE INDIVIDUALIZATION OF "OTHER" CHRISTIANS

3.1 Introduction

Having established the ubiquity of pastoral power handed to the early Christians by their Israelite and Jewish predecessors, this chapter moves to the effects this pastoral power may have had on the early second-century Christian leadership and, particularly, on the ecclesiology of Ignatius of Antioch. According to Foucault, pastoral power is "entirely defined" by its benevolence.[269] The suggestion is that this form of power is first and foremost concerned with salvation, and this salvation is defined as sustenance and good pasture.[270] Ultimately then, pastoral power is concerned with good pasture. From this concern the other intricacies of pastoralism can be extrapolated. These themes, ranging from its benevolence to its individualization, are all in service to the pursuit of good pasture which can further be subcategorized into sustenance and salvation. These two concepts are interrelated, but they also occupy a distinct space for the Christian *pasteur*. For example, the ideas of leadership and movement already established in the ancient Hebraic conception of pastoral power is ultimately in service of the sustenance side of the metaphorical "good pasture." The shepherd leads the sheep to what he believes is the best feeding ground. This may be conceived as a promised land, a land of sustenance that "flows with milk and honey" (Exod. 3:17).

As covered in the previous chapter, the Christian expression of pastoral power has a significant addition to the shepherd motif, namely the sacrifice of the good shepherd for his sheep. This Christian transformation of pastoral power is in service to the salvation of the flock. While salvation is certainly present within the broader and more ancient Hebraic understanding of pastoralism, the focus on salvific work of the pastor is a Christian innovation. If the shepherd cannot navigate the flock safely, his ultimate duty is to sacrifice his safety to protect and save a flock in danger. In this dual responsibility one can see the various themes of Ignatius of Antioch. In the case of being a leader whose goal is to avoid danger, Ignatius's primary teaching is unity. In the case of sacrificing himself for the flock who is already in danger, one finds Ignatius lauding the merits of his martyrdom. This

---

[269] Foucault, *Security*, 172.

[270] Ibid.

chapter focuses on the first portion of this dual responsibility: Ignatius's leadership and his attempts to avoid danger. To begin, Ignatius's commitment to unity within the church will be shown to be his attempt to avoid the dangers posed to the early second century church. Then, his ecclesiological program will be examined, particularly its congruence with the main themes of pastoral power.

3.2 Unity: The Path to Good Pasture

Ignatius invokes the theme of unity (ὁμόνοια) throughout his writings.[271] It is clear in Ignatius's writings that unity is not only a priority, but paramount to his goals for the church. Ignatius writes to Polycarp saying, "Consider unity, for nothing is better."[272] In his treatment of the varied issues to which he speaks, Ignatius frequently does so with the expressed goal of unity.[273] If unity is Ignatius's theme and he writes his letter on his martyrdom journey, effectively making them his last instructions to the churches to which he is writing, then the issue of disunity must have been a pressing one for Ignatius. The problem is, there is almost no description of the type or range of this presumed disunity in the early church in Antioch. The nature of the disunity may provide answers to the reason for Ignatius's martyrdom, and demonstrate his pastoral need to correct this issue.[274] Therefore, it is prudent to attempt to glean from the Antiochene church's brief historical context a plausible theory regarding the conflicts in Antioch.

The church in Antioch is steeped in cultural background befitting the discord assumed in Ignatius's writings. The city provides a unique historical, social, political, and religious milieu that affected the formation of the early Christian communities residing there. Noting the significance of the city for early Christianity, Metzger declares: "With the exception of Jerusalem, Antioch in Syria played a larger part in the life and fortunes of the early Church than any other single city of the Graeco-Roman Empire."[275] The large, established, and reasonably respected Jewish population made a Christian community relatively easy to found. To understand the formation and makeup of the early church, understanding this Jewish community is important.[276]

---

[271] Schoedel, *Ignatius*, 21–22.

[272] Ign. *Pol*. 1.2.

[273] Ign. *Eph*. 2.2; 3.2; 4.1–2; 5.1; 13.1; Ign. *Magn*. 4–6; 13; Ign. *Phld*. 2.2; 3.2; 4; 7.2; 8.1; Ign. *Pol*. 1.2.

[274] Corwin, *Ignatius*, 54.

[275] Bruce M. Metzger, "Antioch-on-the-Orontes," *BA* 11.4 (1948): 69–88.

[276] Carl H. Kraeling, "The Jewish Community at Antioch," *JBL* 51.2 (1932): 130–60.

Antioch was one of largest cities in the world at the turn of the second century. Depending on the source, the population was anywhere from 100,000 to 800,000, although the latter seems improbable.[277] The population density was also impressive by modern standards, as it is estimated that there were 195 people per acre in the city at its peak, a higher population density than any found today.[278] Josephus reported the city to be the third largest city in the Roman Empire behind Rome and Alexandria.[279] Such a mass of people must have included different opinions and customs. With a population density that would assume a rapid transmission of new ideas, Antioch was primed to be a location where discord was inevitable.

Geographically, Antioch was a very strategic city, located at a crossroads of a network of roads that connected the north with the south and east with the west.[280] Such a prime location had an effect on the population. Antioch's location made it perfect for itinerant preachers and prophets to travel to and from. Paul begins his missionary journeys from this accessible city, highlighting again the centrality of its location and its plethora of travel options. It has been suggested that these factors combine in the ancient world to produce a city whose social and cultural transmissivity is uniquely high.[281] It is not simply Antioch's population, however, but its mixture of population, the density of that population, and mobility due to the trade routes that provide the right components for new ideas to perpetuate prolifically. This will understandably affect the factionalism among the Christians in Antioch in the second century.

3.2.1 The Jews in Antioch

---

[277] The number is contested among many scholars. Zetterholm argues for 300,000–400,000. Zetterholm, *Formation,* 28. Downey notes there are many issues surrounding the populations recorded in ancient texts. Downey briefly summarizes the various ancient sources of population data, noting their differences and progression. Glanville Downey, *A History of Antioch in Syria* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1961), 582–83. Regardless, the city was quite large and populous and is universally described as one of the most populous and important cities in the Roman Empire.

[278] Zetterholm, *Formation,* 28. Zetterholm compares the population densities among modern cities such as New York, Chicago, and Calcutta. Andrea U. De Giorgi, *Ancient Antioch* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2016), 179–81.

[279] Josephus, *J.W.* 3.29.

[280] David S. Wallace-Hadrill, *Christian Antioch: A Study of Early Christian Thought in the East* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1982), 1.

[281] Matt Grove, "Population Density, Mobility, and Cultural Transmission," *Journal of Archaeological Science* 74 (2016): 75–84.

Before moving too far into the formation of the church in Antioch, it is helpful to note the social situation of the Jews in the city out of whom these first Christian communities would spring.[282] Josephus writes that the Jews were part of the founding of Antioch, also noting that they enjoyed citizenship and rights equal to those of the Macedonians and Greeks.[283] Josephus continues by suggesting the rights continued until the time of his writing, suggesting the Jews maintained some level of favor in the city until the time of the early Christians. One must note, however, that the claims of Josephus may be an exaggeration. It is wise to acknowledge the compromises necessary to be a full citizen, Roman or Greek, would be too much for many Jews. Ideas such as sacrificing to the local gods were never tolerated among the ancient peoples who considered themselves Jewish. Even in the community in Antioch, however Hellenized, the Jews must have retained at least the basic understandings of being a separate people.[284] Therefore, Josephus's claims must be sobered to an extent. The best one can assume is that the Jews in Antioch were treated fairly and given rights as close to citizenship as possible, with the caveat of some religious and social situations in which the Jewish oddities would interfere with such rights. It is not hard to believe in light of this that they belonged to every social and economic class in the city.[285] Gruen notes well the intricate nature of the Jewish condition in Alexandria, serving as an example of the general attitude of the Diaspora Jews in the Roman Empire. He writes:

> Jews could and did live anywhere in the city, but the majority chose to make their residence in two particular districts that became known as the Jewish quarters. In other words, Jews had access to all parts of Alexandria, mingling freely and (in some cases) living among the Gentiles, but most preferred the company of their co-religionists. Greek and Latin authors refer with some frequency to Jews dwelling in their midst. They were not ghettoized. But, at the same time, their identity was undisguised and their peculiar customs conspicuous. Pagans noticed

---

[282] This is a view shared by Barclay, who believed it is vital to understand the Diaspora communities in order to understand the early Christian ones; see John M. G. Barclay, *Jews in the Mediterranean Diaspora: From Alexander to Trajan (323 BCE–117 CE)* (Berkley: University of California Press, 1996), 15.

[283] Josephus, *Ant.* 12.3.1.

[284] Barclay suggests both Philo and Josephus evidence a distinct Jewish people in Diaspora communities, even while acknowledging the Hellenization of these communities; Barclay, *Jews*, 1–4.

[285] Bernadette J. Brooten, "The Jews of Ancient Antioch," in *Antioch: The Lost Ancient City*, ed. Christine Kondoleon (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press and Worcester Art Museum, 2000), 29–37.

their tendency to keep to themselves. But they did notice them. Numerous comments from a wide range of writers point to Jewish adherence to monotheism, observance of the Sabbath, dietary restrictions, and the practice of circumcision. Attachment to distinctive traditions continued to mark diaspora existence. And Jews did not have to hide them away in subterranean regions.[286]

Metropolitan Jews within the Roman Empire were, like many people groups, accepted and integrated to the level at which they were comfortable. In the case of Judaism, the monotheistic traditions of their faith created a desire to live in relatively close proximity to one another. But this is not to say there was a fully distinct separation, or that any separation was mandated by the state. In fact, in the case of the Antiochene Jews, Josephus notes the Jews enjoyed a high reputation among the city's citizenry. This unusually high place within the Antiochene community is said by Josephus to be the result of Jewish participation in the military campaign of the Seleucid kings.[287] Whatever the reason, the Jewish community in Antioch was a strong and relatively privileged one.[288]

As Antioch constituted the biggest city in Asia Minor in the centuries surrounding the time of Christ, it was one of the only major capital many in Palestine could reasonably hope to see.[289] The Jews who sought power wanted to be there, as well as those who sought wealth. And still some who sought a sheltered life went for the promised rights of citizenship.[290] The situation in Antioch appealed to Jews for a variety of reasons. In summary, the proximity of Antioch to Jerusalem, its size, its prominence within the Roman Empire, and the favorable views on the Jewish people surely effected the size and diversity of the Jewish community.

Various accounts, chief among them that of Josephus, claim that the proliferation of Jews by the time of Christ to be extensive to almost every part of the known world, especially in Syria, and even more

---

[286] Erich S. Gruen, *Diaspora: Jews amidst Greeks and Romans* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2002), 5–6.

[287] Josephus, *Ant.* 12.3.1.

[288] This is not to say the Jews were never singled out or persecuted. Zetterholm suggests that even in Antioch, where toleration and even assimilation occurred, that tolerance could easily be swayed to hatred, particularly by Imperial Edicts and other civic action; see Zetterholm, *Formation*, 116–17.

[289] The other city being Alexandria.

[290] Kraeling, "The Jewish Community." 130–60.

specifically in Antioch due to the size of the city.[291] Harnack suggests the number of Jews in Antioch is "particularly striking."[292] Unfortunately, there has been no discovery of detailed records in Syria, so an exact number is impossible to know. A comparison with Egypt provides a reasonable comparison, and since Egypt kept detailed records of its citizens for taxation purposes, a number for the Jewish population there is easier to estimate. Philo suggests the number of Jews in Egypt amounted to a million men.[293] If this is the case and the Jewish population was greater in Syria than in Egypt, one must assume a very large number for the Jews in Syria topping the one-million-person mark in the least. For Antioch itself, an estimation of at least 45,000 Jews is presented.[294] This number shows the success of the Jews in the area. This aligns with the statements made by Josephus regarding the overall Jewish situation in Antioch. Regardless of the exact number, understanding the success of the Jewish community in Antioch undergirds the success of the Christians there in the first and second centuries. Not only was Christianity a religion sprouted in the roots of Judaism, making Christian conversion relatively simple, but its evangelical message was bound to attract gentile followers as well. Given the relatively privileged nature of the Jewish community in Antioch and their amicable relationship with the gentiles in Antioch, the city was naturally a place of gentile conversion as well. Perhaps in no other city was the message of Christ, rooted in the religion of the Jews, more poised for instant and vast success both to the Jews and gentiles.

Another distinction of note is the theological nature of Diaspora communities in antiquity. Prior to 70 C.E., the spiritual and cultural epicenter of Judaism lay in Jerusalem where the Sadducees directed the state in near theocratic form. The communities of the Diaspora, however, were influenced by varied cultural and religious ideas surrounding them. For a city such as Antioch, whose population was vast and whose foundation was multicultural at its very founding, a milieu of Hellenized and ancient traditions would inevitably find its way into the ideas of the Jewish community in Antioch. These metropolitan Jews, like many Diaspora communities, were often exempt from the regulations

---

[291] Josephus, *J.W.* 7.43.

[292] Adolf von Harnack, *Mission and Expansion of Christianity in the First Three Centuries* (New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1962), 7.

[286] Philo, *Flacc.* 6.43.

[294] Kraeling, "The Jewish Community," 130–60, suggests a population density of around 12 percent based on the Jewish population density in Alexandria. He also notes the 12 percent figure of 45,000 Jews in Antioch may be low considering the favorable conditions the Jews reportedly enjoyed in Antioch compared to those in Alexandria.

of Pharisaical Judaism found in Jerusalem.[295] Antioch was far enough away from Jerusalem that it operated somewhat autonomously. The Jews in Antioch were, after all, not under the constant control of the Sanhedrin. The cultural influence on them from non-Jewish neighbors was much higher than that of their Palestinian counterparts. However, it is too simplistic to suggest the Jews of the Diaspora in the Greco-Roman period were either fully gentile-integrated apostates or cloistered communities living a fully Judean lifestyle.[296] Jews in the Roman Empire were often settled together, but rarely forcibly or exclusively so.[297] The expression of faith among these Jews was varied. Since this was the case, it is logical the first Christians had a similar experience. Although reasonably close, geographically speaking, to the earliest church leaders, the church in Antioch would, as any Diaspora community, have more imperial and Hellenistic influences on their beliefs and lifestyles.

In such an urban and diverse city as Antioch, new ideas were readily accepted.[298] Thus a new Jewish sect with a distinctly evangelistic and inclusive message of salvation would have been reasonably tolerated. There is no way to know if there was any tension between the earliest Christians and Jews, except what we know regarding Gentile and Jewish Christians recorded in New Testament.[299] From this account, the founding of the church in Antioch was not met with much resistance, again keeping with what one expects in light of the accounts of the city by Josephus and Philo. Antioch appears to be regarded as a relatively tolerant city, where the early church thrived. This is certainly not a universal view since many Christian documents hint of tension between the Jewish and Christian communities. But as Robinson notes, this is true of all early Christian documents.[300] Aside from Jewish persecution

---

[295] Downey notes the level of acceptance the Antiochene Jews had of gentiles and vice versa. Such acceptance is in stark contrast to the rigid adherence to the law, a hallmark of the Jews in Jerusalem; see Downey, *A History*, 272.

[296] Gruen, *Diaspora*, 5–7.

[297] Ibid., 3.

[298] Corwin approaches the same subject from the perspective of diverse cultural background. The diversity of the cosmopolitan populace in Antioch produced a people who are vastly different from one another in their thoughts and actions. The result is a turbulent citizenry; see Corwin, *Ignatius*, 47.

[299] The accounts of the church in Antioch are sporadic. From Luke's account in Acts 11:19–26, Antioch was a place where the early Jesus movement began to convert gentiles to their cause. And the general discussion of the church in Antioch continues through Acts 14 and was very positive, describing a place where ministry to both Jews and gentiles flourished. There is, of course, the incident recorded in Acts 15 that hints of conflict even early in Antioch's Christian history. This event is recorded with more intensity in Paul's letter to Galatians (see Gal. 2:11–14).

[300] Robinson suggests the timbre of early Christian writings to be highly imbibed with conflict, ensuring an entrenched mentality that helped bind them together as a people; Robinson, *Ignatius*, 21.

of Christians in Palestine, there is nothing recorded indicating a widespread enmity between the groups in the Diaspora.

3.2.2 Early Antiochene Christians

Acts 11:19–20 provides the only extant biblical attestation to the founding of the church in Antioch. Luke writes:

> So then those who were scattered because of the persecution that occurred in connection with Stephen made their way to Phoenicia and Cyprus and Antioch, speaking the word to no one except to Jews alone. But there were some of them, men of Cyprus and Cyrene, who came to Antioch and began speaking to the Greeks also, preaching the Lord Jesus.

This record shows very little tension between the Jews and gentiles in Antioch. The freedom displayed among these early Christians in Antioch and Cyrene would have an interesting consequence for the early church. The Jewish Christians in Antioch were acting vastly different from the Judaism from which they sprang, abandoning some of the laws defining their very identity as Jews. This is particularly true regarding the interaction between Jewish Christians and gentile Christians. The ramifications of this interaction, which in the eyes of the Jews was against the law, would be not only conflict among different ideologies within Christianity, but theological ramifications that changed the course of Christianity. Soon after church's founding, the "Incident in Antioch" occurs, angering Paul and sparking his second and third missionary endeavors.[301]

Paul's pointed account of the incident in Galatians 2 suggests that this was a constant point of contention of his with Peter and the Jewish Christians. After all, he writes of it with some biting rhetoric years later in this letter to the Galatians.[302] What this early conflict highlights for this study is that the tension for the early church in Antioch was not only from outside forces, but from inside

---

[301] Dunn suggests that Paul's so-called "Second and Third Missionary Journeys" should be reclassified, since they, unlike his first which had its origin and termination in Antioch, were simply moving from place to place with no real place of origin. These subsequent itinerant endeavors are classified by Dunn as independent, both of an origin city church and Jewish Christianity. The incident becomes a "watershed" moment in which the course of Paul's life, and Christianity in general, would be distinctly altered; see, Dunn, "The Incident," 38–39.

[302] Paul writes that Peter "stood condemned," (Gal. 2:11), was acting in hypocrisy (Gal. 2:13), and was "not straightforward with the truth of the gospel" (Gal. 2:14).

ones as well. Even more, the inflammatory results of this ancient schism lasted for years, evidencing just how strong the theological divide could be. If the results of a simple argument between Paul and Peter could cause such unresolved tension between them, the effects of similar disagreements over theology might be presumed half a century later. A brief account of the "Incident in Antioch" and its relevance for this study will now be undertaken in hopes of showing the heritage of discord among the early Christians in Antioch.

3.2.2.1 The Incident in Antioch: Early Discord

Christianity has, almost from its inception, been a movement of people that actively adds ideas to its institution. As noted, the evangelistic nature of the faith virtually insured that the addition of new believers will move a congregation with novel ideas about the faith. Nowhere is this more evident than with the conversion of the Apostle Paul. From the onset, Paul's ideas regarding soteriology and the message of Christ produce something quite unique among his contemporaries, to the point of alienation.[303] Paul's subtle alienation produced an independent itinerant preacher, whose ideas would eventually dominate much of the early church. His views on salvation for gentiles and grace fundamentally change the expression and transmission of the early Christian faith. The church governance and order that he espouses greatly shaped Christianity in much of the Roman Empire.[304] As such, his views and works illustrate most clearly the inherent movement found in an evangelistic faith, namely that the inclusion of an increasingly large and diverse group of people begets the inclusion of a plethora of diverse ideas.

This diversity is easily seen in Paul's additions to the gospel message, where he struggled to gain legitimacy, but was ultimately accepted.[305] Even the Jerusalem Council proves the inclusive nature of the faith. The account in Acts 15 suggests a leadership whose willingness to include new believers into the faith will actively change it. Paul's success at obtaining the council's concession regarding circumcision and, more importantly salvation, clearly shows that new ideas are a part of even the earliest Christian tradition. In relation to pastoral power, this fluidity of theological expression is, in

---

[303] Eung Chun Park, *Either Jew or Gentile: Paul's Unfolding Theology of Inclusivity* (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox, 2003), 78.

[304] This thesis holds to the general idea that the Pastoral Epistles mention church ecclesiology that is suggestive of a proto-threefold episcopacy.

[305] A great study of Paul's revolutionary ideas in light of the traditions of his day can be found in Campbell, *Paul.*

essence, the movement of the early church. Even within the urban stagnation present within the Roman Empire out of which Christianity sprang, there is a movement of the mind and soul that calls for the pastor to navigate his flock.

The necessity of pastoral leadership in this form of movement is seen in another lesson to be learned from Paul's new ideas and his interactions with church leadership: there are inherent dangers present within the above described movement. This is especially noticeable when new ideas clash with the established beliefs.[306] Nowhere is this more evident than in what has been deemed the "Incident in Antioch."

Within just a few years of its inception, the early church experiences a certain level of infighting and discord. Paul's new ideas, even though agreed upon by the Jerusalem Council, are not easily put into practice for some. The result is a clash between Paul, Peter, and a delegation of leaders sent from Jerusalem by James. Dunn suggests this is an "important watershed" for Paul's theology and his life.[307] Because of this incident, Paul essentially ends his partnership with the Antiochene church, ends his partnership with Barnabas, and leaves to go about his missionary journeys. There is, in this difference of opinion, the split of a church and the loss of fellowship. It shows the power of dissenting ideas. It is quite possibly the blueprint for the type of conflicts that will plague Antioch in the future.

The situation regarding Jesus-believing gentiles in Antioch plays an important role in understanding the developing theological differences within the Antiochene Christian communities.[308] To give context to the uniqueness of the varying communities, a brief overview of the "Incident in Antioch" will be provided.[309] The incident shows a void between those with a desire to incorporate both Jews

---

[306] Park notes the ongoing legacy of the rivalry between Paul's soteriological tradition and the Jamesian Jewish community in Jerusalem, from which the early church began. For his part, Paul attempted to remedy the void. But it nonetheless continued past the death of James; see Park, *Either Jew*, 76–77.

[307] Dunn, "The Incident," 37.

[36] Trevett, *A Study*, 41

[309] This is intended to be very brief. Many scholars have different opinions regarding the nature of the disagreement. Sanders argues the issue is regarding the level of contamination with unclean food that causes James's discomfort; see, Ed P. Sanders, "Jewish Association with Gentiles and Galatians 2:11–14," in *The Conversation Continues: Studies in Paul and John in Honor of J. Louis Martyn*, eds. Robert T. Fortna and Beverly R. Gaventa (Nashville, TN: Abingdon, 1990), 170–88. Dunn believes the issue is over the degree of observance to the Law for Jesus-believing Jews; see Dunn, "The Incident." Esler believed the problem to be in the ramifications of destroying the barrier that separated Jew from gentile. Esler holds that James wanted fellowship only after the Jesus-believing gentiles converted to Judaism; see Philip F. Esler, *Community and Gospel in Luke-Acts: The Social and Political Motivations of Lucan Theology* (Cambridge:

and gentiles in a way that allows for diversity and those who would see more distinction between the two groups of Jesus followers. Though Antioch does not seem to be the originator of the mini-schism, it bears the brunt of its earliest effects. This is seen most keenly in the aftermath of this incident, where the evidence suggests Paul leaves and begins his second career as an itinerant preacher[310] and breaks with the church in Antioch.[311]

While it is going too far to suggest Antioch is, in particular, a place of great discord, the strength of the personalities at play and the uniqueness of their vision for the church may have set the standard for multiple Christian communities within the city. If Paul, for example, gained a significant following of gentile Christians in the city, and his theology was perpetuated alongside a more Jewish approach from the Christians following Peter and James, it is not unreasonable to assume that, almost from its inception, the Antiochene church was, in reality, church communities in the plural.[312]

The only firsthand account of this situation in the primitive church in Antioch is that of Paul himself. Paul writes in Gal. 2:11–22 of the incident. Dunn speaking of the incident notes, "for the first time, probably, he [Paul] had come to see that the principle of 'justification through faith' applied not simply to the acceptance of the gospel in conversion, but also to the whole of the believer's life."[313] If Dunn's statement is accepted, Paul, a learned theologian and interpreter of the Law as a trained Pharisee, directly opposed much of the Jerusalem church's view on the matter of living according to the law

---

Cambridge University Press, 1994). Holmberg believes the issue to be one of self-identity. In Holmberg's view, James's issue was entirely for the Jesus-believing Jews, that they maintain their otherness in the midst of Jesus-believing gentiles. Paul, in contrast, believed that Christian identity should supersede that of Jew or gentile; see Bengt Holmberg, "Jewish versus Christian Identity in the Early Church?" *RB* 105.3 (1998): 397–425. For a more detailed review of the differences between scholars, see Zetterholm, *Formation*, 129–36.

[310]Again, it is helpful to note the difference between Paul's first missionary journey in which he is sent by the Antiochene church and his subsequent journeys, where he is simply continuing on to found new communities of Christians in various cities; see Dunn, "The Incident," 38–39.

[311] James D. G. Dunn, *Jesus, Paul, and the Law: Studies in Mark and Galatians* (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox, 1990), 257–58.

[312] Horrell makes a similar claim, noting this is a distinct possibility. He does, however, note that this is indeterminate based on Paul's writings, as they do not indicate the situation in Antioch past his departure after the incident; see David G. Horrell, "Pauline Church or Early Christian Churches: Unity, Disagreement and the Eucharist," in *Einheit der Kirche im Neuen Testament: Dritte Europäische Orthodox-Westliche Exegetenkonferenz in Sankt Petersburg, 24–31. August 2005*, ed. Anatoly A. Alexeev, Christos Karakolis, Ulrich Luz, with Karl-Wilhelm Niebuhr sl(Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008), 185–206.

[313] Dunn, "The Incident," 36.

(specifically the ceremonial aspect) first here at Antioch. Dunn goes on to note that Paul, in the wake of the incident, branches out as an independent missionary, and develops a Christianity that is quite separate from Jewish Christianity.[314] This is effectively one of the largest early "splits" in Christianity. A new direction for some, while others remained in a distinctly Jewish pattern of belief.

Another theory helps explain some of the heritage of the Antiochene leadership. While discord was a primary concern for Ignatius, the idea of political capitulation for the sake of security is a motif that may be seen in his leadership, or at least in his writing. Noting the incident and Peter's response to the delegation from James, Matak suggests it is not particularly James's theological misgivings that cause Peter to revert to table segregation, but political concerns due to other gentile-Christian and Jewish-Christian relations in Jerusalem.[315] This interpretation is fairly close to an early Christian view of the incident. John Chrysostom spent a sizable section of his homiletic commentary on Galatians reasoning Paul's depiction of the incident. He surmises that Peter's action to revert to segregation in table fellowship was not out of person fear, but of fear that his table fellowship with Gentile believers would cause the defection of the delegation.[316]

If Matak and Chrysostom are correct and Peter makes his decisions based on political concern, it is a striking foreshadowing of Ignatius's call to unity for what will be argued are similar reasons a generation later. Regardless, the incident between Peter and Paul in Antioch denotes a church that is not wholly unified. Even under the watchful eye of the most prominent leader of the early Christians there are those who show opposition. This suggests the church in Antioch, moving into the second century, has a history of discord. By the early part of the second century, this discord may have grown to such a proportion as to draw the attention of the Roman authorities, and therefore endanger its very existence.

From an historical standpoint, this incident would have been monumental in the early Antiochene church. The argument between Antioch's two most prominent Christian residents, and especially

---

[314] Ibid., 37.

[309] Dragutin Matak, "Another Look at the Antioch Incident (Gal 2:11–14)," *Kairos: Evangelical Journal of Theology* 6.1 (2012): 49, 47–59, 56.

[316] John Chrysostom, *NPNF1-13. Saint Chrysostom: Homilies on Galatians, Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians, Thessalonians, Timothy, Titus, and Philemon*, ed. Philip Schaff, Ebook. (CCEL, 1976), NP.

considering the status the early apostles were given, would be constant in the mind of a leader less than a century later. Hengel notes of Peter, Paul, and he includes John, "To them we owe thanks for the apostolic witness that is the foundation for our common faith and the starting point for all ecumenical reflection."[317] The influence of Paul and Peter suggests their behavior sets a precedent for the early church. For better or worse, in this incident in Antioch, the precedent is one of division. They form two distinct visions for Christianity. With time, these visions become nearly a rivalry. This is evidenced clearly in 1 Cor. 1:11–12 where Paul admonishes the congregation for declaring their various allegiances to himself or Peter. Hengel assumes the divisions caused by the incident in Antioch to be both important and negative, with lasting effects that reach beyond just that city.[318]

The ramifications for Paul's life have already been discussed. The fact that Paul left even after his impassioned defense of his soteriological convictions, indicates he was on the losing side of the argument. This leaves Peter, and by extension James, to fashion the church in Antioch, the results of which are profound. As Zetterholm points out, the delegation from James essentially causes Peter to create two separate commensality groups, while Paul believes his solution to be the only way to unity.[319] For Paul, any line of demarcation between the Jews and the gentiles diminishes the power of the gospel. His conviction in this was strong enough to leave Antioch. This incident in Antioch establishes the basis of separation between Jews and gentiles even within Christianity. Eventually, this will become a distinction between Jews and Christians. Christianity will eventually follow the theological teachings of Paul, but the effects of the conflict for the city of Antioch and beyond were already accomplished. It may not be going too far to say that this caused at least two Christian communities with differing ideologies to exist in Antioch, although this distinction is simplifying the

---

[317] Martin Hengel, *Saint Peter: The Underestimated Apostle* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2010), 99.

[318] Ibid., notes.

[319] Zetterholm, *Formation*, 161–62.

nuanced situation too drastically.[320] Regardless, this was an event of immense magnitude in the formation of the early church in Antioch and beyond.[321]

Ignatius was fully aware of the ramifications of the Antioch Incident and its effects on the Christians of his city. After all, these were two pillars of the faith arguing near the very beginning of the church in Antioch.[322] It is easy to conceive this conflict to have been near legendary among the Christians in Antioch. Given the brief history above, acknowledging the vast numbers of Jews and potential Christians within Antioch, and inferring from the opponents Ignatius addresses in his letters, a plurality of churches with distinctly different ideas and theologies must be assumed. This is the heritage of the Antiochene churches and the reality in which Ignatius finds himself bishop.

What the Antioch Incident reveals is not only the existence of plurality within early Christianity, but the speed at which these pluralities can perpetuate, and the level of division they can create, even in the midst of highly respected leadership.[323] Conflict within Christianity is seen, in light of this early encounter, as a normality. These conflicts continue through Ignatius's time even to the present. A byproduct of this is the church's responses to these occurrences. In the case of Ignatius, as will be argued here, the answer is to seek unity within an ecclesiological establishment designed to lead and shepherd the whole church in a given city.

---

[320] The distinction between the two visions of Christianity are said simply by Lee who suggests that Paul is attempting to create a Christianity that is inclusive and unifying while Peter maintains a Christianity that creates a distinction of "us" and "them" within Christianity. While this in itself does not constitute two distinct sects of Christianity, Lee notes the differentiation of the groups will have profound and lasting impacts on the later Christian communities throughout Rome; see Jae Won Lee, *Paul and the Politics of Difference: A Contextual Study of the Jewish-Gentile Difference in Galatians and Romans* (Cambridge: James Clarke & Co., 2015), 164.

[321] Corwin notes that although it is impossible to trace the factiousness from Paul's time in Antioch to Ignatius's, she does note the interesting connection between the two, alluding to the legacy of such divisions within these two early descriptions of the church in Antioch; see Corwin, *Ignatius*, 48.

[322] Ignatius shows his understanding of Paul's legacy in his *Epistle to the Ephesians* (Ign. *Eph*. 12.2). It is telling that not only does Ignatius grasp Pauline theology, but has an understanding of his biography and legacy as well. Smith notes: "Ignatius seems indebted to not only the model of Paul's death but also the apostle's theology of suffering and death." This is, at the very least, indirect evidence that an event as significant as Paul's decision to leave Antioch over a dispute would be very well known to Ignatius, something also presumed by Smith; see Carl B. Smith, "Ministry, Martyrdom, and Other Mysteries: Pauline Influence on Ignatius of Antioch," in *Paul and the Second Century*, ed. Michael F. Bird and Joseph R. Dodson (New York: T&T Clark, 2011), 37–56.

[323] The fact that Paul writes of this in his Epistle to the Galatians is even more telling, as some believe this epistle to be the earliest extant New Testament writing; see Elmer, "Setting the Record Straight," 21–38.

3.2.2.2 Antioch in the Early Second Century

Moving into the second century, the evidence of continued conflict is present. While once again there are no extant sources that are explicit in the recording of such conflict, there are sources where conflict is seen as implicit. These sources are the Gospel of Matthew, the Didache, and Ignatius's letters, although the former is a first-century source. Most notable of these sources is the Gospel of Matthew. Although there is no scholarly consensus as to the location of the Matthean community and the Gospel's origin, many have suggested Syria (and particularly Antioch) as a probable location.[324] Stanton suggests the state of the church in the Matthean community is one of upheaval. This suggests the Christians have recently begun to alienate themselves from the Jews, and the new rapidly expanding churches evidence "shallow faith and dissention."[325] Brent believes the Gospel gives evidence to at least three distinct groups within the Antiochene church: the exclusivists, those who believed Jesus had come to save only the Lost Sheep of the House of Israel, the inclusivists, a Hellenistic group supportive of the gentile mission, and a charismatic group, who seem to be "hovering in the background" and who claim the authority of the Spirit.[326] Brent states these groups argue their points by "selectively remembering acts and sayings of Jesus," producing very different communities because of this.[327] They are, in many ways, diametrically opposed to one another. In the case of the inclusivists and exclusivists, their arguments can be traced back to the aforementioned incident between Paul and Peter. If Brent is correct, Matthew gives the veiled evidence of conflict in the second half of the first century,[328] perhaps even a continuation and escalation of the incident decades earlier.[329]

---

[324] For an overview of the scholarship see Graham Stanton, *A Gospel for a New People: Studies in Matthew* (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox, 1993), 1–22.

[325] Ibid., 2.

[326] Brent, *A Martyr Bishop*, 23–26.

[327] Ibid., 24.

[328] This assumes a late first century composition for Matthew's Gospel. The fact that this is a veiled reference creates a problem for interpretation. It appears to be an argument against antinomianism of some kind, but whether it was someone within the community or without cannot be known. Given the assumed late first-century date for Matthew's Gospel, it could also be that the Matthean community came in contact with a Pauline community that had developed an antinomian theology. This, however, cannot be more than conjecture since there is no further evidence; see Roger Mohrlang, *Matthew and Paul: A Comparison of Ethical Perspectives* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1984).

[329] For this study a date for Matthew is only of casual importance. A majority of scholars suggest Matthew is dated between the 80s and 90s. Nolland argues this is based on the assumption the prophesy suggesting the destruction of the Temple was written after its occurrence. Nolland gives further argument that the Gospel could not have been written after 70; see John Nolland, *The Gospel of Matthew: A Commentary on the Greek Text* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2005), 16.

Like Matthew, the *Didache*, a document whose importance in the early church is evidenced by its near canonization, is believed to originate from the Antiochene community.[330] Within the *Didache* there are also acknowledgements of serious division within the community. The primary evidence for this is the instructional nature of the *Didache* itself. Its instructions on church order and governance appear reactionary, as if directed at a group of "others" or more likely in response to them. Jefford notes there is even stronger indication of serious conflict within the text, conflict strong enough to have eschatological consequences.

Noting the *Didache's* apocalypse, Jefford suggests the antichrist does not come from outside of the community but from within.[331] He writes: "The antichrist does not appear to be Caesar, but to be an embodiment of a division within the community itself."[332] Like the references in Matthew, the *Didache* gives evidence of a community in continued conflict.[333] The severity of the language in the apocalyptic writing within the *Didache* hints at an escalating negative view on a divided community.

These two documents provide an excellent window into the situation in Antioch in Ignatius's day. Jefford even suggests that the Gospel of Matthew, the *Didache*, and Ignatius's ideas originate in Antioch, and they may have interacted with each other contemporaneously.[334] Their combined

---

[330] This is not a consensus. Those in favor of this view include: Halleux, Jefford, Van de Sandt, and Fraper; see André de Halleux, "Ministers in the Didache," in *The Didache in Modern Research*, ed. Jonathan A. Draper (Leiden: Brill, 1996), 300–20; Clayton N. Jefford (ed.), *The Didache in Context: Essays on Its Text, History and Transmission* (Leiden: Brill, 1995); Hubertus Waltherus and Maria van de Sandt, *Matthew and the Didache: Two Documents from the Same Jewish-Christian Milieu?* (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 2005); and Jonathan A. Draper, "Social Ambiguity and the Production of Text: Prophets, Teachers, Bishops, and Deacons and the Development of the Jesus Tradition in the Community of the Didache," in *The Didache in Context: Essays on Its Text, History and Transmission,* ed. Clayton N. Jefford (Leiden: Brill, 1995), 284–312.

[331] Jonathan A. Draper, "Social Ambiguity and the Production of Text: Prophets, Teachers, Bishops and Deacons and the Development of the Jesus Tradition in the Community of the Didache," in *The Didache in Context: Essays on Its Text, History and Transmission*, ed. Clayton N. Jefford (Boston: Brill, n.d.), 284–312.

[332] Ibid., 284.

[333] Slee offers the perspective that the didachist may have been writing to restrict the prophets coming to Antioch from Jerusalem, having suffered through this conflict already in the Antioch incident; see Michelle Slee, *The Church in Antioch in the First Century CE: Communion and Conflict* (New York: Sheffield Academic, 2003), 112.

[334] Jefford also argues that, although the *Didache could* have originated in either Egypt or Palestine as some have suggested, the various points of agreement and similar language with Matthew and Ignatius lend credence to a similar place of origin. Regardless, for this study, the agreements within Matthew, the *Didache*, and Ignatius's epistles are of utmost importance; see Clayton N. Jefford, "The Milieu of Matthew, the Didache, and Ignatius of Antioch: Agreements and Differences," in *Matthew and the Didache: Two Documents from the Same Jewish-Christian Milieu*, ed. Huub Van De Sandt (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2005), 35–48.

evidence provides even deeper context with which to examine the situation in Antioch, particularly the existence of continued conflict, bringing the response of Ignatius into greater focus. If they did all originate in Antioch around the turn of the first century, their references to conflict show churches that are struggling to deal with significant tensions among themselves. The conflict is not simply between Ignatius and those of whom he disapproves, but a systemic problem in need of being addressed by all three these authors.

Finally, Ignatius's epistles provide the clearest evidence of churches in conflict in Antioch. His arguments against schismatic groups is clear and repetitive. According to Ignatius's writings the heretical beliefs most concerning to him are the Docetic and Judaizing teachings present in the churches to which he writes. But these never constitute a recurring motif for him. Ignatius argues against these teachings, not as his primary theme, but as support for his teaching on unity. For Ignatius, the idea of unity, and by extension peace, was of vital importance. His exuberance at hearing of the peace in Antioch is found in multiple points in his letters.[335] What Ignatius shows in this is not simple disagreements or tension between factions of Christianity, but arguments worthy of open and detrimental conflict.[336] Unfortunately, his mention of peace is ambiguous and there have been multiple theories regarding the nature of this peace. While some suggest Ignatius was speaking of the cessation of specific persecution in Antioch, it is highly likely his language refers to the cessation of infighting among the various Christian factions within Antioch.[337] This is especially true when looking at his rhetoric in his *Epistle to the Smyrneans*. Ignatius's celebration of the church in Antioch and its newfound peace includes that they, "recovered their own greatness and their own corporate body has been restored to them."[338]

Trevett summarizes the interpretations of previous scholars' understanding of this peace well, stating:

---

[335] Ign. *Phd.* 10.1; Ign. *Smyrn.* 11.2; Ign. *Pol.* 7.1.

[336] Corwin, *Ignatius*, 52–54.

[337] Those suggest the end of persecution are: Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, 368; Zahn, *Ignatius.* Those in favor of the resolution of internal conflicts among the Christian factions include: Harrison, *Polycarp's*, 83; Trevett, *A Study*, 55–66; Schoedel, *Ignatius,* 10–11; Brent, *A Martyr Bishop*, 11; Corwin, *Ignatius*, 25; Paul Trebilco*, The Early Christians in Ephesus from Paul to Ignatius* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007), 634.

[338] Ign. *Smyrn.* 11.2.

It has been argued that

(a) *peace* marked the end of a time of persecution;

(b) *peace* indicates the appointment of a like-minded bishop-successor;

(c) *peace* refers to the cessation of strife which was internal to the Antioch
Christian community."[339]

These three interpretations constitute the most likely meaning to Ignatius's term. The following will be an examination of each of these interpretations, beginning with the cessation of persecution, moving then to the appointment of a like-minded bishop, and finally the end of internal conflict.

3.2.2.2.1 The End of Persecution

There are no extant imperial proclamations noting a specific end to Christian persecution in Ignatius's day. The cessation of persecution, when it occasionally occurred, would have been a gradual process, and one that would not have created an occasion for a church such as that of Antioch to declare it as an event.[340] Therefore, the idea that Ignatius's peace marks the end of a general persecution in Antioch seems unlikely. Ignatius himself appears to be the casualty of persecution of some sort. Ignatius spares no amount of space writing of the honor of his impending martyrdom and he is direct in doing so when he writes sentences such as:

> I was being brought in chains from Syria because of the name and hope we
> share, and I was hoping, through your prayer, to be allowed to fight the beasts
> in Rome, that by doing so I might be able to be a disciple."[341]

Ignatius writes specifically regarding his predicament. In fact, the only ambiguous part for the modern reader was the condition causing his arrest. Ignatius gives the reasoning as being "because of the name and hope we share." The impression the modern reader is left with is that Ignatius's circumstances are commonplace among Christians of the day. This, mixed with the enthusiastic treatment of

---

[339] Trevett, *A Study*, 56.

[340] F. W. Schlatter, "The Restoration of Peace in Ignatius's Antioch," *JTS* 35.2 (1984): 465–69.

[341] Ign. *Eph.* 1.2.

martyrdom Ignatius espouses, as well as other extant sources, namely *The Acts of the Martyrs*, depict a time when Christians accepted martyrdom and persecution of varying degrees as normal.[342] For these reasons, it seems Ignatius would be more inclined to use specific wording regarding martyrdom and the cessation of a general persecution if it existed at the time. Persecution for the early Christians was a continual threat, even in its sporadic appearance around the Empire. Cessation of an actual organized persecution would merit a larger degree of specified treatment in Ignatius's work.

Ignatius enthusiastically endorses the action of martyrdom saying: "Allow me to be an imitator of the suffering of my God."[343] It seems reasonable that any salvific causality attributed to such martyrdom would be inferred. As Moss suggests, this is a tool employed by the martyr genre often in the early church, suggesting that martyrdom makes one not just an imitator of Christ but an alternate Christ:

> Assimilating the martyr to Christ affected more than the literary imagination; it fundamentally altered the status of the martyrs in the eyes of the audience. It endowed them with Christly authority, authority that could be manipulated by controlling the memory, legacy, and cults of the saints, but an authority that could never quite be harnessed. By presenting a martyr as *alter Christus*, an author or homilist unwittingly created the potential for the complete assimilation of the martyr to Christ. Such assimilation encompassed not only the manner of death but Christ's saving function and divine status.[344]

Since Ignatius is both enthusiastic in his martyrdom and in a position to benefit from an increase in authority for his own writing, at the very least an allusion to the peace in Antioch and its possible connections to his own martyrdom would be fitting. This is especially true if the martyrdom has a salvific connection to the peace in Antioch.

---

[342] The idea of a constant stream of Christian persecution may be an exaggeration. But the sporadic nature of actual persecution and prosecution would have a profound effect for the early Christians and may have affected their psyche during and after these periods of persecution; see Moss, *Ancient Christian Martyrdom*, 12. Also see Paul Bedjan, ed., *Acts of Martyrs and Saints: Acta Martyrum et Sanctorum* (Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias Press, 2008).

[343] Ign. *Rom.* 6.3.

[344] Candida R. Moss, *The Other Christs: Imitating Jesus in Ancient Christian Ideologies of Martyrdom* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2010), 46.

Further, it is helpful to remember Ignatius's main and repetitive theme of unity.[345] Looking at the discourse of peace, the omission of martyrdom language along with peace, and the incongruity of this persecution theory with the central theme of unity, it is reasonable to assume Ignatius was not intending to chronicle the end of an era of persecution in Antioch. Therefore, the first interpretation, although possible, will be rejected by this study.[346] Next will be an examination of the appointment of a like-minded bishop.

3.2.2.2.2 The Appointment of a Like-Minded Bishop

There is a certain appeal to this interpretation of Antioch's peace. Most of this appeal stems from the continuity between this interpretation and the themes about which Ignatius writes. After all, the idea of a single bishop is one of the most prevalent ideas contained in the entire Ignatian corpus. Also, the idea that this would be a momentous victory for Ignatius and his life's work must also be acknowledged. And while there is nothing to concretely suggest this is his reasoning, it is at the very least, a possibility.[347]

Schlatter argues that Ignatius's discourse in Ign. *Rom.* 9 supports this theory.[348] He suggests that having God himself as Antioch's bishop is not normal, and the church there will not be restored until Jesus Christ will be bishop over it. According to Schlatter, this rhetoric affirms that Jesus Christ alone can reveal God to humanity, and, in the same way, the bishop does this for the church.[349] With God as the shepherd of the church, it becomes probable that human misunderstanding can occur. The church in Antioch, then, is in peril until Jesus, and by extension his episcopal representative, can restore the order that enables the church to understand God. While this shows Ignatius's theological urgency to the appointment of a bishop in Antioch, it fails to give the specifics one would expect from the appointment of a new bishop, specifically his name.

---

[345] Schoedel suggests this means solidarity within the Christian community.

[346] As previously noted, this is in line with much of the modern scholarship since Harrison.

[347] Ehrman, *Apostolic Fathers,* 208.

[348] Schlatter, "The Restoration," 467–68.

[349] Ibid., 468.

This brings up another argument against this view: the ambiguity by which Ignatius writes. If Ignatius's main theme is unity, his secondary goal seems to be to espouse the merits of the monepiscopacy. The bishop is given every amount of respect possible in his epistles. In most of his letters, Ignatius acknowledges the bishops of the city to which he writes by name, Onesimus in Ephesus,[350] Damas in Magnesia,[351] Polybius in Tralles,[352] and Polycarp in Smyrna.[353] Of the three letters that do not bear a bishop by name, Smyrneans includes a second entire epistle written to their bishop (Polycarp), Philadelphians includes lengthy discussion regarding the merits of their bishop, and Romans was a letter written with a singular purpose in hopes of staving off any rescue being planned by the church there. It seems unlikely, then, that Ignatius's mention of peace is referring to the appointment of a new bishop in Antioch, since one is not mentioned either by name or by office.

Again, the monepiscopacy is the tool Ignatius espouses to reach his ultimate goal in unity. Ignatius writes his epistles with the purpose of instructing, but also to convince his audience of his point of view. In both the theory of ending persecution and the appointment of a bishop as a reason for Ignatius's jubilation at the "peace in Antioch," there are no attempts to use this as persuasive rhetoric to sway his audience. He is allowing the rest of his discourses to be the background of this statement regarding peace. It is entirely possible that the peace in Antioch included the election of a new bishop. However, this is not the reason for peace, and therefore not the reason for Ignatius's jubilation. The appointment of a single-minded bishop, if it in fact happened, seems more likely to be the outward sign of something greater happening within the community, namely the end of internal conflict.

3.2.2.2.3 The End of Conflict

The third theory presented regarding Ignatius's mention of peace in Antioch is the cessation of internal conflict among the Christians. Having already established conflict was part of the Antiochene church throughout its brief history, this seems highly probable.[354] While historical conflict alone is not enough to convince of the merits of this theory, there is considerable precedent for the use of Ignatius's

---

[350] Ign. *Eph.* 1.3.

[351] Ign. *Magn.* 2.1.

[352] Ign. *Trall.* 1.1.

[353] Ign. *Pol.*
[354] This is the view favored by Trevett, Ignatius, 56–66; Schoedel, *Ignatius*, 10–11; Corwin, *Ignatius*, 25–28; Trebilco, *The Early Christians*, 634, among others.

language to mean the end of conflict in the early church. Ignatius uses εἰρήνη [peace], which some suggest means the end of internal conflict. Harrison is most notable in his argument for this.[355] Harrison quotes the work of Streeter to begin his arguments. Streeter notes,

> When a man on his road to death is seen using every opportunity to impress one idea with all the prestige that martyrdom would give him; when he enforces it in language neurotically extravagant; and when there is evidence that his sub-conscious as well as his conscious mind is dominated by the same idea, we may well conclude that it stood to him as the summation of his life's work. But if the consolidation of an ecclesiastical discipline centred in the monarchical bishop was the ideal for which Ignatius had lived, and which he hoped by a martyr's death firmly to rivet on the Church at large, it is a fair presumption that it was a thing which he had had to fight for in his own Church of Antioch…. To us the point of interest is to note that, alike in his anxiety and in his joy, there speaks a man whose life work has just been saved.[356]

Streeter's assessment is similar to what is continually argued in this study: Ignatius's writings are of a desperate nature, and display, with few deviations, a common theme of unity. With this in mind, the cessation of internal strife would be a moment of great joy for Ignatius, whose major and recurring theme is unity. Corwin suggests these internal conflicts account for Ignatius's sense of authority and failure.[357]

Another argument for the cessation of internal strife is argued by Brent. He surmises if Ignatius was arrested for being the head of an illegal religious organization, they would never have been granted a "restoration" of corporate status from a Roman legal standpoint.[358] Brent's argument is based on the idea that restoration of peace in the terms used, namely after the end of a persecution from without, suggests a restoration to corporate status; something that was not afforded the Christians until 313

---

[355] Harrison, *Polycarp's*, 81–89.

[356] Burnett H. Streeter, *The Primitive Church: Studied with Special Reference to the Origins of the Christian Ministry* (New York: Macmillan, 1929), 175.

[357] Corwin, *Ignatius*, 25.

[358] Brent, *A Martyr Bishop*, 21–22.

C.E. Brent believes the reason Ignatius alone is the casualty of this conflict is that it is because he was in charge of a community causing strife within the city of Antioch. The legality of Christianity in this instance seems to be overlooked.[359] External conflict in the form of specific persecution regarding the Christians as an illegal group must therefore be highly suspect. There would not be true "peace" in this regard for multiple centuries. The status of the Christian communities is most likely one of begrudged tolerance under Roman law.

Given the fact that conflict within the early church in Antioch is evidenced in multiple sources dating back to the very beginning of the church, and finding evidence of this continued into the second century in the writings of Ignatius, the most likely scenario for Ignatius writing regarding peace is that it is due to the end of internal conflict. While it is entirely plausible this is evidenced by the appointment of a like-minded bishop, this does not detract from the understanding that internal conflict had, at least for the time, ceased.

The breadth and severity of conflict within the church at Antioch is at the very least ambiguously evidenced in multiple sources. Taken together, the conclusion can be made that these conflicts constituted a distinct issue for the early church. This study will now examine the response of a *pasteur* to this conflict.

3.3 The Pastoral Response to Conflict

Returning to the main features of pastoral power identified by Foucault, Ignatius's response to conflict can be seen in what Foucault believed is the pastor's need to direct the whole flock. To understand a pastor's need to direct the entire flock, or to use Ignatius's words in Ign. *Eph.*, direct "flawless unison,"[360] one must grasp the oxymoronic understanding of individualization with regards to its universalizing effects. Individualization is both an apparatus for leading and controlling the individual as well as the means by which the shepherd builds and maintains the flock. It is the individualized nature of pastoral power that is able to form a common identity among a group. It is a causal nexus between the shepherd and the flock. As the shepherd gathers the individuals, the logical outcome is

---

[359] Brent, *Ibid.*, 22. This is not to say that persecution for the crime of being a Christian did not happen. It appears in this instance that it was not of particular concern. The larger problem, the conflict itself, was the main issue prompting the martyrdom of Ignatius.

[360] Ign. *Eph.* 4.2.

the flock. Foucault said, "But what the shepherd gathers together is dispersed individuals. They gather together on hearing his voice."[361] As previously noted, for the Christians, the commonalities that usually bound people together, such as ethnicity, social class, or race were not a concern. Their identity was in their common shepherd who brought these individuals together. The flock exists because of the shepherd and the shepherd, at least in regard to the earthly shepherds of Christian belief, exists because of the flock.

For the ancient Christians, what is inherently wrong with the idea of multiple, autonomous, and even differing bodies of believers in a given city in the early second century? For Ignatius, and any pastor for that matter, individualization, brought to bear to its end, ensures the need for a unified flock. If a shepherd calls the sheep and they do not gather, then those sheep do not belong to the shepherd. The sheep's identity is in the gathering. Thus, those that do not gather when called must then belong to someone else. When speaking of Christian identity, those that answer to the call of the bishop are true Christians. Those that do not gather under the bishop stand apart as something else—something that will become known as heresy.

The danger then lies in one of the facets of pastoral power that is most easily overlooked, especially in this context—its benevolence.[362] If those that gather at the call of the bishop are considered to belong to the church, and therefore Christ, the converse must be true for those who do not gather; they are something other than belonging to Christ. They can no longer be called Christians. They become something other. In a time before the actual definition of "heresy" against something even resembling orthodoxy, what caused one to be an outsider, at least for Ignatius, was to be separate from the bishop. In the absence of defining heresy, or even defining "proper" Christianity, separation from the bishop constitutes being outside of what Ignatius believes is true and ultimately good. It is therefore dangerous for these schismatic believers to exist, for their individual sake, and the sake of the church. This is, at its core, a benevolent motive for the bishop. Soujeole, speaking of the mysteries of the church, declares that benevolence is "the most ancient ecclesiological paradigm."[363]

---

[361] Michel Foucault, *Politics, Philosophy, Culture: Interviews and Other Writings, 1977–1984*, ed. Lawrence D. Kritzman (New York: Routledge, 2013), 61.

[362] Foucault, *Security*, 171.

[363] Benoit-Dominique de La Soujeole, *Introduction to the Mystery of the Church* (Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 2014), 465.

When dealing with power of any kind, it is difficult to believe those seeking to gain or maintain power do so altruistically. This is especially true when viewed from the power models of the Greek and Roman cultures in which the early church arises. The concept of a power whose ultimate goal is the safety and well-being of those under its influence is quite difficult to comprehend. While there may be some similarities, to equate pastoral power to other forms of power creates many misconceptions. Foucault asserts this in regard to pastoral benevolence:

> You will say that this is part of all religious, moral, and political descriptions of power. What kind of power would be fundamentally wicked? What kind of power would not have the function, purpose, and justification of doing good? It is a universal feature, except that, nonetheless, in Greek thought anyway, and I think also in Roman thought, the duty to do good was ultimately only one of the many components characterizing power. Power is characterized as much by its omnipotence, and by the wealth and splendor of the symbols with which clothes itself, as by its beneficence. Power is defined by its ability to triumph over enemies, defeat them, and reduce them to slavery. Power is also defined by the possibility of conquest and by the territories, wealth, and so on it has accumulated. Beneficence is only one of a whole bundle of features by which power is defined.[364]

Pastoral power, while showing similarities to other leadership types on the surface has distinctions that create a need for a single body. It is because pastoral power is one whose ultimate goal, or "defining characteristic" is benevolence. Unlike the *poleis* of Ancient Greece or the Roman Empire, the Christians and Jews, whose leaders were *pasteurs,* were not concerned, primarily at least, with geographical locations.[365] They were not concerned with the amassing of wealth or by grandeur. These ideas will begin to shift within Christianity only after it integrates with the power structures of the Roman Empire over 200 years after Ignatius writes his letters. The early church was defined more fully by its pastoral leadership and simplistic existence. It was not enough for the pastor that Christians

---

[364] De La Soujeole, *Introduction,* 465.

[365] This is not universal. The Jews of course were passionate about the Promised Land in Palestine and the Temple. But their history of nomadic existence essentially instilled a sense of temporariness to their geography. Even when given the land, they were often exiled from it. According to the HB, this was in response to God's will and often the result of errant behavior. A great example of this is as Christianity begins to emerge, the Jews once again find the Temple in ruins and their pastoral sensibilities become once again relevant to their faith and existence.

believe; they must believe the best form of the faith. This is the terminology of green pastures.

While recently the consensus that the early Christians met exclusively in houses has been challenged, the alternative meeting places of outdoor spaces, warehouses, and storefronts do little to depict a church seeking the grandeur of temples or basilicas.[366] Rather, the church was a fluid group of believers more concerned with caring for one another and spreading their faith than they were with being a powerful entity. The *pasteur* in these Christian communities then has no need to protect a place or things or try to increase wealth in pursuit of these ends. The *pasteur*, what can be called at this point, the bishop, has the sole responsibility to care for the people in his church.

Christian pastoral concern is for the wellbeing of the souls and lives of their flock. Christianity in the time of Ignatius existed within an already established political system, but sought to be apart from this structure.[367] Again, the evangelistic nature of the faith creates movement, and Christianity functions as a sort of spiritual nomadic tribe, moving from one understanding to the next, adding ideas from the outside and refining their own from within. The uniqueness of this ideology is seen very keenly in the lack of ethnic and cultural superiority.[368]

The teachings of Paul make it clear that belonging to Christ supersedes belonging to other identifiers. He writes (Col. 3:9–11):

> Do not lie to one another, since you laid aside the old self with its evil practices, and have put on the new self who is being renewed to a true knowledge according to the image of the One who created him—a renewal in which there is no distinction between Greek and Jew, circumcised and uncircumcised, barbarian, Scythian, slave and freeman, but Christ is all, and in all.

Within Christianity then, there is no geographic location to defend, no ethnic or cultural superiority to champion, and no other people to dominate. Leadership over this group is not motivated by

---

[366] Edward Adams, *The Earliest Christian Meeting Places: Almost Exclusively Houses?* (London: Bloomsbury, 2013).

[367] The totality of the Christian's separation with mainstream Roman culture is seen even in Paul's letter to the Romans. The relativity of social status is particularly telling, breaking important barriers within Roman society; see Peter Lampe, *Christians at Rome in the First Two Centuries: From Paul to Valentinus*, trans. Michael Steinhauser (London: Continuum 2006), 80–81.

[368] Denise Kimber Buell, *Why This New Race? Ethnic Reasoning in Early Christianity* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2005), 138–70.

financial gain, geographic conquest or security, or even self-advancement. Pastoral power exists only in relation to the flock, and even more so in relation to the safety of the flock in movement.

The problem with this type of movement, a movement of ideas, is the inherent danger of schismatics within the ever-growing community. If new people are present, outliers must be presumed. In response to this, the pastor individualizes these outliers for the purpose of returning them to the fold.[369] Individualization is a tool used in service to the prime objectives of the *pasteur*, the safety and sustenance of the flock. It is in this individualization that Ignatius's primary theme is found. Ignatius seeks, above all else, the unity of the churches in the cities to which he writes.[370] In his pursuit of unity, Ignatius uses the pastoral tool of individualization as his chief message.

3.3.1 Individualization

This theme of unity and conformity is, as much of the leadership that will develop in the early centuries of Christianity, based on ideas developed in the pastoral communities of the Ancient Israelites, but also on political concepts of the Romans and Greeks before them. The Romans had *concordia,* based largely on the Greek notion of ὁμόνοια. Both of these concepts arose out of disunity and chaos within the political systems of their day.[371] But it is in the shepherd where the Christians find their model of leadership. While the terminology of ἐπίσκοπος (bishop), διάκονος (deacon), and πρεσβύτερος (elder) may not be grounded in the ancient pre-Christian traditions, the obedience to a single shepherd certainly is. Nowhere can this be seen more clearly than in the need for the shepherd to direct everyone in the flock. No one can be allowed to remain both a part of the flock and an outlier. This is evidenced most keenly in the notion that pastoral power utilizes individualization. The shepherd, as Foucault suggests, tends to those that have strayed off course, even if that means he leaves the entire flock for this purpose. However, there is a nuance to individualization that must also be acknowledged: the ultimate goal is the reunification of the entire flock. Individualization is not necessarily a form of punishment or even correction, but a device used to bring the lost sheep back into the fold. It is yet another form of the chief salvific function of the shepherd. This is a defining

---

[369] Foucault, *Security*, 121.

[370] Schoedel suggests Ignatius uses ἔνωσις and ἑνότης primarily in reference to the solidarity of the Christian community. It constitutes the main theme of Ignatius's writings; Schoedel, *Ignatius*, 21–22.

[371] John A. Lobur, *Consensus, Concordia and the Formation of Roman Imperial Ideology* (New York: Routledge, 2008), 40–59.

and unique attribute of the *pasteur*.[372] Unlike the commands of the sovereign in other forms of governance, whose obedience would be ensured by imposing punishments of various forms, the goal of the *pasteur* is to avoid such punishment. It is a tool used to bring the flock together.[373] If punishment is enacted, it is not simply for the greater good, but for the good of the individual. The goal is reform or improvement for the very sake of the individual *and* for the community. Those that stray are brought back into the fold for the express purpose of safety for the individual, which will in turn secure the entire flock. Thus, the individualization of pastoral power is reciprocated to the whole community.

If the purpose of the individualized attention and correction is to bring those that have unique movements within the larger body back into synchronization with the whole, then as much as there is individual attention, this attention is mutually beneficial to the whole body. This is why Foucault describes this as a paradox.[374] In pastoral power, there is a need to individualize in order to bring a singular movement to the flock. Not one person should be allowed to move independently or stray from the direction the shepherd has chosen. After all, pastoral power is one of benevolence, and the shepherd's goal is the best possible destination or pasture. The individualization within pastoral power brings unity to the whole flock in order that everyone reaches the proper pasture. For the early church this was a unique challenge, as the nascent theology of the first centuries of its existence was exceedingly vulnerable to the influx of new and competing ideas.[375] As this occurs, the need for more individualization for the purpose of universalization became an ever-pressing need for early Christian leaders.

It is not enough to simply acknowledge individualization as a tool for the bishop, as individualization can take many forms and could result in multiple ecclesiological systems. The increased need for individualization in an ever-growing church presents significant issues for the earliest Christian

---

[372] Foucault, *Security*, 173–74.

[373] Brian Kaylor, "Sheep without a Shepherd (but with an Archbishop): Foucault's Pastoral Power and the Denying of Communion," *Atlantic Journal of Communication* 19.3 (2011): 152–68.

[374] Foucault, *Security*, 174.

[375] Although the Eusebian model argues that what we know as "orthodox" Christianity was always the dominant form of Christianity, there have been more recent attempts to assume a plethora of Christian traditions whose dominance depended largely upon geography. This view is championed most notably by Bauer, whose work constitutes the main scholarship in this area. Ehrman agrees with Bauer and suggests that early Christian theology was remarkably varied; see Bauer, *Orthodoxy*; and Bart D. Ehrman, *Lost Christianities: The Battles for Scripture and the Faiths We Never Knew* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005).

leaders. Nothing of a prescribed individualization scheme existed in the first centuries of Christianity. The mechanics of pastoral power established by Ignatius can provide valuable insight into the origin of institutionalized pastoral power. Already noting Ignatius's ubiquitous theme of unity, and its relationship to individualization, a key component to understanding the use of pastoral power in his ecclesiology is to determine his institutional use of individualization. In other words, how did Ignatius choose to incorporate individualization into his ecclesiological program, and conversely, how did individualization effect his ecclesiology?

3.3.1.1 Individualization as an Ecclesiological Paradigm

It is quite telling that Ignatius is so repetitive in his instruction to these varied communities. Ignatius gives instruction, encouragement, praise for, obedience to, and admonition regarding the bishops in most of his writing.[376] He leaves out instruction on the bishop in his *Epistle to the Romans* alone.[377] While it is argued that Ignatius was not attempting to create a new church order in his writings, there is a clear level of instruction included in his writing. As Isacson suggests, it is very probable Ignatius was not the originator of the monepiscopacy, but he is its greatest and most vocal champion in the early second century.[378]

Combining the theme of unity with the resounding and repetitive instructions regarding the bishops, a pattern emerges that shows an early implementation of pastoral power structures within the ecclesiology of Ignatius. Ignatius's commitment to this form of church governance advances a concept that begins to create a power structure that will dominate Christianity. In his pervasive calls for unity, Ignatius advocates the monepiscopacy, and he imbibes the bishop with monarchical powers. In this, he foreshadows the fully realized monarchical episcopacy that will be instituted within the Roman Catholic Church within the next few centuries.

Not only does Ignatius give the local bishop full authority of a monarch, but he begins to take this further, creating an office that is representative of God himself. Kharlamov suggests this is the first

---

[376] Ign. *Eph.* 1–6; Ign. *Mag.* 2–7; Ign. *Trall.* 1–3, 7, 13; Ign. *Phil.* 1, 3–4; Ign. *Smyrn.* 8–9; Ign. *Pol.* 2, 6.

[377] Ign. *Rom.* Must be regarded as an anomaly. Its purpose was singular, requesting the Roman church to allow his martyrdom to proceed as scheduled.

[378] Mikael Isacson, "Follow Your Bishop!: Rhetorical Strategies in the Letters of Ignatius of Antioch," in *The Formation of the Early Church*, ed. Jostein Adna (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005), 317–40.

example in Christian theology of institutional deification.[379] The results of this institutional deification can be seen in later Christian offices, church practices, and beliefs. By creating a comparison between the bishop and God, Ignatius's discourse begins moving the church toward what Foucault called "an apparatus of power."[380] There is little ambiguity in the words of Ignatius regarding the authority of the bishop. Clarke notes Ignatius's comparison of the bishop and God as both analogous and direct. Of the former he writes, "The analogy is as follows:

> as the Lord
> > did nothing
> > > without the Father…
>
> so you
> > must not do anything
> > > without the bishop and the presbyters."[381]

While this analogy is enough evidence to show Ignatius's claims regarding the bishop are substantial, there are times when he uses stark language to express his idea. In Ign. *Trall.* 3.1 he writes, "So too let everyone respect the deacons like Jesus Christ, and also the bishop, who is the image of the Father." Ignatius institutionalizes God's authority, and places it first in the hands of the bishop, who then disburses that authority to the deacons and elders. In the language of Ignatius, there is no other option for the Christian.[382]

With such discourse and given Ignatius's position as bishop of Antioch, these statements appear to be the consolidation of power. But in remembering Ignatius as bishop, it must not be forgotten that these words are penned on his martyrdom journey. Ignatius is not asking for people to look to him in the place of God, but to their city's bishop. Without recognizing the self-sacrificial nature of Ignatius while writing these things, it is easy to misinterpret the motive of his rhetoric. It is precisely because of his martyrdom that his motives become clearer. Ignatius is not attempting a coup, garnering a following, or gaining status. His writing is imbibed with a selfless quality because of his

---

[379] Vladimir Kharlamov, "Emergence of the Deification Theme in the Apostolic Fathers," in *Theosis: Deification in Christian Theology*, ed. Stephen Finlan and Vladimir Kharlamov (Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2006), 51–66.

[380] Foucault, *Security*, 199.

[381] Kevin M. Clarke, "'Being Bishoped by God: The Theology of the Episcopacy According to St. Ignatius of Antioch," *Nova et Vetera* 14.1 (2016): 227–43.

[382] Ign. *Magn*. 4.

circumstances. His love for his community is evident, most notable by his self-sacrifice.[383] Ignatius is in a unique position to make statements that appear extraordinarily self-serving because he has nothing to gain from them, except the knowledge that he has done his best to preserve and strengthen the churches to which he writes. All of this is done in the service of Ignatius's ultimate goal of unity within the church.

In light of Ignatius's situation, his statements regarding the bishop must be taken as pure ecclesiological instruction, rather than power seeking, at least for himself. The structure of power Ignatius attempts to implement is designed specifically as a way to institutionalize the individualization inherent within pastoral power. In other words, Ignatius's proposed ecclesiology creates offices that inherently individualize. Ignatius does not simply advocate for the bishop's authority. He specifically states that there is no Christianity apart from the bishop. He writes:

> And so it is fitting not only to be called Christians, but also to be Christians,
> just as there are some who call a person the bishop but do everything without
> him. Such persons do not seem to be acting in good conscience, because they
> do not hold valid meetings in accordance to the commandment.[384]

Believers cannot have unity with Christ without unity with the bishop.[385] Ignatius echoes these words in Ign. *Rom.* 3.2, speaking of being found a Christian in both word and deed. He writes regarding his own martyrdom, "[T]hat I not only be called a Christian, but also be found one." For Ignatius, the action of following in Christ's footsteps made his Christianity authentic. For the church, he suggests this is tied to their willingness to submit to the bishop and walk with him in every way. Clark explains Ignatius's logic this way:

> Just as Christ shares the Father's mind, or rather *is* the Father's mind (τοῦ
> πατρὸς ἡ γνώμη), so the world's bishops share the mind of Christ (οἱ
> ἐπίσκοποι οἱ κατὰ τὰ πέρατα ὁρισθέντες ἐν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ γνώμῃ εἰσίν).
> Thus, the bishop is the path for believers to "run together in harmony with the

---

[383] L. Arik Greenberg, *"My Share of God's Reward": Exploring the Roles and Formulations of the Afterlife in Early Christian Martyrdom* (New York: Peter Lang, 2009).

[384] Ign. *Magn.* 4.1.

[385] Kharlamov, "Emergence," 65.

mind of God" (συντρέχητε τῇ γνώμῃ τοῦ θεοῦ) (Ign. *Eph*. 3.2).[386]

By commanding such a close alliance with the bishop, Ignatius is advocating for an ecclesiological framework that forces Christians to be in contact with, and synchronized to, the direction of the bishop. This is not simply a notion of whether or not the bishop is the supreme authority, this is commanding the believers to have the bishop be a part of everything. By doing so, the bishop is then able to survey the entire flock, and thus the individualization of the flock is brought into the ecclesiastical program. Ignatius, having established the authority of the bishop as having the authority of God, makes the ubiquity of the bishop necessary for the church to exist. If the bishop is not present, then the meeting is invalid.[387]

Obedience is only one of the facets of the bishop-church relationship. The universal presence of the bishop is the individualizing of the relationship. While Foucault suggests the institutionalization of the pastorate to have occurred "from around the third century,"[388] here is evidence that this process began at the beginning of the second century with Ignatius. Foucault's summary of the Christian pastorate is evocative of the commands of Ignatius. Foucault states,

> So, the pastorate in Christianity gave rise to a dense, complicated, and closely woven institutional network that claimed to be, and was in fact, coextensive with the entire Church, and so with Christianity, with the entire Christian community. Hence the institutionalization of the pastorate is a much more complicated theme. Finally, and above all, the third difference, and it is this that I would like to stress, is that in Christianity the pastorate gave rise to an art of conducting, directing, leading, guiding, taking in hand, and manipulating men, an art of monitoring them and urging them on step by step, an art with the function of taking charge of men collectively and individually throughout their life and at every moment of their existence.[389]

---

[386] Clark, "Bishoped," 233.

[387] Ign. *Smyrn.* 8.2.

[388] Foucault, *Security*, 221.

[389] Ibid., 222.

Although the more complex institutionalization of the pastorate Foucault mentions is not fully described in Ignatius's epistles, the institutionalization of pastoral power is clearly reflected in the commands regarding the bishop, and most assuredly regarding the church apart from the bishop. This is the first step in creating Christian pastoral power that will find its fullest expression in later centuries. As Schoedel notes, this is not to say that the monarchical episcopacy has been established fully yet, but evidence that Ignatius is attempting to "shape the world around him in his own image."[390] In this, then, the beginnings of institutional pastoral power, or the infancy of the monarchical episcopacy can be found. And also, in this, the individualization within pastoral power is most vibrant.

Whether Ignatius is the originator of this shift in pastoral power, or simply an outspoken proponent, is, and most certainly will remain, a debatable point. There is not enough extant evidence to determine where these ideas first began to materialize.[391] What evidence there is points to Ignatius as the first and most ardent proponent of the monepiscopacy and its institutionalization. The ubiquity of Ignatius's calls for unity and obedience to the bishop suggests his ecclesiological beliefs, which will eventually dominate Christianity in the centuries after his writing, were not universally held among his contemporary churches. Bauer notes Ignatius's approach of "admonition rather than of description" provides adequate evidence for this.[392] The success of Ignatius's ideas is juxtaposed against the failures of Ignatius as a leader to begin with. While there is no extant evidence of the exact nature of Ignatius's trial and condemnation, the fact that he is to be martyred, and the discord among the church in Antioch, suggests a certain amount of failure to convert those in Antioch to follow his leadership. It is to this failure that modern scholars are indebted, as success would most likely exclude the impassioned epistles used to understand the formation of the monepiscopacy. From these letters the divided landscape of the second-century church in Antioch and the struggles Ignatius faces become clear. Therefore, the failures of Ignatius are as beneficial for this study as his successes, as they provide the ability to examine Ignatius's attempts to individualize schismatic believers by bringing them under the direction of the bishop.

---

[390] Schoedel, *Ignatius*, 49.

[391] This is particularly in reference to the monepiscopacy, not the offices alluded to in the Pastoral Epistles. While the Pastorals may presuppose the monarchical episcopacy, this cannot be concluded with any certainty; see Schoedel, *Ignatius*, 23.

[392] Bauer, *Orthodoxy*, 61.

3.3.2 The Individualization of Schismatic Christian Factions

It has been noted that Ignatius was not concerned with "pagan" teachings that were incompatible with Christianity.[393] This is in holding with his main theme of unity. It was of no consequence what the Roman world believed so long as the Christians maintained a unified front. In a similar way, the commands to obey a single bishop and to make him a part of every gathering, produce for Ignatius a type of Christianity that is not threatened by outside teachings. What is addressed in Ignatius's epistles are the factions within Christianity that have a much higher chance to corrupt the believer. It is to these schismatic groups that Ignatius sets himself opposed. The "heretical" beliefs of those who claim to be Christians but stand apart from what Ignatius believes to be the truth, constitute a danger to both the soul of the Christian and the strength of the church.

From Ignatius's writings three Christian "factions" within the early church are easily identified.[394] Zahn and Lightfoot, however, believed there to be only one group of schismatic teachers.[395] Ignatius never identifies any of his opponents, but the arguments he makes against heresy suggest there were at least two groups against which Ignatius writes. The third existed because there clearly is the group of Christians of whom Ignatius appears to be the leader. These are the Christians to whom Ignatius writes, imploring his readers to follow his ecclesiology for the sake of unity. Subservient to this goal, Ignatius then addresses his main opposition to unity, the Judaizers and the Docetists. The Judaizers possess a Christianity that is too archaic for Ignatius. Their beliefs, in Ignatius's mind, were rooted still too firmly and conventionally in Judaism. Ignatius saw Christianity as a completion of Judaism, superseding the doctrines and laws of the latter. Judaizers, according to Ignatius, cheapened the freedom obtained through Christ, leaving the gospel with little to offer.[396] In spite of the inclusion of a Judaizing faction within the church, the infrequent mention of them in Ignatius's writing, and the relatively soft rebukes of them suggest that Docetism was the chief concern of Ignatius.[397]

---

[393] Olavi Tarvainen and Jonathon Lookadoo, *Faith and Love in Ignatius of Antioch* (Eugene, OR: Pickwick, 2016), 13.

[394] Corwin, *Ignatius*, 52.

[395] Tarvainen and Lookadoo, *Faith and Love*, 14.

[396] Ign. *Magn.* 10; Ign. *Phil.* 6.

[397] Brown and Meier, *Antioch and Rome*, 80.

While the Judaizers were scolded for their ignorance of the gospel, the Docetists were dealt with in much harsher terms. The Docetists were a faction apparently large enough to cause a disturbance between each other serious enough for the government to notice. These groups were not simply coexisting alongside one another, but were sometimes working against each other. This antagonistic behavior even turns to occasional open conflict, causing many issues for Ignatius and the church.[398] It is the schismatic nature of this group that is Ignatius's primary concern. This is evidenced once again by his overarching theme of unity. This is not to say he did not specifically disagree with the theology present within their group. But, his treatment of their beliefs is not extremely robust and is often used as a sub-point to his greater themes of unity and obedience to the bishop. In order to understand Ignatius's opponents, an overview of the two groups is discussed below, with more emphasis on his primary opponent—Docetism.

3.3.1.2.1 Judaizers

Judaizers present a difficulty for the study of Ignatius. In one instance it must be conceded that Jews and Christians were very similar, if not identical, in the nascent Christian movement. This similarity makes knowing the exact nature of Judaizers' beliefs difficult.[399] After all, many of the earliest Christian communities met in the Jewish synagogues and were considered a sect within Judaism. Anachronistically, the first "Christians" were actually ethnic and practicing Jews. However, the emergence of Christianity as a distinct religious group was always an inevitability. When Christianity began to consist of Christ-believing Jews and Christ-believing gentiles, the exacerbation of that which differed between Christianity and Judaism increased, creating tension between them. Further, the evangelistic nature of the Christian movement was bound to create an imbalance within the community. As the success of Christians' proselytizing increased, so did the numbers of Jesus-believing gentiles. Eventually, the non-Jewish Christians outnumbered the Jewish Christians, although the date of this happening is indeterminate. If one were to simply take the numbers and extrapolate the consequences over a century, a distinct gentile Christianity will ultimately become the dominant expression.[400] As the gentiles outnumbered their Jewish counterparts, the traditions of

---

[398] Corwin, *Ignatius*, 52.

[399] Charles K. Barrett, "Jews and Judaizers in the Epistles of Ignatius," in *Jews, Greeks and Christians: Religious Cultures in Late Antiquity: Essays in Honor of William David Davies*, ed. Robert Hamerton-Kelly and Robin Scroggs (Leiden: Brill, 1976), 220–44.

[400] Lieu, *Christian Identity*, 1–26.

Judaism increasingly diminish as new gentile Christian traditions become normalized. There was a distinct population that either could not let go of the old Jewish beliefs or rediscovered a passion for their rituals. The result was a Christianity that was more Jewish in appearance than what was becoming the standard gentile Christianity of the second century, and those that held these beliefs become known as Judaizers.

Jews and Christians carry the same heritage up until the split between the two movements. Their early relationship is one that includes both antagonism and hostility, but also kinship and even fondness.[401] Antioch had a history of a Jewish community that was progressive with regard to new ideas and outsiders.[402] However, the early tension between the Christ-believing Jews and the Christ-believing gentiles was not aided by the Jewish War which ended in the destruction of the Temple in Jerusalem in 70 C.E. Though the Jews had always enjoyed great status among the community in Antioch, this was tested in the years following this Jewish revolt. The results of the war were social, political, and financial for the Jews. This is evidenced by, among others, the *fiscus Judaicus* levied at the Jews as punishment for the war. While this alone was probably not enough to sway the Christians to part ways with the old faith, it was almost certainly a factor.[403] The theological differences were already a point of tension between the two groups. As the second and third generation of Christians understood the work of Christ, it is increasingly evident that much of Judaism, particularly in practice, appeared irrelevant to their beliefs. This is the argument Ignatius uses most often in his treatment of the Judaizers. The work of Christ means Christianity must function independently of Judaism, or the former has little merit.

This independence from Judaism was vitally important to Ignatius, so much so that he opposes the Judaizers in ways similar to although admittedly gentler than the Docetists. Trevett writes,

---

[401] This is a belief that finds much consensus among scholars. A different perspective regarding Judaism and Christianity is presented by Neusner, who claims that Christianity must be viewed as a distinct religion from its conception, not as a continuation or reformation of the ancient beliefs of Judaism; see Jacob Neusner, *Jews and Christians: The Myth of a Common Tradition* (Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock, 2003).

[402] Kraeling suggests the evidence from 4 Maccabees, as well as the attitude of the early Christian community in Antioch, point to a progressive Jewish community; see Kraeling, "The Jewish Community," 130–60.

[403] The socio-political situation for the Jews and Christians is much more nuanced than will be treated here. For a more thorough treatment, see Zetterholm, *Formation*, 185–89.

Ignatius dealt with the paroxysms engendered by Docetism by closing the door on it. He dealt with the Judaizers using a combination of reprimand, conciliation, and (sometimes cautious and defensive but also) reasoned debate, as part of which he offered alternative understandings of their concerns."[404]

Ignatius believed the similarities between the Jews and Christians were a concern, but of little consequence when compared to the differences, namely the soteriology pioneered by Paul. This was the freedom from the law that he championed a half-century earlier.

While some scholars hold that there were Docetic Judaizers, or some semblance of this combination,[405] it is probable that the Judaizers were not causing the same disturbance on a Christological front as the Docetists. Trevett believes that Ignatius is not attacking Jewish beliefs, but the Christians who adopted the old traditions.[406] The Judaizers were instead causing a disturbance in that they were Christians practicing Judaic customs and living like Jews. While this was certainly not an issue for the earliest Christians a generation or two earlier, it was in fact common, this was clearly not acceptable to Ignatius. He writes, "It is outlandish to proclaim Jesus Christ and to practice Judaism."[407]

In his argument against Judaizers, Ignatius echoes Paul most emphatically. Note the similarity between Ignatius's direction in *Magn.* 10.3 and Paul's in 2 Cor. 3:11 which reads: "For what was glorious has no glory now in comparison with the surpassing glory." For Paul and Ignatius, the grace of Christ makes the law seem foolish, and this is the impasse that creates a distinction between Ignatius and the Judaizers.[408] The difference between Paul and Ignatius on this point is their emphasis.[409] Again

---

[396] Trevett, *A Study,* 182.

[397] Lloyd Gaston, "Judaism of the Uncircumcised in Ignatius and Related Writers," in *Anti-Judaism in Early Christianity Volume 2: Separation and Polemic*, ed. Steven G. Wilson (Waterloo, ON: Wilfred Laurier University Press, 1986), 33–44.

[398] Trevett, *A Study,* 194.

[407] Ign. *Mag.* 10:3.

[408] Paul J. Donahue, "Jewish Christianity in the Letters of Ignatius of Antioch," *VC* 32.2 (1978): 81–93.

[409] Another way to say this would be to suggest, as Smith does, that Ignatius continues the trajectory of Paul's thought, advancing a precedent established by Paul; see Smith, "Ministry," 44–46.

the onus is placed on Paul to establish churches around the new belief in Christ and all the benefits of sacrificial grace that it accompanied. Ignatius's focus is to keep churches together and strengthen them under a unified front. The former is an apostle and evangelist, the latter a bishop. For Ignatius, this means that Judaism presents a distinct threat to Christian communities whose theological bearing is oriented in grace, something somewhat antithetical to the obedience to the law espoused by Judaism. Ignatius states this plainly in *Magn.* 8:1, saying: "For if we have lived according to Judaism until now, we admit that we have not received God's gracious gift."

Ignatius's mention of the Judaizers occurs in his epistles to the Magnesians and Philadelphians.[410] Both instances give clues as to the specific identity of the Judaizers. Particularly, in the letter to Philadelphia Ignatius appears to be speaking of gentiles who are adopting Jewish customs. He writes: "But if anyone expounds Judaism to you do not listen to him; for it is better to hear Christianity from a man who is circumcised than Judaism from a man uncircumcised."[411] Regarding the true nature of Ignatius's opposition, Gaston claims this is not against Jewish practices *per se*, but rather against bringing Jewish beliefs and practices back into the church.[412] Robinson argues against this, noting that Ignatius's use of the term "Christian" (in Ign. *Mag.* 10:1) suggests a forceful contrast to Judaism, perhaps based on his belief that in Ignatius's Antioch there was a significant level of Jewish and Christian hostility.[413]

Somewhere between these two views lies the interpretation of Schoedel. He puts it this way: "What Ignatius is saying is this: Any entanglement with Judaism is unfortunate, but how much better to have moved—as especially the apostles did—from Judaism to Christianity than in the reverse direction."[414] Whichever scholar is accurate, in Ignatius, the emerging distinctness of Christianity apart from Judaism is clearly articulated. Ignatius is clearly pushing for separation between Christians and Jews. This was problematic immediately due to the fact that there were Jewish Christians in Antioch and Asia Minor since the founding of the churches there. Such a separation would raise a significant level

---

[410] Ign. *Mag.* 8–10; Ign. *Phil.* 6:1–2.

[411] Ign. *Phil.* 6:1.

[412] Gaston, "Judaism," 33–44.

[413] Robinson, *Ignatius*, 113.

[414] Schoedel, *Ignatius*, 202–3.

of strain between the Jewish and gentile Christians. It can be suggested then that Ignatius sought to move past such separation by admonishing the attempts to Judaize what was increasingly seen as a new religion.

What can be seen in any of these scholars' approaches is a leader who seeks to end differences amongst Christians. Even if one takes the more nuanced approach of Gaston, the interpretation of Ignatius's admonishments is seen as a leader who is willing to abandon beliefs, not out of theological conviction, but out of a ruthless pursuit of unity. It is, in a sense, the most efficient way to produce a unified and singular vision amongst his followers. With his focus on unity, Ignatius finds it more beneficial to simply abandon Judaism altogether for the sake of church. The Judaizers then become the target of Ignatius's ire, seen as a significant and even covert threat against a unified Christianity. This highlights once again Ignatius as shepherd of the church in Antioch tasked with the protection and leadership of the entire flock.

Although Judaizers were clearly a concern for Ignatius, having been mentioned even the select few times as evidence of this concern, it is Docetism that primarily draws the wrath of Ignatius. His treatment of Docetism is much more prevalent in his writings and, to a great degree, harsher. This study will now look at Docetism, which constitutes Ignatius's primary opponent, and his response to them.

3.3.1.2.2 Docetists

It is not surprising that the subsequent generations after the Apostles faced increasing opposition from false teachers and their heresies. These second and third-generation Christians possessed no canon or codified teaching and were thus susceptible to errant theology.[415] As the majority of Christians began to accept what will eventually become known as orthodoxy, groups with radical ideas concerning Christ became marginalized and eventually became known as heretics. The schismatic group that concerned Ignatius most were the Docetists.[416] The true nature of Docetism is difficult to define.

---

[415] Bruce M. Metzger, *The Canon of the New Testament: Its Origin, Development, and Significance* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1987), 40.

[416] Daniel L. Hoffman, "Ignatius and Early Anti-Docetic Realism in the Eucharist," *Fides et Historia* 30.1 (1998): 74–88.

According to Kinlaw, the term has been used by some as an umbrella term for different heresies combated by the Apostolic Fathers, while others define it more specifically.[417]

While the term "docetist" is often used to describe the opponents of Ignatius in the early second century, there is no shortage of ambiguity in his treatment of this particular opponent. Ignatius refers to this heretical group, or groups, as unbelievers or atheists.[418] He never calls them by the now ubiquitous nomenclature of Docetism. Eusebius writes of a letter by Serapion of Antioch, who lived and worked at the turn of the third century, in which he refers to the teachings contained in the *Gospel of Peter* as Docetic.[419] This is, of course, nearly a century after Ignatius's own writing, so the correlation here is very difficult to prove or assume. What Ignatius particularly teaches against is the notion that Christ could not have suffered and only appeared to suffer on the cross. This is a belief that is associated with a number of teachers in the second and third centuries who have been classified a Docetic.[420] It seems likely then, that although the teachers above may not be contemporaries of Ignatius, the ideas they propose that will come to be collectively known as Docetism, is the same general heretical beliefs Ignatius opposes in parts of his letters. If by Ignatius's time they had not yet received a name under which they were classified, the beliefs themselves are clearly evidenced in the writings of Ignatius.

The inability of many to reconcile the fully-God and fully-human nature of Christ was common in a Hellenistic world, whose gods would not have allowed so much frailty to exist.[421] The difficulty of the Hellenized world to accept a deity with such presumed frailty as Jesus Christ will continue to produce heretical ideas designed to reconcile the cross with a more popular view of power and divinity, most notably in the rise and proliferation of the various Gnostic beliefs. As Foucault reasons,

---

[417] Those who use a broad definition include Bauer, Slusser, and Koschorke. Those that use a narrow definition include Weigandt, Davies, and Brox; see Pamela E. Kinlaw, *The Christ is Jesus: Metamorphosis, Possession, and Johannine Christology* (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2005), 74–76.

[419] Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.* 6.12.

[128] See Ign. *Trall.* 10; Ign. *Smyrn.* 2.

[420] These include Marcion, Satornilus, Cerdon, and a community responsible for the *Acts of John*; see Travis W. Proctor, "Bodiless Docetists and the Daimonic Jesus: Daimonological Discourse and Anti-Docetic Polemic in Ignatius's Letter to the Smyrnaeans," *ARG* 14.1 (2013): 183–204.

[421] Martin Hengel, *Crucifixion in the Ancient World and the Folly of the Message of the Cross*, trans. John Bowden (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1977), 16.

the power of the shepherd is "completely foreign to Greek thought."[422] Since Christianity was distinctly preaching their pastoral God to the Hellenized Roman Empire, the disconnect is bound to produce a need to reconcile this discrepancy of what power inherently is and what it is used for. The milieu of Hellenized thought, as Pearson suggests, is the only way to account for Gnostic beliefs.[423] As Uhlhorn wrote of Gnosticism: "It seemed completely to have reconciled Christianity with culture."[424] And it is helpful to note the similarities between Gnostic and Docetic beliefs. As Christianity brings its completely foreign message into the Hellenized world, Gnostic, and by extension Docetic, beliefs are almost a certainty.

It is not particularly helpful for this study to make such detailed distinctions between the names and peculiarities of Gnosticism and Docetism in the early second century. It is beneficial to acknowledge Ignatius writes strongly against a heretical group with beliefs aligned with what will eventually be called Docetism, which is a subcategory of the more general Gnosticism. While these two religious beliefs are distinct, their origin and makeup are similar. These terms will be used interchangeably in order to examine the larger danger these beliefs posed for the church. Chiefly among the concerns for Ignatius is the very nature of the Gnostic belief system. It was an attempt to convey Christianity in a way that harmonized with the prevailing philosophies of its culture.[425] In typical Hellenistic syncretism, Gnostic Christianity is the product of combining multiple religious beliefs from all over the Roman Empire and imbuing and applying them to Christian faith.[426] In many ways, these beliefs constituted an easier conversion point for many within the Hellenized world. Again, within the context of pastoral power and the effects these beliefs had on the church in Asia in the second century, one

---

[422] Foucault, *Security*, 119.

[423] Birger A. Pearson, *Gnosticism, Judaism, and Egyptian Christianity* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2006), 27. Although Gnosticism is now considered a very loose generalization of a number of religious beliefs. The discourse of "othering" varied groups was gradual and developed a language of Gnosticism that became an umbrella for different beliefs. The main thread of these faiths is the need to reconcile the power of Jesus and the frailty he displayed on the cross. For this study, the accuracy of the title is sacrificed in order to reasonably address the chief arguments between what will become orthodoxy and ideas that find their home in a number of religions, but become, at least to many modern readers, an amalgamous group of semi-related beliefs referred to as Gnostics; see David Brakke, *The Gnostics: Myth, Ritual, and Diversity in Early Christianity* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2010) 1–28.

[424] Gerhard Uhlhorn, *Conflict of Christianity with Heathenism*, trans. C. Egbert Smyth and C. J. H. Ropes (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1904), 347.

[425] Antonia Tripolitis, *Religions of the Hellenistic-Roman Age* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2002), 121.

[426] Ibid.

can see the importance of Ignatius's arguments against them. The appeal within the Hellenized world of these views constituted a danger and was therefore a target for Ignatius in his campaign for unity.

That a god could possibly serve as a sacrifice for his subjects goes against the very notion of being a god in the Hellenistic world. The very understanding of power, especially that possessed by divine beings, does not allow for the salvific sacrifice of the cross. Religious ritual among all of the Greco-Roman cults existed to create a power relationship between the subject and the ruler.[427] The Christian notion that God would first provide the sacrifice, instead of his subjects, and then this sacrifice would be for the benefit of the subjects and not the deity is completely inverted for the Romans. Once again, the uniqueness of pastoral power, and the pastoral nature of God, comes into sharp contrast with the Hellenistic views on power. The existence of a god whose benevolence is so complete that he would forfeit his omnipotence for the sake of his subjects was not something to be fathomed in the Hellenistic understanding of power. The concept of power in Hellenistic culture was serious, so much so that they often put the emphasis on power over that of a deity's personality.[428] As Christians continually grow out of and within a Hellenistic culture, the reconciliation of the cross with an omnipotent God results in beliefs such as Docetism. For Ignatius, the overwhelming attraction toward a view of Christ that is compatible with Hellenized thinking constitutes a danger worth combatting in his final instructions to his surrounding churches in Asia. The attraction of what can be called a "Hellenized Christianity" threatens the unity of the church, since it is incompatible with the gospel, and therefore the church.

It is in his letters to the Ephesians, Smyrnaeans, and Trallians that Ignatius's teaching against these beliefs are found.[429] In *Trall.* 10.1 Ignatius writes: "But if, as some who are atheists—that is, unbelievers—say, that he only appeared to suffer (it is they who are the appearance)." Proctor notes the severity of the language Ignatius uses in his letter to the Smyrneans, namely when he calls the Docetists "daimons."[430] Ignatius argues:

---

[427] Janet Huskinson, *Experiencing Rome: Culture, Identity and Power in the Roman Empire* (London: Routledge, 2000), 266.

[428] Abraham J. Malherbe and Carl R. Holladay, *Light from the Gentiles: Hellenistic Philosophy and Early Christianity: Collected Essays, 1959–2012* (Leiden: Brill, 2014), 770.

[429] Ign. *Eph*. 7; Ign. *Smyrn*. 2–7; Ign. *Trall*. 9–11.

[430] Proctor, "Bodiless Docetists,"183–204.

> For he suffered all these things for our sake, that we might be saved; and he truly suffered, just as he also truly raised himself – not as some unbelievers say, that he suffered only in appearance. They are the ones who are only an appearance; and it will happen to them just as they think, since they are without bodies, like the daimons."[431]

One can see in these passages that Ignatius is passionate in his dislike of the heretical group.[432] In opposing such a belief, Ignatius often emphasized the humanity of Christ. In his epistle to the Christian believers in Ephesus, Ignatius teaches that Christ is "both fleshly and spiritual, born and unborn, God come in the flesh, true life in death, from both Mary and God, first subject to suffering and then beyond suffering."[433] This defense of the true incarnation will be an important aspect of his argument for the eucharist found in his letter to Smyrna, a topic that is central to the main themes in the Ignatian corpus.[434]

As Weinandy notes, Ignatius advocates, but never explains why, Christians have a belief in the dual nature of Christ. In doing so, Ignatius demonstrates continuity with apostolic Christology.[435] It would be another two centuries before systematic theological treatment of the subject through works such as Athanasius's *On the Incarnation of the Word*.[436] Weinandy's belief that Ignatius was not concerned with explaining his theology points to the very nature of what Ignatius was attempting to accomplish against heresy, namely a uniform theological declaration for believers, one presided over by the bishop. It was not a chief concern for Ignatius that believers understand why Christ was both divine and human, but simply that they believed uniformly. Of course, Ignatius believed he was theologically

---

[431] Ign. *Smyrn.* 2.

[432] Corwin suggests is a notion from which Ignatius "recoils in horror," pointing again to the severity of Ignatius's attitude toward Docetism; see, Corwin, *Ignatius*, 54.

[433] Ign. *Eph*. 7.2.

[434] John E. Lawyer, "Eucharist and Martyrdom in the Letters of Ignatius of Antioch," *ATR* 73.3 (1991): 280.

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

[436] This is not to say Ignatius has no part in advancing the dual nature of Jesus—he does. But his theological reasoning is not present in his writings; see Robert M. Grant, *Jesus after the Gospels: The Christ of the Second Century* (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox, 1990), 57.

correct, but again this is not his reason for writing, as his concern appears centered wholly around the oneness of the Christians to whom he writes.

This is not to say that Ignatius was not adamant in his defense of the apostolic faith. Ignatius's language against the false teachers was often brutal, writing such lines as, "I would rather not even remember them until they repent,"[437] and calling them "rabid dogs."[438] To borrow the language of Trevett, "This was strong stuff contrary to the norms of Christian hospitality."[439] Even in these harsh rebukes of the heresy, one does not find a proper theological explanation for beliefs on the order of works displaying deeper theological reflection. The lack of explanation in Ignatius does not necessarily signify a lack of theology but provides significant evidence that his writings were not theological instruction but ecclesiological.[440] Ignatius calls out the heresy, but does little to argue against it in grand theological prose.

Corwin believes these heretical groups had once been a part of the church and the division must have been contemporaneous with Ignatius's leadership.[441] Bauer adds to this by noting that Docetism was particularly dangerous because it was "a false teaching of an unmistakable gnostic brand—a heresy that pursues its path within churches themselves, and not alongside them."[442] It was a syncretistic Christian movement, more dangerous because of its affirmations of Christianity on some points, but schismatic on others.[443] Ignatius writes of them: "Even though such persons seem to be trustworthy, they mingle Jesus Christ with themselves, as if giving a deadly drug mixed with honeyed wine."[444] To Ignatius, who is demanding unity above all else, this is much more dangerous than fringe groups that have either abandoned the faith altogether, or were too far flung to be considered a threat to him or his church. All of this is made more dangerous based on the Hellenistic culture present within the

---

[437] Ign. *Smyrn*. 5.3.

[438] Ign. *Eph*. 7.1.

[439] For Ignatius, the concept of what is now orthodoxy was not contingent upon proper belief, but unity with Christ, produced by a unity with the church and evidenced by the proper celebration of the eucharist; see Carl E. Braaten and Robert W. Jenson, *Marks of the Body of Christ* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1999), 65–69.

[440] Corwin, *Ignatius*, 53.

[442] Bauer*, Orthodoxy*, 78.

[443] Grant, *Jesus*, 57.

[444] Ign. *Trall.* 6.2.

Roman Empire. Again, Docetism represents a particular gnostic belief attempting to reconcile Christ with culturally accepted notions of power and deity.

To combat Docetism, Ignatius uses language that is directly targeting the very idea of γνῶσις ("knowledge"). It is not surprising that Ignatius particularly urges the obedience to the bishop in terms that appeal to the mind. In order to supersede those that believe in secret knowledge, he submits as evidence the mind of God himself. He does this in his first instruction to the believers in Ephesus. In Ign. *Eph*. 3.2 he writes:

> But since love does not allow me to be silent concerning you, I decided to
> encourage you, that you may run together in harmony with the mind of God.
> For also Jesus Christ, who cannot be distinguished from our life, is the Father's
> mind, just as also the bishops who have been appointed throughout the world
> share the mind of Jesus Christ.

Ignatius's first instruction, in his first epistle, is to share the mind of the bishops, because it is the mind of Christ. It is a telling argument for the mind of the believers. If that was allowed to be divided, then the heart and soul would follow its division. Ignatius believed that the mind of God has "real noetic and moral content."[445] By appealing to the mind first, Ignatius combats those who presume secret knowledge and therefore undermines the claims of the Docetists.

Returning again to Ignatius's pastoral instinct, Docetism held consequences for the believer that Ignatius finds unacceptable. Starting with the denial of Christ's flesh, the Docetic must then deny the earthly birth of Jesus and, conversely, a true death. Denying the death of Jesus makes the eucharist an unnecessary celebration for the Docetic.[446] This would then translate into abstaining from the Eucharist, which Ignatius held in such high esteem.[447] Ignatius's logic is presented fully in his letter to the church in Smyrna. He writes:

---

[445] Vall, *Learning Christ*, 179.

[446] Geoffrey Wainwright, *Doxology: A Systematic Theology* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1984), 234–35.

[447] Corwin, *Ignatius*, 55.

But take note of those who spout false opinions about the gracious gift of Jesus Christ that has come to us, and see how they are opposed to the mind of God. They have no interest in love, in the widow, the orphan, the oppressed, the one who is in chains or the one set free, the one who is hungry or the one who thirsts. They abstain from the eucharist and prayer, since they do not confess that the eucharist is the flesh of our savior Jesus Christ.[448]

He ends this portion of his letter by suggesting it is better to avoid these heretics because they are divided and cause division, which is the "beginning of evils."[449] His logic leads him to the ultimate statement here which is to flee division. Again, Ignatius's primary function is to keep the flock together, and in doing so, he creates the conditions for individualization to take place.

Thus far, it has been Ignatius's rhetoric that has evidenced his use of pastoral power. His arguments against the Docetists and the Judaizers show his commitment to the correction of the flock. It is his use of the eucharist, however, that most strongly evidences his commitment to pastoral power. As Foucault notes: "Power exists only when it is put into action."[450] What will now be examined is Ignatius's use of the eucharist and the argument will be made that it constitutes putting pastoral power into action for Ignatius. It is in the eucharist that Ignatius finds a tangible tool for individualization; his metaphorical shepherd's staff. By requiring that the entire congregation pass before the bishop or his representative, Ignatius creates the conditions for which he can see and contact each member of the flock. This in turn, allows Ignatius to engage in individualization of the whole flock.

3.4 The Eucharist: Institutionalized Individualization

Ignatius holds that church order and the eucharist are closely related.[451] By creating a distinction between those that celebrate the eucharist, and those that do not, Ignatius engages in discourse that is the first step of individualizing, which must be the definition of the "other." This "othering" creates

---

[448] Ign. *Smyrn*. 6.2–7.1.

[449] Ign. *Smyrn.* 7.2.

[450] Michel Foucault, "The Subject and Power," *Critical Inquiry* 8.4 (1982): 777–95.

[451] Corwin suggests Ignatius attempts to create unity in both institutional structure and worship experience, a view shared by Lawyer; see Corwin, *Ignatius*, 81; Lawyer, "Eucharist and Martyrdom," 280.

distinctions.[452] By creating the distinction between those that celebrate the eucharist and those that do not, Ignatius sets a boundary by which proto-orthodoxy can be measured, and thus creating the conditions necessary for individualization to occur.[453] The eucharist then can be seen as one of the first, if not the first, measurement of orthodoxy available to the early church.[454] Foucault writes:

> [A] power relationship can only be articulated on the basis of two elements which are each indispensable if it really to be a power relationship: that "the other" (the one over whom power is exercised) be thoroughly recognized and maintained to the very end a person who acts…[455]

Even if pastoral power requires a *pasteur* to know what a person is thinking,[456] it is the actions that define the differences, allowing this pastoral relationship to exist. It is only after defining those who exist outside the flock that the *pasteur* can then endeavor to bring the "other" back. Ignatius creates a boundary by which to measure the parameters of the church, and the eucharist, presided over by the bishop, constitutes that boundary.

Before pastoral power, or any type of power, can be exerted, this "othering" must take place in order for there to be any direction by which to exert power. In other words, Ignatius is defining truth, or one could say orthodoxy, by the eucharist.[457] Foucault states:

> Truth is a thing of this world: it is produced only by virtue of multiple forms of

---

[452] Jeremiah W. Cataldo, "The Other: Sociological Perspectives in a Postcolonial Age," in *Imagining the Other and Constructing Israelite Identity in the Early Second Temple Period*, ed. Ehud Ben Zvi and Diana Vikander Edelman (New York: Bloomsbury, 2015), 12.

[453] Norris believes that Ignatius takes significant strides forward in establishing orthodoxy; see Frederick W. Norris, "Ignatius, Polycarp, and I Clement: Walter Bauer Reconsidered," *VC* 30.1 (1976): 23–44.

[454] McPartlan argues that the Eucharist, which predates any formal councils, the canonized scripture, and the earliest creeds, is the initial marker of continued belonging in the church; see Paul McPartlan, *Sacrament of Salvation: An Introduction to Eucharistic Ecclesiology* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1995), 33–35. Also see David P. Long, "Eucharistic Ecclesiology and Excommunication," *Ecclesiology* 10.2 (2014): 205–28.

[455] Foucault, *The Subject*, 789.

[456] Ibid., 783.

[457] This is to say the measure of the community was eucharistic; see John Meyendorff, "The Nicene Creed: Uniting or Dividing Confession?," in *Faith to Creed: Ecumenical Perspectives on the Affirmation of the Apostolic Faith in the Fourth Century,* ed. Stephen Mark Heim (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1991), 1–19.

constraint. And it induces regular effects of power. Each society has its regime of truth, its "general politics" of truth: that is, the types of discourse which it accepts and makes function as true; the mechanisms and instances which enable one to distinguish true and false statements, the means by which each is sanctioned; the techniques and procedures accorded value in the acquisition of truth; the status of those who are charged with saying what counts as true.[458]

Although truth regarding the mysteries of Christ and the church may, to the believer, lay outside the earthly construct of truth, ecclesiology, specifically the determination of orthodoxy, is distinctly cohesive with Foucault's thoughts. Ignatius, in his discourse on the eucharist, lays out the "techniques and procedures" of determining a proto-orthodoxy; that being the participation in the eucharist with the bishop present. In this, Ignatius provides the conditions present for "othering" to occur.

For Ignatius, however, the eucharist goes far beyond simply "othering" the schismatics of early Christianity; it provides the only tangible tool of individualization available to the second century bishop. By requiring celebration of the eucharist together, under the supervision of the bishop, Ignatius actively institutionalizes pastoral power. Demanding that everyone participate together effectively requires that the Christians in a city continuously and ritualistically appear before the bishop, effectively creating unity and continuing to prioritize the authority of the bishop.[459] It brings the flock together and provides the context by which the bishop can observe the entire flock.

Looking again to Ignatius's letter to the Smyrneans, the argument against Docetism[460] inevitably leads back to the eucharist, showing the connection between the eucharist and the bishop's ability to observe the entire flock and keep it together and unified. The eucharist is the fundamental action of the body of Christ that allows for continued monitoring of the totality of the congregation by the bishop. This is something McGuckin suggests was normative by the time of Cyprian a century later, when schism was assessed not on doctrinal grounds but on eucharistic participation.[461] Therefore when Ignatius

---

[458] Paul Rabinow, ed., *The Foucault Reader* (New York: Pantheon, 1984).

[459] Willy Rordorf, *The Eucharist of the Early Christians* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1990), 59–61.

[460] Ign. *Smyrn*. 6–7.

[461] McGuckin not only suggests that the eucharist is the means by which the bishop could asses schism, but he also suggests that Cyprian was "following the lead of Ignatius of Antioch…"; see John A. McGuckin, *The Path of Christianity: The First Thousand Years,* Kindle Edition (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 2017), n.p.

argues against Docetism, it circles back once again to, as Foucault puts it, "an art of monitoring them and urging them on step by step, an art with the function of taking charge of men collectively and individually throughout their life and at every moment of their existence."[462] This very statement is echoed in Ignatius writings when he says: "Be eager to come together more frequently to give thanks and glory [*Or: to celebrate the eucharist and give thanks and glory*] to God."[463]

This eucharist-as-assessment is evidenced especially when combined with his commands in *Smyrn*. 8.2 saying: "It is not permitted to baptize or to hold a love feast without the bishop." The two sacramental actions of the believer for Ignatius occur only in the presence of the bishop. Baptism was also important for Ignatius. One can certainly see the implications of a person publicly announcing becoming part of the flock. However, there is deeper connotation for Ignatius's understanding of baptism. The symbology of dying to the self and being reborn into a new life actually becomes intimately tied to the notion that the shepherd will need to die to the self in order to build the flock. Even in baptism there is a sense that Ignatius desires to be compared to the crucified Jesus. Gordon Lathrup writes that Ignatius "seems to wish to convince the Roman church that he does indeed choose to the cup which his Lord drank, to be baptized with the baptism with which his Lord was baptized."[464] In this the bishop presides over a ritual deconstruction of the self, in order for a reconstruction of a new being, one that is dependent on the flock and the shepherd.

While baptism is a single event at the beginning of the believer's commitment to the church, the eucharist is the ongoing ritual by which the bishop has access to the entire congregation. It is, in essence, the vehicle of consistent and continued individualization in the early second century, and Ignatius vehemently protects it in his epistles.[465] Ignatius's goal is, as Corwin suggests, to institutionalize unity, both by an ecclesiological system of united ministry, as well as a shared experience in worship.[466] It is in the eucharist that Ignatius finds the tool to accomplish both. This is

---

[462] Foucault, *Security*, 222.

[463] Ign. *Eph*. 13.1. Emphasis not mine.

[464] Gordon Lathrup, "The Water That Speaks: The Ordo of Baptism and Its Ecumenical Implications," in *Becoming a Christian: The Ecumenical Implications of Our Common Baptism*, ed. Thomas Best and Dagmar Heller (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1999), 13–29.

[465] Although his instruction on the eucharist is more poignant in his letter to the Smyrnaeans, he writes similarly on one single eucharist in both Ign. *Eph*. 13.1 and Ign. *Phil*. 4.

[466] Corwin, *Ignatius*, 81.

what led Foucault to say:

> What is sacramental power? Of baptism? It is calling the sheep into the flock. Of communion? It is giving spiritual nourishment. Penance is the power of reintegrating those sheep that have left the flock. A power of jurisdiction, it is also a power of the pastor, of the shepherd. It is this power of jurisdiction, in fact, that allows the bishop as pastor, for example, to expel from the flock those sheep that by disease or scandal are liable to contaminate the whole flock. Religious power, therefore, is pastoral power.[467]

Foucault acknowledges here the power of the sacraments, and although he once again only views pastoral power from the third to fourth century onward, this same principle is at work in the sacraments available to Ignatius.

It is not just in his expressed reference to the eucharist that one can see Ignatius's commitment to this unified eucharist. Ignatius uses language similar to his reference in *Eph.* 5.2, which states, "anyone who is not inside the sanctuary" or "the altar room." In *Phil.* 4 he writes of "one altar." In *Mag.* 7.2 he also uses the term "one altar." In *Trall.* 7.2 he one again refers to those "inside the sanctuary." Some of these references, such as the first two references are used in explicit teachings on the eucharist. While the latter two are inferred references. In each case Ignatius does not elaborate on the eucharist.[468] Instead he uses it as a tool to once more call the believers together under the bishop.

In these repeated mentions of the eucharist the pattern emerges that signifies that Ignatius's goal is to further strengthen the notion that anyone outside of the sanctuary or altar is outside the church. In each of his references to the eucharist, whether explicitly "othering" the heretical teachings of the Docetists or bolstering his ecclesiological claims, Ignatius advocates for a singular congregation who worships under the direct supervision of the bishop. This is, in other words, the individualization of others and the supervision of the entire flock. In his use of the eucharist, Ignatius develops

---

[467] Foucault, *Security*, 205.

[468] Sven-Olav Back, "The Eucharist in the Letters of Ignatius of Antioch," in *Institutions of the Emerging Church*, ed. Sven-Olav Back and Erkki Koskenniemi (New York: Bloomsbury, 2016), 113–28.

institutionalized pastoral power in the early second century.

3.5 Conclusion

This chapter has examined the discord among the early Christians in Antioch and the discord facing Ignatius and his church. It has also examined his use of the eucharist as a response to this lack of unity. By examining the eucharist as an early pastoral tool, it has been shown that Ignatius's use of the eucharist is easily interpreted as institutionalized pastoral power, used to both individualize the heretics of his day, as well as providing the occasion for continued surveillance of the entire church under his care.

The church in the second century was not unified. Whether the disunity was rampant or limited to a select number of schismatic groups, Ignatius's situation and timbre of his letters is clearly an indication of the severity of the problem. The prolific nature of his writing and the preservation of his letters suggest that his words struck a chord within the early church. Antioch, in particular, bears the scars of this discord and Ignatius, in all likelihood, suffers the consequence of it.

Further, unlike many of the other churches of antiquity, the churches in Antioch have a legacy of multiplicity far older than most. Unlike churches founded by other early apostles, Antioch becomes the battleground between two of the largest figures in early Christianity, Peter (or perhaps James) and Paul. The incident between them, which occurred very early in the church's existence, essentially established within the very early church two distinct Christian congregations. While this may or may not have led to the consequences facing Ignatius's congregation, it set the standard for multiplicity among the Antiochene Christians.

Half a century later, Ignatius writes to many churches in Syria with the primary theme of unity. Above anything else, Ignatius pleads for unity among the believers to whom he writes. His desire for the monepiscopacy is due to his call to unity. His disdain for heresy, his ecclesiological program, and his occasional theological arguments are all in support of his primary goal of a unified congregation within the cities to which he writes. Organizationally, for Ignatius, this is achieved by an ecclesiology built around the leadership of one person, the bishop. All of his teachings regarding the bishop are accompanied by this theme of singularity among the believers.

To achieve this unity, Ignatius not only advocates the monepiscopacy, but demands that worship be

presided over by the bishop. The most tangible tool at Ignatius's disposal in service to this is the eucharist. By demanding the eucharist be administered or presided over by the bishop alone, Ignatius wields it as an effective tool of pastoral power. Demanding the bishop's presence at the eucharist accomplishes two of the very basic facets of pastoral power: it individualizes those inside the church, and it allows the bishop to survey the entire congregation. With regards to the former, the eucharist sets the boundary by which early orthodoxy is established, "othering" those who do not celebrate with the bishop. For the latter, the eucharist provides a means by which everyone must appear before the bishop, to be seen and monitored. Effectively, for Ignatius, the eucharist is a multifaceted tool to accomplish the goals of pastoral power.

Unity and the eucharist constitute main themes within the Ignatian corpus. The understanding of these within the broader schema of pastoral power is evident. But there is another theme permeating the letters of Ignatius, namely martyrdom. The next chapter of this study will now examine Ignatius's legal situation, and his pastoral response to the dangers which he and his flock were facing from external forces around the time of his death.

CHAPTER 4

SACRIFICE: THE PASTORAL RESPONSE TO PERSECUTION

4.1 Introduction

If internal conflict was a major concern for Ignatius, so much so that his undisputed main theme throughout his entire corpus is unity, then external conflict (persecution) was the other major concern. For Ignatius, unity is also a useful tool against this external threat of persecution. It may be fairer to say that unity maintains its prominence within the discussion of persecution, even in the midst of his preoccupation with his pending martyrdom, something he saw as a solution to persecution in some way. In the previous chapter it was argued that Ignatius's extensive discussion on unity proved the depth of conflict within Antioch and assumes similar strife in the other churches to which he writes. This chapter aims to examine the martyrdom discourse of Ignatius's martyrdom procession in order to evidence his attitude toward persecution and the pastoral response to it. The nature of this persecution is currently highly debated, but the fact that Ignatius was set to be killed as a leader of the Christians in Antioch proves that some form of persecution, or to phrase it another way, Roman public policy regarding Christianity's illegality, was in place within the Roman Empire at the beginning of the second century. Furthermore, the discourse itself creates, or perpetuates, a reality of persecution within the early church.

Ignatius understands martyrdom as a tool for protection and unity. Ignatius's discussion of the morbid subject is extensive enough to merit some recent concerns that he was obsessed with his martyrdom.[469] Ignatius certainly praised the merits of martyrdom, something not surprising given his circumstances. It is understandable for Ignatius to be consumed with the subject, as he is on his way to be martyred while he writes. Thus, it may be even more plausible to assume that Ignatius was simply preoccupied with his current situation rather than being obsessed with martyrdom. Furthermore, by championing

---

[469] The harshest critic of Ignatius's voluntary martyrdom language is De Ste. Croix, who calls his desire for martyrdom a "pathological yearning," and his mental state "abnormal." Frend goes so far to describe Ignatius desire for martyrdom, "exaltation bordering on mania." This view is shared by Brent who calls him, "[t]he disturbed Ignatius, who is eager for martyrdom." It must be noted that this is not the consensus, as there are many interpretations of Ignatius's desire for martyrdom, one of which will be presented here. It goes to show, however, that Ignatius's fervor towards his self-sacrifice is easily seen as outside the realm of normal human thought patterns; see Geoffrey E. M. de Ste. Croix, "Why Were the Early Christians Persecuted?," *Past & Present* 26 (1963): 23–24; Frend, *Martyrdom*, 197; and Brent, *A Martyr Bishop*, 19.

his own martyrdom, Ignatius increases the impact and authority of his writing. Whether Ignatius is obsessed or not, it is clear his motivation for *writing* on martyrdom closely resembles that of writing on unity: he is concerned for the safety and security of the church.

While unity through harmony, as discussed in the previous chapter, provides security against division and heresy, unity through martyrdom provides security against persecution. By inspiring the church by the sacrifice of one, and by equating that with the sacrifice of Christ, Ignatius is able to promote unity, provide safety, ensure authority for his writing, and comfort Christians whose very existence is frequently a cause for danger.[470]

Although the cause of Ignatius's martyrdom is debated, his use of his circumstance for both instruction and protection for the church is evident in his writing. In this Ignatius remains true to his pastoral call. His writing never ceases to waiver from his desire for the safety and health of the church, foregoing often his own predicament unless it can be used to facilitate the achievement of his goals.

Ignatius's discussion of his martyrdom itself gives clues to the nature of his predicament. The language Ignatius uses when dealing with his impending death is that of sacrifice. It is his desire, wholeheartedly, to follow in the footsteps of Jesus, or to "attain to God."[471] Elsewhere he writes that it is the only way he can actually be seen to be a true Christian; to put his words into action and sacrifice himself for his church; to follow in the footsteps of the good shepherd and lay down his life for his sheep. He writes in *Rom*. 3.2: "[T]hat I not only speak but also have the desire, that I not only be called Christian but also be found one."

The context of martyrdom in which Ignatius finds himself is also telling. It is important to accurately understand the nature of persecution in Ignatius's day in order to gather a deeper understanding of his motives for desiring martyrdom. It is in the context of early second-century Roman treatment of Christianity that one can see the sacrificial nature of Ignatius's desire for martyrdom and the

---

[470] Moss, *Other Christs*.

[471] Ignatius's language is nearly consistent throughout his letters regarding martyrdom, allowing him to "attain to God." His one variation comes in his *Epistle to the Romans* in which he wishes to "attain to Christ" (Ign. *Rom.* 5.3; 6.1). Otherwise his language is consistently "attain to God" (Ign. *Magn.* 14; Ign. *Eph.* 10.1; 12.2; Ign. *Trall.* 13.3; Ign. *Rom.* 1.1–2; 2.1).

importance he places on using his death as a means by which he can, once again, promote unity in the churches to which he writes.

After giving a brief overview of early Christian persecution, this chapter will shift to understanding how, theoretically, pastoral power presumes to deal with such an occurrence. Once again, Foucault's work will be the basis for this investigation. It will be shown, like any shepherd of humans or animals, the *Pasteur's* response is congruent with the response of Ignatius and other Christian writers in and around Ignatius's day. Ignatius's embrace of pastoral power and the lengths to which he employs this power will be shown to affect not only his writing, but his ecclesiology.

4.2 The Discourse of Persecution in the Early Church into the Second Century

As the burgeoning church begins and expands, the discourse of persecution, by both the persecutors and the persecuted, creates various conditions of maltreatment of Jesus-followers throughout the Roman Empire. In order to gain insight into Ignatius's writing, it is important to understand the context in which he writes. His ecclesiology, and his pastoral approach in general, need to be examined within this context to understand his intentions for his own life and his desire to see the monepiscopacy become the dominant form of leadership of the church and the basis of its ecclesiological structure. Ignatius's discourse of persecution and martyrdom, and his response, are built on the early Christians' discourse of their persecution. These discourses shaped early Christian identity, which was handed to Ignatius.

One of the more misunderstood contexts of the early second-century church is the prevalence and nature of persecution. Whether it be due to the accounts of the now canonized scriptures themselves, or the testimony of early Christian historians, the nature and severity of persecution in the early centuries of Christianity is often misrepresented due to the disparate nature and varying historicity of the sources.[472] De Ste. Croix notes there was no general persecution of Christians until the Emperor Decius in 250. He also affirms that, even though persecution was present, it was localized and very brief. In between these times he believes there was relative peace between the church and the Roman state.[473]

---

[472] Moss suggests the evidence can range from Roman legal records to romanticized passion narratives of early Christians; see Moss, *Ancient Christian Martyrdom*, 8–9.

[473] De Ste. Croix, "Why Were the Early Christians Persecuted?" 6–38.

From a purely historical perspective, persecution appears to be relatively small compared to the reports that are often presented in the Christian documents of the early church. The discrepancy between the two can be explained, not in terms of false reporting, but because of the difference in perception between the Romans as the oppressors and the Christians as the oppressed.[474] Thus there developed a discrepancy in discourse. Perkins has made important strides in better understanding early Christian suffering and persecution. She suggests the discourse of early Christian writers, although not objective reality, creates for the Christians a subjective reality in which they find their identity and cultural consciousness.[475] This Christian focus, however, ignores the discourse regarding Christianity among the Romans, which creates its own discursive understanding of Christianity. The Roman discourse creates the conditions under which Christians will often find themselves the target of varied persecutions. It is particularly this milieu of Christian identity, as understood by the Romans, that makes Ignatius's pastoral response so urgent. By understanding the context in which Ignatius finds himself, his motives and actions will become easier to understand, and a pastoral pattern of response will be easier to observe.

To complicate the matter of understanding both the subjective and objective realities of Christian persecution, the types of persecution and the reasons behind them varied considerably through the first centuries of Christianity. To begin, this study will examine the extant evidence found in the Book of Acts, followed by a very brief look at two examples of New Testament responses, namely that of Paul and that of the writer of 1 Peter. These two writers were chosen for the ubiquity of their teaching on suffering, and their temporal differences within the first century in an attempt to gain a varied view, as much as is possible, within the confines of the New Testament canon.

4.2.1 The New Testament

Nearly at its inception, the followers of Jesus were marginalized to varying degrees. As Frend puts it, "suffering and tribulation belonged to the very nature of the primitive church."[476] Aside from the crucifixion of Jesus, the Christian movement was far too small to be a concern for the Roman Empire

---

[474] Ibid.

[475] Perkins, *Suffering Self*, 3.

[476] Friend, *Martyrdom*, 79.

at its onset. The Book of Acts, however, notes the localized persecution of Jesus's followers by their fellow Jews in and around Jerusalem in the earliest days of the movement.[477] Acts 4–7 catalogues the beginning of this persecution. Starting with simple rebukes in chapter 4 and escalating to the stoning of Stephen in chapter 7, the very first Christians began to be persecuted, even to death, for their beliefs and proselytizing. Acts is full of these accounts of persecution, firstly at the hands of fellow Jews, and then by gentiles throughout the Roman Empire.[478] This is useful for this study insomuch as it shows the prevalence of persecution soon after the church's inception. In fact, the disciples had been told that they would be persecuted and were expecting as much.[479] Cunningham notes that the death of Jesus begins the persecution of the disciples.[480] The discourse of persecution was carried over from Jesus's words in Luke.[481] From the very beginning then, the earliest Christians developed an identity of persecution, or perhaps more accurately, the Jesus movement began with the self-understanding of being a persecuted group.

These early Christians developed a discourse that championed that identity to bolster the credibility of early Christian writers and provide a sort of litmus test for the standing of the believer at large.[482] Even in these early writings, Christianity begins to champion martyrdom as the fullest expression of devotion to Christ. While this is not necessarily foreign to other causes in the ancient world, the accounts of Christian martyrdom are often criticized as being romanticized, even if they attempt to record a true story.[483] By championing martyrdom and persecution, the early Christians subvert the very conception of their relatively powerless condition. The discourse of martyrdom and persecution

---

[477] De Ste. Croix, *Christian Persecution*, 107.

[478] These can be found in chapters: 9 (Plot to kill Paul); 12 (James is killed, and Peter arrested); 14 (Paul is stoned nearly to death); 16 (Paul is imprisoned); 21–23 (Paul is arrested by the Romans).

[479] Sean McDowell, *The Fate of the Apostles: Examining the Martyrdom Accounts of the Closest Followers of Jesus* (New York: Routledge, 2016).

[480] Cunningham also suggests it may be better understood as continuing to persecute Jesus through the disciples; see Scott Cunningham, *Through Many Tribulations: The Theology of Persecution in Luke-Acts* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1997), 186–87.

[481] Luke 6:22–23, 27–29, 8:15, 9:23, 10:3–16, 14:27, 21:12–18, 22:35–36.

[482] James A. Kelhoffer, *Persecution, Persuasion and Power: Readiness to Withstand Hardship as a Corroboration of Legitimacy in the New Testament* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010), 28–29.

[483] Moss, *Ancient Christian Martyrdom*, 9–16.

effectually strips the oppressors of their power, as the classic mechanisms of punishment become less of a deterrent for the oppressed and more of a badge of honor. It is this subversive power of martyrdom that Ignatius wields so effectively to advocate for his position. This use of martyrdom, although championed by Ignatius, did not originate with him. Instead, its origins within the Jesus movement stem from its earliest writings.[484]

Paul, the most prolific writer in the NT, is also, as far as it is documented, the most continually persecuted Christian in the early church. The Pauline Epistles provide much evidence to the fact that early Jesus followers understood persecution to be something both of normalcy and a necessity. This is something Frend notes is rooted in Jewish apocalyptic beliefs.[485] Of course there is a distinct Christian view in Paul's teachings on suffering as well. The prolific nature of Paul's writing, combined with his teaching on persecution, show the power of the letter at perpetuating ideas and creating culture, something that will have a profound impact on later writers, especially Ignatius.[486] Within Paul's writings one can see the Christian response to persecution, at both the hands of the Jews and then the Romans. In Paul, one sees a consistent stream of martyrdom discourse that changes the narrative of what persecution means to the early Jesus followers and to Christians into the second century.

4.2.1.1 The Pauline Epistles

Particularly, Paul has long been seen to have an influence on Ignatius and his writing, perhaps more so than any other writer found in the NT.[487] Understanding Paul's view on suffering, persecution, and even martyrdom will be vital in understanding the foundation on which Ignatius builds his discourse on his own suffering and immanent death. In his first letter Paul writes, "For you, brethren, became imitators of the churches of God in Christ Jesus that are in Judea, for you also endured the same sufferings at the hands of your own countrymen, even as they did from the Jews" (1 Thess. 2:14). Paul, exhorting the Christians in Thessalonica, shows that it is now the Romans who are persecuting these Gentile Christians. Paul continues in 3:4: "For indeed when we were with you, we kept telling

---

[484] Elizabeth A. Castelli, *Martyrdom and Memory: Early Christian Culture Making* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2004), 35–36.

[485] Frend, *Martyrdom*, 85–87.

[486] Lucetta Mowry, "The Early Circulation of Paul's Letters," *JBL* 63.2 (1944): 73–86.

[487] Clayton N. Jefford, *The Apostolic Fathers and the New Testament*, E-book (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2006), n.p.

you in advance that we were going to suffer affliction; and so it came to pass, as you know." This exemplifies Paul's understanding of persecution. It was a forgone conclusion for him. It was part of the condition of the believer, and it was a part of the gospel itself.[488] For Paul, suffering was an integral part of his life as an apostle, and it functioned in many different ways to further the gospel.[489]

One example of the numerous functions of suffering in Paul's discourse is its use as a necessary means of growth. He writes (Rom. 5:3–4): "And not only this, but we also exult in our tribulations, knowing that tribulation brings about perseverance; and perseverance, proven character; and proven character, hope." Paul's teaching here is subtly different. In these differences the robustness of his understanding of suffering and persecution are seen. It is not simply that persecution and other forms of suffering are going to happen, but they are cause for celebration. This will be echoed repeatedly and emphatically in Ignatius's treatment of the subject. Suffering for Paul was a chance to participate in grace.[490] Instead of something to avoid, they are instead an invaluable tool for spiritual growth. In a similar way, Ignatius suggests that spiritual gain is to be had by struggle[491] and that martyrdom will make him a better disciple of Christ.[492] It can be seen that even in Paul's earlier writings, persecution is being cast in a positive light. By casting suffering in this light, Paul effectively begins to shift the balance of power from the oppressors to the oppressed.

Further, as Jervis suggests, the suffering of the believers may even be seen by Paul to be a way in which Christians participate in God's bringing about the new age.[493] This is something Paul echoes in Gal. 4:19, saying: "My children, with whom I am again in labor until Christ is formed in you." Paul suffers for the Galatians until the new life in Christ is completed. Suffering goes beyond the individual to suffering for others. In these, Paul shows his understanding of suffering to be unavoidable,

---

[488] L. Ann Jervis, *At the Heart of the Gospel: Suffering in the Earliest Christian Message* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2007), 16.

[489] Thomas R. Schreiner, *Paul, Apostle of God's Glory in Christ: A Pauline Theology* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 2001), 87–102.

[490] R. Kent Hughes, *Philippians: The Fellowship of the Gospel* (Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 2007).

[491] Ign. *Pol.* 1.3.

[492] Ign. *Eph.* 1.2.

[493] Jervis, *At the Heart*, 18–20.

necessary for personal spiritual growth, and necessary for the growth of Christ's kingdom. As persecution spread from Judea to a greater Roman occurrence, Paul continues to find multiple reasons to embrace and even champion suffering. It is multifaceted and speaks directly to the spiritual condition of the new believers to whom he writes.

One more facet of Paul's use of suffering is important, as it will be echoed emphatically in Ignatius's letters, is Paul's use of suffering as a bolster to his authority.[494] Paul's authority is often challenged, as he was not one of the original twelve apostles of Christ. Paul makes his claims to authority most often in his example of suffering for the church.[495] Kelhoffer says it well:

> [F]or Paul suffering was a form of cultural capital that was a double-edged sword: it could be construed no only as detrimental to his and other persecutors' standing but also as a validation of his apostolic authority when that authority was under attack from rival Christian leaders.[496]

Paul's suffering, for the gospel and the church, provides him with not only proof of his faith, but imbibes him with an authority that he considers necessary in order to supersede his opponents. Nowhere is such a claim to authority more poignant than in his farewell to the Galatians in 6:17, which reads: "From now on let no one cause trouble for me, for I bear on my body the brand-marks of Jesus." Paul sees his suffering as both a symbol of pride, but more importantly, as a signifier of authority. Galatians sees language throughout suggesting that Paul has, by this time, gained the authority to distance himself from the "pillars" in Jerusalem.[497] This proof of authority will be echoed in Ignatius's numerous discussions regarding his own martyrdom. Paul's model of suffering as a claim to power will permeate the discourse of early Christianity, especially in Ignatius.[498]

---

[494] Frend, *Martyrdom*, 85.

[495] Sergio Rosell Nebreda, *Christ Identity: A Social-Scientific Reading of Philippians 2.5–11* (Oakville, CT: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2011).

[496] Kellhoffer, *Persecution*, 43.

[497] James D. G. Dunn, *The New Perspective on Paul* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2008), 189–90.

[498] Jonathan Hill, "The Self-Giving Power of God: Dunamis in Early Christianity," in *Divine Powers in Late Antiquity*, ed. Anna Marmodoro and Irini-Fotini Viltanioti, E-book (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017), n.p.

What has preceded is by no means an exhaustive look at Paul's embrace and teaching on suffering, but it provides a glimpse at the attitude he had towards the subject even early in his writings. It also provides an understanding of some of the earliest Christian attitudes-at-large toward suffering. One can see in the earliest extant Christian writings, the discourse of persecution and its effect on forming the Christian identity. Paul's theological teaching on the subject is vast and found throughout many of his epistles, of which an investigation here would be impractical.[499] Instead, a look at a few brief examples in other NT epistles will be more helpful to establish a base of understanding regarding suffering and persecution in the first, and into the second, centuries. Paul's writing constitutes roughly the middle of the first century. The remaining considerations regarding suffering constitute the very last decades of the first century into the very first of the second. They offer a glimpse of Christian attitudes of persecution that is contemporaneous with Ignatius.

4.2.1.2 First Peter

Although 1 Peter's theological traditions are the subject of debate, it is highly likely there is a strong Pauline influence in the letter.[500] This is not surprising, since Paul's letters themselves would have been frequently circulated among the early Christians, especially by the end of the first century.[501] This is not to say that 1 Pet. is a simple recreation of Pauline ideas regarding suffering. On the contrary, 1 Pet. functions as new ideas built from a Pauline attitude. Paul's views on suffering begin with its unavoidability, and then move to the growth of the believer, and finally to the growth of Christ's kingdom. First Peter particularly advances the latter understanding soteriologically. In 1 Pet. suffering takes on meaning and merit for its effect on the outsider, namely its persuasiveness.[502] For 1 Pet., the example of the believer under persecution acts as an irresistible witness to the greatness of Christ.[503]

---

[499] For an in-depth look, see Kelhoffer, *Persecution*, 30–92.

[500] David G. Horrell, "The Product of a Petrine Circle? A Reassessment of the Origin and Character of 1 Peter," *JSNT* 24.4 (2002): 29–60.

[501] Mowry argues effectively for the circulation of Paul's letters before their collection into a corpus in the later stages of the second century. As individual writings, and arguably the only extant Christian writing of the time, it seems reasonable to assume these writings were valuable enough for circulation. Further, Paul's corpus constitutes a model of didactic writing that is repeated by later New Testament authors; see Mowry, "The Early Circulation."

[502] Kelhoffer, *Persecution*, 105.

[503] 1 Pet. 2:21–24, 3:1–2.

This argument for the championing of suffering and martyrdom was echoed by Tertullian when he wrote: "The blood of the Christians is the seed of a new life."[504]

First Peter's other focus is eschatological, shifting the focus away from the Pauline ideas above to "eschatological vindication."[505] While finding continuity with Paul in the inferred notion that persecution will be a reality for the Christian, 1 Pet. distinctly looks to the end of time, to the reversal of their current persecution model. The author states (1 Pet. 4:16–18):

> [B]ut if anyone suffers as a Christian, he is not to be ashamed, but is to glorify God in this name. For it is time for judgment to begin with the household of God; and if it begins with us first, what will be the outcome for those who do not obey the gospel of God? And if it is with difficulty that the righteous is saved, what will become of the godless man and the sinner?

For the author of 1 Pet., the *eschaton* is both imminent and a source of hope for the persecuted. The end will bring about the reversal of fortunes for the suffering believers.

This brief overview of martyr discourse in the NT shows, even in its simplicity, the preoccupation the early church had with suffering and persecution. From the perspective of the early believers, one must assume that persecution was extremely common in the first century. But as Moss contends, this may be a mistaken interpretation.[506] De Ste. Croix also argues that the persecution of Christians was both localized and sporadic with only a very few generalized persecutions that were, once again, relatively brief.[507] However, the historical reality is less important than the rhetorical world being presented by the early Christian movement. Many of the earliest circulated texts create the impression that persecution was inevitable, and that martyrdom is, at the very least, commendable in response. By the second century, the discourse of suffering had become so prevalent that it formed the identity of the

---

[504] Tertullian, *Apol.* 50. Tertullian, *Q. Septimi Florentis Tertulliani Apologeticus*, ed. Franz Oehler and John E. B. Mayor, trans. Alexander Souter (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2012).

[505] Ibid., 115.

[506] Moss, *Myth*.

[507] De Ste. Croix, *Christian Persecution*, 106–7.

believers and possibly shaped their own perception of reality.[508] This gives great insight into Ignatius's treatment of the subject. However, it is helpful to examine other extant sources to understand the historical underpinnings of the suffering discourse of the early Christian movement. This study moves now to Roman and extracanonical Christian sources, gaining a wider perspective of suffering and martyrdom leading up to Ignatius. It is vital to understanding Ignatius's predicament, and therefore his pastoral response, to understand the discourse regarding Christianity by their Roman counterparts. The specific cultural context in which the second-century Christians find themselves creates a particular response. Understanding said context will aid in understanding that response, especially with regards to the pastoral response.

4.3 The Roman Discourse of Persecution against Christians

Roman religion, even in its cosmopolitan forms, was very important to many of the Roman citizens, but particularly to Roman leadership. Polybius, writing around 150 B.C.E., suggests Roman religion sets Rome above other cultures of his day. He writes: "But the quality in which the Roman commonwealth is most distinctly superior is in my opinion the nature of their religious convictions."[509] He goes on to say that this is particularly helpful when governing, using their religious convictions to keep order. He suggests there was wisdom "in introducing among the people notions concerning the gods and beliefs in the terrors of hell."[510] It was a way to keep public order. While Rome was considered tolerant among the ancients, the understanding of *religio* as a form of governance meant that tolerance existed only insofar as it did not interfere with public order.[511] Various religions were tolerated, especially for ethnic groups, as long as they were not offensive to the Roman people and their deities.[512] In other words, for the Roman officials, whatever else they may have actually believed regarding their religion, it was certainly understood as a vital part of their power. Horsley reveals that Augustus reorganized the Roman power relations into those of civil

---

[508] De Wet notes of the discourse of slavery in 1 Peter: "Slavery became a language to speak about oneself, about others, about God, the emotions, nature and the beyond and the life after death." In a similar way, suffering does the same, creating for early Jesus followers a framework with which they understood their reality; see De Wet, "Suffering Slave," 15-24.

[509] Polybius, *Hist.* 6.56.6. Polybius, *The Histories*, trans. W. R. Paton, 1st ed., vol. 3 of *Loeb Classical Library* 138 (London: Heinemann, 1923).

[510] Ibid.

[511] Kenneth R. Himes, *Christianity and the Political Order: Conflict, Cooptation, and Cooperation* (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 2013), n.p.

[512] Frend, *Martyrdom*, 106.

religion.[513] For the Romans, their concern was not whether a religious belief offended their beliefs, but rather if it interfered with their power.

In this political sphere, Christianity was distinctly offensive, not only in its theological claims of Christ alone as their object of worship, but in its social claims as well. Col. 3:11 sums up both saying, "a renewal in which there is no distinction between Greek and Jew, circumcised and uncircumcised, barbarian, Scythian, slave and freeman, but Christ is all, and in all." Not only does Paul make a suggestion that is insulting to the Roman gods, he also makes social claims that are disruptive to the status quo.[514] Adding to these dangerous ideas is the notion that Christianity is evangelistic. With Paul's gentile missions, Christianity is no longer an ethnic religion, it is something new. Christianity has aims to convert the masses, and this is at odds with the Roman religion and social order, and therefore goes beyond the tolerance of Rome. It makes sense then that a rising antagonism against the Christians emerged among the general Roman population. The discourse regarding the Christians within the Empire quickly turns against them in ways that are bizarre to the point of absurdity.

4.3.1 Public Discourse regarding Early Christians

As the Christians form their self-identity in part on the discourse of suffering and martyrdom, the Romans' perception of Christianity was formed by a discourse aimed at, not only "othering" the Christians, but vilifying them. While the Romans were masters at physically dominating a people group, the Christians were different in that they were not an established entity, but a growing populace from various strata of Roman society. By perpetuating negative discourses regarding the Christians, the Romans seek to dominate the Christians in a completely different way, by social pressure and perception.[515] Tertullian suggests the rumors about Christianity create a narrative that perpetuates persecution.[516] These rumors include infanticide, cannibalism, and sexual deviancy. To these rumors there is evidence that some Romans did not believe the totality of the charges. Cook suggests that some of these supposed rumors where not believed by many and, in fact, were debunked by an

---

[513] Richard A. Horsley, ed., *Paul and Empire: Religion and Power in Roman Imperial Society* (Harrisburg, PA: Trinity, 1997), 10–24.

[514] Michael F. Bird, *Colossians and Philemon: A New Covenant Commentary* (Cambridge: Lutterworth, 2014), 90–91.

[515] Essentially, the Romans are attempting to employ the tactic they use to not only "other" the barbarians outside of the Empire, but to make them inferior. In other words, it is a discourse of superiority that allows and perpetuates domination; see Herfried Münkler, *Empires: The Logic of World Domination from Ancient Rome to the United States*, trans. Patrick Camiller (Maldin, MA: Polity, 2007), 95–97.

[516] Tertullian, *Apol.* 7.8–14.

investigation by Pliny the Younger.[517] Benko, however, evidences correspondence between Octavius Januarius and Q. Caecilius Natalis that particularly blames the Christians for all of these crimes.[518]

Caecilius is clear of the Christians' reputation when he writes: "[T]hey call one another promiscuously brothers and sisters, that even a not unusually debauchery [sic.] may be the intervention of that sacred name become incestuous." He further accuses Christians thus:

> I hear they venerate the head of that vilest of all animals, the ass, consecrated by some foolish conceit or other..... The story of their initiation of new converts is equally well known and abominable. A child hidden in a shock of grain, that it may deceive the unwary is placed before the one being instructed in their sacred rites. This child, wrapped in the grain is killed by hidden and secret wounds inflicted by the convert who has been incited to apparently harmless blows. Alas! [sic.] the wickedness of it! Greedily they drink up the blood, eagerly they tear the limbs apart. They are banded together by this victim.[519]

In the court of public opinion this is quite damning. And although these opinions are not contemporaneous with Ignatius or the writers of the NT, they signify just how virulently despised the Christians were and how deviant their reputation among many Romans. The Roman discursive response to Christianity was, as far as we know, considerably inaccurate. The reasons for these misconceptions are not clear. Whether the rumors spread about Christianity were simply started out of ignorance or out of a purposeful campaign of slander cannot be known. However, the perpetuation built by the Roman discourse of Christianity produces, for many Romans, a deep mistrust and animosity toward Christians. The irony of the Roman discourse is that it is both a response to and

---

[517]John Granger Cook, *Roman Attitudes toward the Christians: From Claudius to Hadrian* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010), 48–50.

[518] Stephen Benko, *Pagan Rome and the Early Christians* (Bloomington; IN: Indiana University Press, 1984), 54–57.

[519] Minucius Felix, *Oct.* 8–9, trans. Lucile Starr Cravens, "The Octavius of Menucius Felix" (University of Illisois, 1911).

strengthened by the Christian discourse regarding themselves and their Roman brethren, because it was the secrecy of the Christians that led to the charge of *flagitia* by the Romans.[520]

Adding to this vitriolic disdain among the general populace in Rome was the politically antagonistic nature of the Christians. As previously noted in Col. 3:11, the Christians were establishing a new way of living life and were developing a new social order. This alone was cause for concern among the Romans. Even more disturbing was that, as De Ste. Croix puts it, "[t]hey were always talking about the imminent end of the world; and one of their books spoke with bitter hatred of Rome, thinly disguised under the name of Babylon, and prophesied its utter ruin."[521] This is not an insignificant form of antagonism. Further, by the time of John's writing of his Apocalypse, there was a call for Christians to remove themselves from civic life.[522] John sees an incompatibility between the life of the Christian and participation in guilds and other social and economic functions of the Roman cities.[523] By the end of the first century Christians were not only speaking antagonistically against the Roman Empire, but were a growing faction of people causing economic and social upheaval.[524]

4.3.2 Nero's Persecution: Political Discourse against Christians

In the first century, nowhere is the clash between Christians and Rome attested to more graphically than the episode of the great fire of Rome in 64 CE. The Roman historian Tacitus chronicled the fire, and Emperor Nero's response. Tacitus argues that Nero conducted himself admirably, providing shelter for those displaced, and bringing in food and other aid.[525] He went on to establish a new building code to prevent future conflagrations, and offered to help those displaced by the fire to rebuild their homes.[526] However, the discourse of the fire among the Romans was decidedly negative towards

---

[520] Frank L. Cross and Elizabeth A. Livingstone, eds., *The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), 1266.

[521] De Ste. Croix, *Christian Persecution*, 122.

[522] Particularly Rev. 18:3–4.

[523] Adela Y. Collins, "Persecution and Vengeance in the Book of Revelation," in *Apocalypticism in the Mediterranean World*, ed. David Hellholm (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1983), 729–50.

[524] Wilken notes that Romans in Bithynia complain to Pliny about a group of Christians. He guesses they had been refraining from economic activity, causing strife in the area; see Robert L. Wilken, *The Christians as the Romans Saw Them* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2003).

[525] Tacitus, *Ann.* 15.39.

[526] Ibid., 15.42.

Nero. The Emperor seized desolated land to build an enormous palace, and the ensuing discontent of the Roman citizens eventually turned to salacious rumor.[527] Since Nero used the fire to build a massive palace, many people believed a rumor that Nero purposefully set the blaze.[528] Unable to get rid of the rumor, "Nero fastened the guilt and inflicted the most exquisite tortures on a class hated for their abominations, called Christians by the populace."[529]

One can again see the discursive construction of a Christian identity among the Romans.[530] By building upon the reputation of Christians and fastening blame for the fire to them, Nero further exacerbated the Christians' notorious identity among the Romans. Nero's political discourse transforms the Christians from a fringe group of "others" whose purported practices created animosity among some Romans, to an active threat against the Empire and its citizens. Nero's new discourse takes Christians from the enemy of the social norms of the everyday Roman citizen to the enemy of the Empire itself. Tacitus continues saying:

> [A]n immense multitude was convicted, not so much of the crime of firing the city, as of hatred against mankind. Mockery of every sort was added to their deaths. Covered with the skins of beasts, they were torn by dogs and perished, or were nailed to crosses, or were doomed to the flames and burnt, to serve as a nightly illumination, when daylight had expired.[531]

---

[527] Ibid., 15.41, 44.

[528] Nero was not even in Rome at the time. When he did return to Rome, he enacted many civic improvements to help prevent future fires. Most notably he mandated new building codes to help eliminate the spread of fires across streets and to use less flammable materials. The confiscation of land to build his new palace, however, caused the uproar that eventually led to rumors that Nero set the fire himself, and even went so far as to accuse the emperor of singing while overlooking the conflagration; see James W. Ermatinger, *Daily Life of Christians in Ancient Rome* (Westport, CT: Greenwood, 2007), 67.

[529] Tacitus, *Ann*. 15.44. All translations of the Annals of Tacitus taken from Cornelius Tacitus, *Annals of Tacitus / Translated into English, with Notes and Maps by Alfred John Church and William Jackson Brodribb.*, trans. Alfred John Church (New York: Macmillan, 1888).

[530] Allan A. Lund, "Zur Verbrennung der sogenanten Chrestiani (Tac. Ann. 15,44)," *ZRGG* 60.3 (2008): 253–61.

[531] Tacitus, *Ann*. 15.44.

This is the persecution by which it is claimed Peter and Paul were executed in Rome.[532]

The whole episode shows the nature of hatred against the Christians and the ease at which an official persecution might arise. And while most of the persecution of Christians in the first two centuries was localized and sporadic, this first large-scale persecution of Christians shows the violent potential the discourse could have, and the speed at which the narrative can turn negative toward the Jesus movement. The danger for these early Christians was real if even only potentially. This played a large part in the psyche of all Christians.[533] In regard to Ignatius, that may have been a significant catalyst for his writing. This psychological effect on Christianity changes its own discourse about itself. In response to Nero, the Christians themselves crafted a narrative regarding Nero, one that will culminate in John's Revelation. Furthermore, the Christian narrative sets Paul as a model martyr, victorious in death against the tyrannical Emperor.[534] Added to the milieu of reasons for Christian persecution, the type and frequency of persecution is in need of examination for this study.

The nature of Roman action against the Christians is interesting given the legal status of Christians at this time. As already noted, persecutions were not continuous against the Christians, but its illegality was a constant.[535] Williams asks then: why was Christianity not summarily wiped out? Why was persecution not a constant daily occurrence for the Christians?[536] The answer, Williams suggests, is in two main factors: the legal system within the Roman provinces, and the social relationship between

---

[532] The primary evidence for this is nearly exclusive to apocryphal works like the *Acts of Peter, Acts of Paul,* and to a lesser extent, the *Acts of the Holy Apostles Peter and Paul*; see Eastman, *Ancient Martyrdom Accounts*, xvii–xxv.

[533] Rubén Rosario Rodríguez, *Christian Martyrdom and Political Violence: A Comparative Theology with Judaism and Islam* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2017), 122.

[534] J. Albert Harrill, "St. Paul and the Christian Communities of Nero's Rome," in *The Cambridge Companion to the Age of Nero*, ed. Shadi Bartsch, Kirk Freudenburg, and Cedric Littlewood (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017), 276–89.

[535] Williams makes the argument that the legal status of Christianity itself was fluid into the beginning of the second century. He finds no specific Roman edicts against Christianity itself. Instead, he argues that the actions of Christians were illegal, particularly not paying tribute to the Roman gods, a requirement of all the Roman citizens. It was not until the second century that Christianity was considered illegal and even then only because of prior reputation. Although this distinction would be important in another context, for this study it is much more important to note the larger context of Christian persecution, not necessarily its legal status. Although Williams's distinction may be true, in actual Roman responses against early Christians, the distinction is much less-clearly defined. Also, by the time of Ignatius the legal status had already shifted to making Christianity itself illegal; see Williams, *Persecution*, 179–236.

[536] Williams, *Persecution*, 226–27.

the Christians and the general populace.[537] Thus, it is to the nature of the conflict and the prosecutorial system that this study will now turn. This makes Ignatius's response to his own persecution much clearer.

4.3.3 The Nature of Persecution: Pliny's Correspondence with Trajan

Perhaps the best evidence for the average treatment of Christianity is found in correspondence between Emperor Trajan and Pliny the Younger circa 112 C.E. Not only is this valuable for its definitive language concerning Christian legal proceedings, but also for being contemporaneous with Ignatius.[538] As such, their correspondence regarding Christians will be examined to gain a clear picture of the legal proceedings against Christians in Ignatius's day. Their correspondence is certainly helpful to prove the historicity of Christian persecution, but also provides a glimpse of the perception the Roman authorities have of the Christians. Essentially this provides a gauge by which the impact of discourses surrounding these groups can be measured.

Pliny, who was appointed governor of Bithynia and Pontus from 110–112 C.E., sheds great light on the workings of Roman governance at the beginning of the second century. Like any proconsul up until the latter part of the second century, Pliny constituted the *imperium* in his region.[539] Particularly valuable to this study is Pliny's concern over the handling of Christians. Out of concern that he is proceeding properly, Pliny writes to Trajan:

> I have never been present at any legal examination of the Christians, and I do not know, therefore, what are the usual penalties passed upon them, or the limits of those penalties, or how searching an inquiry should be made. I have hesitated a great deal in considering whether any distinctions should be drawn according to the ages of the accused; whether the weak should be punished as severely as the more robust; whether if they renounce their faith they should be pardoned, or whether the

---

[537] Ibid., 227–39.

[538] This is also telling based on Pliny's location. The province of Bithynia, where Pliny was proconsul, was located on the northwest corner of the Anatolian Peninsula, not far from Antioch. Pontus, of which he was also governor was even closer. The correspondence shows, not only how a governor himself would act in the case of Christians, but also how one in the general geographic and metropolitan context of Antioch would proceed in such cases.

[539] Adrian N. Sherwin-White, *Roman Society and Roman Law in the New Testament: The Sarum Lectures 1960–1961* (Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2004), 1-5.

man who has once been a Christian should gain nothing by recanting; whether the name itself, even though otherwise innocent of crime, should be punished, or only the crimes that gather round it.[540]

One can see from the onset that Christian "persecution," or perhaps better viewed here as prosecution, was not common enough for Pliny to have a precedent on which to follow. This was not an everyday legal matter that Pliny understood, and as such he seeks the guidance from the Emperor himself. Another note from this correspondence that must be mentioned is that the prosecution of Christians was handled by the regional governors.[541]

Even in this opening stanza of Pliny's letter, the understanding of Christian persecution in the early second century is seen to be sporadic and regional. To the former, the evidence of Pliny's ignorance on the subject serves as proof that these occurrences were infrequent. To the latter, Pliny's own words suggest he has jurisdiction in the matter. Furthermore, Pliny's lack of understanding whether Christians should be punished for the name itself, even without other offenses, shows the relative ambiguity of the prosecutorial practices.

What Pliny continues with illustrates the timidity with which he proceeded with prosecution. Pliny continued:

> In the meantime, this is the plan which I have adopted in the case of those Christians who have been brought before me. I ask them whether they are Christians; if they say yes, then I repeat the question a second and a third time, warning them of the penalties it entails, and if they still persist, I order them to be taken away to prison. For I do not doubt that, whatever the character of the crime may be which they confess, their pertinacity and inflexible obstinacy certainly ought to be punished.[542]

---

[540] Pliny, *Ep.* 10.96. All translations of the letters of Pliny taken from Pliny, *The Letters of the Younger Pliny*, trans. John Benjamin Firth (2 vol, 1900).

[541] De Ste. Croix, *Christian Persecution*, 113.

[542] Pliny, *Ep.* 10.96.

There are two points to be addressed here. The first is that Pliny interrogated the accused once, and then if the accused confessed, a second and third time, giving a great deal of time for defense and even repentance. This was not malicious prosecution, but a thorough examining of the suspect with what appears to be a desire to avoid handing down severe punishment.[543] Secondly, Pliny admits he knows nothing of the creed of Christians, whether they are good or bad. Instead he sentences them to death because of their stubbornness and obstinacy.[544]

To Pliny's credit, he shows great restraint to those accused of being Christians. While it has been shown that rumors about Christianity had presented the early Christians as horrible criminals, Pliny shows an open mind, enough to at least admit he knows nothing of their creed. This is similar to earlier in his letter when he wonders if Christians should be prosecuted, even without offense other than the name Christian. Pliny continues his reasoned assessment of the Christians by telling Trajan that after interrogating apostate Christians he discovered that their gatherings were harmless, and the worst thing that could be said of them was they followed "depraved, excessive superstition."[545]

This is, again, a very different picture from the wanton persecution that is often attributed to the entirety of early Roman and Christian interaction. In his response, Trajan echoes the cautiousness of Pliny and, although vague and measured, Trajan makes restraint the unofficial policy of Rome toward the Christians. Trajan writes:

> You have adopted the proper course, my dear Pliny, in examining into the cases of those who have been denounced to you as Christians, for no hard and fast rule can be laid down to meet a question of such wide extent. The Christians are not to be hunted out ; if they are brought before you and the offence is proved, they are to be punished, but with this reservation - that if any one denies that he is a Christian and makes it clear that he is not, by offering prayers to our deities, then he is to be

---

[543] This is a view Williams believes is too generous for Pliny. Instead he suggests Pliny feigns ignorance and already had a good understanding of what he was doing; see Williams, *Persecution*, 204–5.

[544] Sherwin-White presents a theory that Pliny discovered the spurious nature of the *flagitia*, the crimes usually attributed to the Christians. He then prosecutes them for their obstinacy, which Sherwin-White calls *contumacia*. This theory is vigorously opposed by De Ste. Croix. See Adrian N. Sherwin-White, "The Early Persecutions and Roman Law Again," in *JTS* 3.2 (1952): 199–213; and De Ste. Croix, *Christian Persecution*, 123–27.

[545] Pliny, *Ep.* 10.96.

pardoned because of his recantation, however suspicious his past conduct may have been. *   But pamphlets published anonymously must not carry any weight whatever, no matter what the charge may be, for they are not only a precedent of the very worst type, but they are not in consonance with the spirit of our age.[546]

Trajan affirms Pliny's policy of allowing repentance for the crime of Christianity. However, Trajan specifies some very telling procedure that helps to contextualize Ignatius and other Christian leaders in their response to Roman law. There are two related ideas in Trajan's response that affirm the circumstance of the average Christian: they are not to be sought out, and they cannot be prosecuted anonymously.[547] This is in keeping with established Roman law, which requires an accuser to be known.[548] While this direction does not mitigate the illegality of Christianity in its first few centuries, it does provide illumination into the level of perceived persecution. Although illegal, Christians were in little danger of open persecution unless they were formally accused by a third party. To this, though, is added the prohibition against malicious prosecution, attested to by Eusebius. If someone was found guilty of *columny*, they would be punished.[549] This narrative not only makes Ignatius's call to unity for the sake of avoiding persecution not only plausible, but likely.

4.3.4 Roman Law

Using the example of this correspondence between Pliny and Trajan, it is clear that Christians were prosecuted as ciminals under Roman rule.[550] The peculiarities of the Roman legal system, however, provide a modicum of safety to any of Rome's citizenry, including Christians.[551] Roman legal status could only be raised, however, by a *delator* (prosecutor). This *delator* must be willing to openly accuse

---

[546] Pliny, *Ep.* 10.97.

[547] In the case of Pliny, the citizens of Bithynia-Pontus began to accuse Christians frequently, causing their trials and condemnation on an increasingly frequent basis. This, however, did not result in a shift in policy. Christianity remained illegal, but its members were not sought by the authorities, but needed to be accused by their fellow countrymen; see, Wilken, *The Christians*, 22–25.

[548] Sherwin-White, *Roman Society*, 18.

[549] Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.* 4.9.3.

[550] Bernard Green, *Christianity in Ancient Rome: The First Three Centuries* (New York: T&T Clark, 2010), 120.

[551] This is particularly due to the prosecutorial system in place, as there was no public prosecutor. There needed to be an accuser, of which a number of different categories were permitted; see Andrew Lintott, "Crime and Punishment," in *The Cambridge Companion to Roman Law*, ed. David Johnston (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015), 301–31.

the Christian and provide evidence of the fact insofar as they themselves could not be considered maliciously prosecuting another Roman citizen. De Ste. Croix explains:

> It is important to remember that the standard procedure in punishing Christians was "accusatory" and not "inquisitorial": a governor would not normally take action until a formal denunciation (*delatio nominis*) was issued by a *delator*, a man who was prepared not merely to inform but actually to conduct the prosecution in person, and to take the risk of being himself arraigned on a charge of *calumnia*, malicious prosecution, if he failed to make out a sufficient case.[552]

The correspondence between Pliny and Trajan prove that prosecution did occur, but the intricacies of the Roman legal system raise serious questions as to the frequency of this occurrence. Although much is left to conjecture, it is reasonable to assume a peaceful existence between Christians and the average Roman citizen. In many cases it may have required a larger grievance or calamity to affect such prosecution to begin with, something that will be examined later in this chapter. It must be said that the public discourse made the situation more difficult in the case of the Christians. Even the correspondence itself proves the public discourse clouded Pliny's own judgement, to which he then appealed to Trajan, showing that even a governor was at a loss for correct procedure. That does not change the fact that Roman law made prosecution difficult to varying degrees, thus raising the question as to the frequency of prosecution.

Another idiosyncrasy of the Roman legal system was the acceptance of bribery as a means to escape prosecution. There were essentially two options a potential convict has in this regard. The first is to pay off the *delator* himself, thereby eliminating the prosecution from the start. The second is to bribe the authorities under which one is to be tried. Both of these were seen as acceptable in Roman society.[553] One can see this concept in Ignatius's letter to the Romans when he urges them not to interfere or use their influence to secure his release.[554] Under Roman law, bribery was often a way in which one could escape prosecution.

---

[552] De Ste. Croix, *Christian Persecution*, 120.

[553] Ibid., 123.

[554] Ign. *Rom.* 4.1.

Combined with the larger social misinterpretation of the Christians, spread by rumors of *flagitia*, and attested to by Pliny, persecution of Christians was certainly a reality. What is certainly not a reality, outside of a few unique circumstances, was the official seeking out of Christians for what could be considered anything of a systematic persecution.[555] However, since persecution was a reality for the Christians on any scale, it is necessary to examine the reaction to persecution, especially among Christian leaders.[556] Christian persecution was web of complex discursive responses to competing world views. Even a cursory understanding of the Roman legal code is vital to understanding Ignatius's pastoral response. While it has been established that Christianity is illegal, the law code actually makes prosecution of Christianity difficult, to a degree. It is precisely this moderate difficulty that creates the conditions necessary for Ignatius to conclude that unity is the best path to salvation. By advocating a church governance that ultimately hands control to one person, Ignatius is ensuring that matters of conflict remain internal, decreasing the chances of a public disruption that could lead to prosecution. In other words, unity is the means to the greenest pasture, and as shepherd, Ignatius chooses that path. To extend that analogy to its fullest, the monepiscopacy is the shepherd's crook that keeps the sheep on the path of unity. This study now turns to the response of the *pasteur* in order to determine if this response corresponds with that of Ignatius at the turn of the second century.

4.4 The Pastoral Response to Persecution

Exploring the response of pastoral power to persecution will help provide a baseline by which to measure the response of Ignatius. If his response is similar to what can be theoretically extrapolated from Foucault's assertions, then it can be said with credibility if he is responding in similar fashion. If his personal convictions are rooted in pastoral power, it can be assumed that his ecclesiological program will be, in some way, based on the concepts of pastoral power.[557] Again it is worth noting

---

[555] Green, *Christianity*, 120.

[556] It is important to understand that it is helpful to examine persecution from both the oppressor and the oppressed. Not only is it illuminating in terms of discovering a balanced perspective, but it also illuminates the perceived reality of each group. For example, on one hand the Romans might feel their dealing with the relatively small group of Christians is inconsequential compared to the monumental task of governing the entirety of the vast Roman Empire. Meanwhile, the same circumstances will inevitably weigh heavy on the psyche of the Christians, who would feel the persecution more acutely and as monumental occurrences.

[557] The institutionalizing of pastoral power is theorized by Foucault. If pastoral tendencies are present in the second century, it is reasonable to think these will present themselves in any institutionalization, even one attempting to find adoption within the early church.

that Foucault's work on pastoral power within Christianity begins with what he presumes is its institutionalization in the church in the fourth century. Although he never directly addresses pastoral power within the context of persecution in the early church, his thoughts on a shepherd in crisis theoretically shows what a response would look like.

4.4.1 Ignatius and Foucault's *Dispositif*

Foucault believed that any kind of governmental power, but specifically pastoral power, was one whose fundamental charge is the security of those in its care; one that begets what Foucault calls *dispositif* or "apparatuses of security."[558] A reasonable interpretation for this is what one could also call "institutionalized security." It is worth noting that Foucault's use of this term is distinctive. While translated as apparatus, *dispositif* is distinct from the etymologically closer *appareil*, which was also a word available to Foucault. Bussolini believes this is an intentional distinction used by Foucault to differentiate these "apparatuses of security" from those of the state itself.[559] Further, Bussolini suggests Foucault's intention may have been to connect the term, which comes from the Latin translation of the Greek term οἰκονομία, with an economy of power, notably one that is pastoral in nature.[560] This echoes the way in which Foucault sees the management of power relationships, not as law, but in a fluid series of decisions made by both the powerful, and those in their care.

Foucault says: "The dispositive is precisely this: an ensemble (set) of strategies of relations of force which condition certain types of knowledge and is conditioned by them."[561] Power in any form is a relational response to the conditions in which one finds them. Even more related to the current examination of persecution, Foucault believed these power relationships are brought out in an emergency. He again said, "with the term dispositive, I understand a type of—so to speak—formation which in a certain historical moment had as its essential function to respond to an emergency."[562]

---

[558] This thought is interwoven through much of Foucault's *Security, Territory, Population* lectures; see, Foucault, *Security*, 16–108.

[559] Jeffrey Bussolini, "What Is Dispositive?," *Foucault Studies* 10 (2010): 85–107.

[560] Ibid.

[561] Michel Foucault, *Dits et écrits*, vol. 3; quoted in Bussolini, "What Is Dispositive?", 91–92.

[562] Ibid.

If power has this relational response, brought out by a response to an emergency, it seems logical that this is a good starting point in examining the response of our main subject, Ignatius, in reaction to the most pressing emergency in the early church, its persecution. If Foucault is correct, the emergency status of the church in the early second century provides the conditions by which pastoral power will be solidified institutionally, by its response to this ongoing crisis. Another way to state this is that persecution creates the *dispositif* that catalyzes pastoral power into early Christian ecclesiology. In the same way, the pastoral response of *pasteur* is in itself a *dispositif.* As the *pasteur* responds to the persecution with martyrdom, the crisis deepens, and pastoral power actually increases.

When reflecting on Ignatius's consistent calls to the monepiscopacy, something that will eventually turn into institutionalized pastoral power, there are two points to be made regarding the above notion of pastoral power. First, one must understand that Ignatius, as a *pasteur,* is inherently concerned with safety and security. And the second is the security apparatuses of pastoral power, particularly within a given structure or organization (in this case the early Christian church), are based on this basic understanding of security, but arise in response to outside forces.[563] For example, it is not enough to say that, based on pastoral power, Ignatius prized safety, sustenance, individualization, and benevolence. Instead, as Foucault has suggested, the *dispositif* of Ignatius is defined in relationship to the surrounding culture or circumstance. This is why Foucault says:

> This does not mean that pastoral power has remained an invariant and fixed structure throughout fifteen, eighteen, or twenty centuries of Christian history. We may even say that the importance, vigor, and depth of implantation of this pastoral power can be measured by the intensity and multiplicity of agitations, revolts, discontent, struggles, battles, and bloody wars that have been conducted around, for, and against it.[564]

Therefore, the discourse of persecution, both within and outside the early church, both play a role in Ignatius's particular pastoral response. The nature of Christian self-identity as both persecuted and

---

[563] Jeffrey Bussolini, "Michel Foucault's Influence on the Thought of Giorgio Agamben," in *A Foucault for the 21st Century: Governmentality, Biopolitics and Discipline in the New Millennium*, ed. Sam Binkley and Jorge Capetillo (Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars, 2009), 104–21.

[564] Foucault*, Security*, 199.

martyrs, and the larger social discourse regarding Christianity, create the conditions necessary for Ignatius to form a discourse of leadership that, in his mind, should be the ecclesiological standard. The discursive heritage given to Ignatius, as well as the discursive reality in which he finds himself, dictate his response to crisis. In Ignatius's case, that crisis was the tumult within the various churches in Antioch and his subsequent arrest.

If pastoral power is a power most vibrant in crisis, when there is danger, persecution, inner-turmoil, or disagreement, pastoral power can be measured by the level of crisis. For this study, it can be argued that this is a particular reason why Ignatius's leadership takes the form and is institutionalized as pastoral, and why Ignatius as a self-fashioned shepherd champions this form of governance. The crises of the early church exacerbates the level of pastoral power, elevating it above other models of power.[565] Since pastoral power was part of the influence among the early Christians, it is reasonable then to suggest that ecclesiology is a series of dispositive pastoral responses, arising specifically to the needs of the congregation. Ignatius, writing in response to both the internal crises of warring factions within Antioch and the resulting personal persecution he is facing, can be seen as ever-increasing dispositive responses.

Since these crises for Ignatius occur in the formative years of the early church, especially the years when institutionalization was beginning to materialize, a pastoral institution can be reasonably expected. This study will now examine these two ideas in greater detail, beginning with Ignatius's (and subsequently pastoral power's) commitment to security and care, followed by its proposed implementation in the context of early second-century Christianity.

4.4.2 Pastoral Power's Sacrifice

It will be helpful to return briefly to the Christian theme of shepherd, particularly as it relates to self-sacrifice, as this is wholly unique, not only as a theme of pastoral power, but of its distinctly Christian form. If there is a feature of the Christian shepherd that distinguishes itself most from the Hebraic expression, it is self-sacrifice, although there is considerable evidence of Jewish influence on Christian

---

[565] There are certainly other forms of power within the New Testament. Much of the writings of Paul suggest differing and variable types of leadership. The discussion remains whether there was a mandate for offices base on the charismata. Thus, pastoral leadership's domination should be examined. See Pheme Perkins, "Power in the New Testament," *Proceedings of the Catholic Theological Society of America* 37 (2013).

martyrdom.[566] While Foucault suggests self-sacrifice is a theme found in the Mosaic literature, it is transformed in Christian thought into the "keystone of the whole organization of the church."[567] Self-sacrifice, then, can be seen as one of the main dispositive responses to the power of the Roman Empire. The Christians, as the dominated population, could have chosen multiple mechanisms to help ease their suffering, as such populations often use.[568] Christians chose martyrdom. One telling episode in Christian literature is found in the "Quo vadis" story from the *Apocryphal Acts of Peter*, where Peter begins to try and sneak away from persecution only to be convicted to return to Rome to face his martyrdom. Such a story underscores the Christian belief that martyrdom is the preferred mode of resistance to the persecution by the Romans.[569] By refashioning themselves not only as persecuted people, but active self-sacrificers in the mold of Jesus himself, the early Christians subvert the destructive power of persecution and turn it to their own gain. This is seen most vibrantly in Ignatius's writings. By becoming a sacrificial shepherd, Ignatius subverts the power of persecution, but also set the mold for future ecclesiological structure by showing the call of the shepherd to be serious and glorious. The sacrificial theme of the shepherd comes directly from the understanding of Christ as the quintessential shepherd. Understanding the self-sacrificial underpinnings of the Christian shepherd is vital to understanding Ignatius's self-identity, and his vision for church leadership structure.

4.4.2.1 The Good Shepherd: Christ as the Paragon of Sacrifice

As I will show later, Ignatius sees in his self-sacrifice an imitation of Jesus. Further, this imitation is seen by Ignatius to have real salvific purpose. Ignatius writes the phrase, "attain to God," regarding his own life.[570] In his mind, with his imitation of Christ unto death, Ignatius's martyrdom becomes the ultimate way in which he can have union with Jesus. The early Christian understanding of martyrdom was seen in a similar fashion, where teachers especially must accept martyrdom as imitation of Christ.[571] This is a notion whose foundations can be traced to the writing of John. Not

---

[566] Jan W. van Henten, "Zum Einfluß jüdischer Martyrien auf die Literatur des frühen Christentums, II. Die Apostolischen Väter," *ANRW* 2.27.1 (1993): 700–23.

[567] Foucault, *Security*, 203.

[568] James C. Scott, *Weapons of the Weak: Everyday Forms of Peasant Resistance* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2008), 241–303.

[569] Daniel Boyarin, *Dying for God: Martyrdom and the Making of Christianity and Judaism* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1999), 42–46.

[570] Ign. *Rom.* 4.1.

[571] Boyarin, *Dying,* 46.

only does John set up Christ as the paragon of pastoral care and sacrifice, he also sets the standard by which Christians can become one with Christ through a reciprocal and mystic relationship.[572] This relationship ultimately leads to the participation of the believer in Christ's sacrifice and victory. Understanding John's account of Christ's teaching will show the discourse of self-sacrifice not only adopted, but championed, by Ignatius. Ignatius's pastoral understanding, particularly regarding imitation and sacrifice, and its implementation into an ecclesial structure, are best understood as a continued evolution of the discourse of self-sacrifice found in John.

John's Gospel is by far the richest in pastoral imagery, and it is from this that one finds the "good shepherd" discourse.[573] By examining John's Gospel, a pattern of pastoral behavior and instruction can be seen that is echoed in Ignatius's self-narrative. John's discourse of pastoral sacrifice has a direct and immediate impact on Ignatius's understanding of his martyrdom and its effects on the community under his care. In fact, without the direct inference of both the self-sacrificial shepherd and the onus within John to emulate that sacrifice, Ignatius's self-understanding as a martyr has no basis.

The fact that Ignatius writes so confidently about martyrdom is because he does so alluding to the emulation of Jesus. This shows his beliefs to be rooted in some authoritative idea. John 10:1–21 in particular provides the basis for self-sacrifice as a particular Christian understanding of pastoral power. Contained within a larger framework of pastoral imagery, John 10, the "Good Shepherd" discourse, records Christ self-identifying as a shepherd. Not only is this unique in its language among the Gospels, but it is based on the Christology contained within John; the shepherd motif is contrasted further.[574]

---

[572] Hans Burger, *Being in Christ: A Biblical and Systematic Investigation in a Reformed Perspective* (Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2009), 280–387.

[573] Once again, this study is not concerned with the historicity of the Fourth Gospel, but rather its place among early Christians. It is much more important for this study to understand the Gospel as a whole, and how it affected the Christian communities in the first and second centuries. For a brief analysis of the varied approaches to John, see Francis J. Moloney, *The Gospel of John*, ed. Daniel J. Harrington (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical, 1998), 11–13.

[574] Sabbe argues for John's reliance on the synoptics for much of his gospel's theme. However, he does acknowledge the uniqueness of the language and symbolism used in John, particularly the robust expression of the shepherd motif found in John 10; see Marc Sabbe, "John 10 and Its Relationship to the Synoptic Gospels," in *The Shepherd Discourse of John 10 and Its Context*, ed. Johannes Beutler and Robert T. Fortna (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 74–93.

The Good Shepherd discourse itself is a continuation of a larger dispute surrounding Jesus's healing of a blind man.[575] As stated above, scholars tentatively agree that John is organized into a prologue, epilogue and two distinct sections in between now known as the "Book of Signs," and the "Book of Glory."[576] That would squarely place the Good Shepherd discourse within the "Book of Signs." However, a theory presented by Mlakuzhyil argues that there exists a middle bridge section of the Gospel that bridges the two themes.[577] In this theory this story is placed in his proposed bridge section, transitioning the narrative to its final act.

Whether Mlakuzhyil is correct or not, his theory shows how passages such as the Good Shepherd discourse can serve as a pivotal moment in the Gospel. It is in Jesus's self-described notion as shepherd, and particular self-sacrificing shepherd, that one sees the fullest expression of both his power, as expressed in his signs and miracles, and his salvific sacrifice, as expressed in the shepherd motif. As bishop, Ignatius sees himself as the shepherd of his flock, and his duty to it is the same as that of Christ.[578] It is this discourse of self-sacrifice found in John that is most impactful for Ignatius's own writing on the subject.

The Good Shepherd discourse brings together the main themes of John's Gospel and ties together the dichotomy of Jesus as both powerful and sacrificial savior.[579] One can view the entire discourse, beginning in John 9, as a transition from Jesus as miracle worker to Jesus as sacrificial savior. As Carson notes, Jesus uses symbolic language here, something that is distinct from the parables of the Synoptic Gospels.[580] Instead of using a narrative parable, Jesus directly refers to himself in symbolism, establishing an archetypal pattern by which others could follow.

---

[575] Laniak, *Shepherds*, 212.

[576] For a summary, see George Mlakuzhyil, *The Christocentric Literary Structure of the Fourth Gospel* (Rome: Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 1987).

[577] Ibid.

[578] Gomola does excellent work showing the pastoral connection of church leadership at a very early date, showing the linguistic and cognitive threads that bind the two; see Aleksander Gomola, *Conceptual Blending in Early Christian Discourse: A Cognitive Linguistic Analysis of Pastoral Metaphors in Patristic Literature* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2018).

[579] This theme of voluntarily laying down power is continued throughout the NT among the followers of Jesus, particularly in Paul's writings, see Perkins, "Power."

[580] Donald A. Carson, *The Gospel according to John* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1991).

By referring to himself in such rich imagery, one that was imminently recognizable for those who heard and read them, Jesus attaches his identity in such approachable human terms that, when followers do begin to surround Jesus and his movement, the task of emulation becomes rather simple.[581] Within this symbolic self-reference, Jesus sets the framework for his leadership, the power-relationship between him and his followers, the salvific significance of his death, and the emulative path by which Christianity will proceed. This will be the path Ignatius walks so confidently as he is led to his martyrdom.

In the words of John 10 alone there is much to be extrapolated regarding pastoralism. His language is suggestive of Old Testament symbolism where God refers to Israel with the same term ,"my sheep."[582] The parallels between John 10 and Ezek. 34 are more than coincidental, and places Jesus in high Christological thought. Having established his leadership and with allusions to his divinity, Jesus then speaks of his self-sacrifice and the authority he has to both give his life for the sheep and then take it back up again (John 10:11–18). This returns then to the earlier statements Jesus made regarding the sheep following his lead (10:1–5). In this way, one can see that a cursory review of John 10 can show that Jesus self-identifies as a pastoral leader who is to be followed and emulated. Jesus goes first, the sheep follow.

If one were to look at the discourse from its linear logic, then the concept of emulating Christ's self-sacrifice becomes even more apparent. The discourse opens by establishing the notion that the sheep follow. Only then does the "good shepherd" lay down his life. The sheep do not follow the shepherd because he lays down his life, but because "they know his voice" (John 10:4).

By the time self-sacrifice enters the discourse in verse 11, the sheep have already been led out; they are already following. And while this distinction is subtle, the chronology of this following suggests that when the shepherd lays down his life for the sheep, the sheep will continue to follow. The

---

[581] Perkins believes "Jesus' disciples are not trained to carry on the teaching of a master." Instead they are called to follow in his pattern of living to serve the kingdom of God. Thus, language such as this provides an easy path to follow; see Perkins, "Power," 86–87.

[582] Ezek. 34:10–24.

inference here is the sheep may follow the shepherd to the same type of sacrifice.[583] This would be stretching John 10 if it were not accompanied by other references in John to this self-sacrificial model. If John 10 gently introduces the concept, the epilogue (John 21) offers a strongly worded bolster to it.

Thus far, the discourse regarding persecution, martyrdom, and self-sacrifice has shown that following Jesus will mean some form of sacrifice and persecution. It has been shown that the identity of the early Jesus follower was that of the persecuted, but also one that was turned to martyrdom. In Ignatius, however, the discourse of martyrdom not only changes in intensity, but in purpose as well. Preiss in particular argues for the shift in understanding between Paul's and Ignatius's understanding of martyrdom by suggesting that Paul wanted believers to participate with Christ, Ignatius wanted to imitate him.[584] The nuances of Ignatius's discourse on martyrdom have been debated over the past century.[585] In the epilogue of John there is evidence that Ignatius was neither the originator nor the sole believer to champion imitating the sacrifice of Christ. John 21 has long been debated for its supposed addition to the original form of the Gospel, which many assume finished with John 20:31.[586] Again, this issue is not important to this study, as the reception of the Gospel among the early Christians is the important aspect, and there are no textual traditions that do not include John 21.[587] The importance to early Christians of this supposed addition to the Gospel is evidenced in its inclusion from the outset. As such, the words contained within are of particular importance to this study. Particularly, the interaction between Jesus and Peter is of great fascination, as it takes the pastoral and sacrificial themes of the entirety of John's Gospel and propels them onto the followers of Christ. This will be echoed repeatedly in Ignatius, whose self-proclaimed goal is to "attain to God."

---

[583] This logic is inspired by the work of Sang-Hoon Kim, who lays out the structure of John, and uses the individual statements to qualify their counterparts. Although Kim never uses this logic to examine sacrifice as a pattern for discipleship, he does use it to examine the relationship between the "good shepherd" and the sheep; see Sang-Hoon Kim, *Sourcebook of the Structures and Styles in John 1–10: The Johannine Parallelisms and Chiasms* (Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2014).

[584] Theodor Preiss, "La mystique de l'imitation du Christ et de l'unité chez Ignace d'Antioche," *RHPR* 17 (1938): 197–241.

[585] Mellink provides a very detailed analysis of the scholarship regarding Ignatius's understanding of his own martyrdom and its theological and cultural influences; see A. O. Mellink, "Death as Eschaton: A Study of Ignatius of Antioch's Desire for Death," (Ph.D. diss., University of Amsterdam, 2000), 51–129.

[586] Patrick E. Spencer, "Narrative Echoes in John 21: Intertextual Interpretation and Intratextual Connection," *JSNT* 75 (1999): 49–68.

[587] Francis J. Moloney, *Glory not Dishonor: Reading John 13–21* (Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2004).

The dialogue between Jesus and Peter is full of allusions to the earlier parts of John's Gospel, and particularly to the notion of both pastoralism and sacrifice.[588] Within the midst of Peter's threefold affirmation of love for Jesus (John 21:15–17), Jesus directs Peter three times to shepherd, or feed, his sheep. Jesus, in this interaction, commissions Peter as a shepherd.[589] This is the mold by which those who lead the church would be cast. The fact that it was done three times alludes back to Peter's denial of Christ during his trial.

This reference to what had occurred earlier in the Gospel is important, as the writer uses it multiple times to connect what Jesus is saying to other themes in the Gospel, creating a powerful allusion to Christ as exemplar.[590] The connection then between Jesus's use of shepherding as a command for Peter, also alludes to Jesus's self-identification in John 10. This is a watershed moment, placing the mantle of leadership, and setting the expectation of leadership moving forward, on a successor to Christ's aforementioned "good shepherd." If this was the extent of the discourse, its effects would be staggering. With this alone, one could see the ramifications for future leaders such as Ignatius. However, the dialogue continues even further, suggesting that to "shepherd" will mean, in some cases, to sacrifice.

If Jesus sets the model of leadership in John 21:15–17, he details the extent to which the shepherd must go to follow Christ's example immediately. John 21:18–19 continues the conversation and reinforces the notion that to follow Christ is to emulate Christ, even his self-sacrifice. John 10:18–29 quotes Jesus as saying:

> "Truly, truly, I say to you, when you were younger, you used to gird yourself and walk wherever you wished; but when you grow old, you will stretch out your hands and someone else will gird you, and bring you where you do not wish to *go*." Now this He said, signifying by what kind of death he would

---

[588] Spencer, "Narrative."

[589] Or as Aus suggests, "*the* shepherd." See Roger D. Aus, *Simon Peter's Denial and Jesus' Commissioning Him as His Successor in John 21:15–19: Studies in Their Judaic Background* (New York: University Press of America, 2013).

[590] Little, "Peter and the Beloved Disciple," 36–43.

glorify God. And when He had spoken this, He said to him, "Follow Me!"

Significantly, the author of John 21 distinctly sees Peter's death as a way in which he will follow Christ. Stibbe notes this is the transference of the role of "good shepherd" from Jesus to Peter.[591] By ending this section, which plainly suggests Peter's martyrdom, with Jesus saying, "Follow Me," the author implies that Jesus is saying to follow him into death. This is directly reflected in the writing of Ignatius when he suggests that following Christ in his death will make him a true Christian. In fact, Ignatius not only latches on to this concept found in John, he furthers the discourse even more to champion martyrdom. He writes in *Rom.* 3.2: "For me, ask only that I have power both inside and out, that I not only speak but also have desire, that I not only be called a Christian but also be found one." In speaking of his martyrdom in such language, Ignatius equates being a true Christian with being willing to die for Christ's sake.

John 21:15–19 restores Peter as a disciple, but also commissions him as a leader in the church. This leadership, based on the model set forth by Christ, will be one that is emulated by subsequent generations of leaders.[592] John 21 sets the mold for how church leadership will be understood. Echoing both John 10:7–8 and John 15:13, John's epilogue suggests leadership will be invariably linked to sacrifice, as Spencer writes, "both the 'Good Shepherd' and a 'True Friend' have similar functions, namely both are willing to lay down their lives for their flock/friends."[593]

In the epilogue of John, it is seen then that following Christ into death was at the very least a concept that the early Christians believed was a mandate from their God. In order to be a true follower of Jesus, one must be willing to follow him, regardless of whether that will lead to life or death. Even further, John 21:19 suggests that the death of Peter would "glorify God." This is the origin of Ignatius's understanding of martyrdom, and it will provide the authority needed to propel his more overt discourse on the subject.

---

[591] Mark W. G. Stibbe, *John as Storyteller: Narrative Criticism and the Fourth Gospel* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1994) 211–12.

[592] This is evidenced most clearly in the notion of Papal succession from Peter. Even today the succession is viewed as something more than a simple appointment of a person, but something deeper and sacramental, by which the whole church should be led; see Joseph Ratzinger, *New Outpourings of the Spirit: Movements in the Church*, trans. Michael J. Miller and Henry Taylor (San Francisco: Ignatius, 2007), 51–54.

[593] Spencer, "Narrative," 64.

4.4.2.2 The Martyrdom of Polycarp

The earliest extant account of Christian martyrdom outside of the NT is the *Martyrdom of Polycarp*. Although the dates of this martyrdom account are debated, the majority of scholars hold it was written around 155 C.E.[594] Being contemporaneous with Ignatius, and an acquaintance, the views of Polycarp's martyrdom provide a unique insight into the attitude of Christians toward martyrdom in the early and middle parts of the second century. In this account, one can see some of the arguments made by Ignatius, although with less vigor. The account of Polycarp's death, even at its most fantastic, shows an understanding of martyrdom along the same lines as those found in Peter's accounts. Even more, in Polycarp's martyrdom account the same attitude of emulating Christ's death that is seen in Peter, and advanced in Ignatius, is perpetuated by yet a new generation of Christians. There is a rising expectation for martyrdom.[595] Apostolic succession, in a way, becomes a succession in martyrdom. A pattern of behavior had begun to form.

Written by a Christian named Marcion,[596] the *Martyrdom of Polycarp* begins by establishing that Polycarp's martyrdom is in conformity with the gospel.[597] Further, Marcion establishes immediately the imitation of Christ.[598] Later he states it differently, calling it a "special destiny as a partner in Christ,"[599] and further professing, "[B]ut we love the martyrs as disciples and imitators of Christ."[600] In these instances, the author shows similar ideas regarding martyrdom with Ignatius. The author goes to great lengths throughout the account to use symbolic language that identifies Polycarp's account

---

[594] This is not a consensus. The belief of Von Campenhausen is that part of the account was added later to combat the heretical beliefs of the Montanists. Others, namely Barnard and Musurillo, argue for a single composition at an early date. See Hans F. von Campenhausen, "Bearbeitungen und Interpolation des Polykarpmartyriums," in *Aus der Fruzeit des Christentums* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1963); and Leslie W. Barnard, "In Defense of Pseudo-Piontius' Account of Polycarp's Martyrdom," in *Kyriakon: Festschrift Johannes Quasten*, ed. Patrick Granfield, vol. 1 (Münster: Aschendorff, 1970), 192–204; and Herbert Musurillo, *The Acts of the Christian Martyrs* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1972).

[595] David A. Lopez, *Separatist Christianity: Spirit and Matter in the Early Church Fathers* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2004), 83–84.

[596] *Mart. Pol*. 20.1. All translations are from Ehrman, *Apostolic Fathers*.

[597] *Mart. Pol*. 1:1.

[598] *Mart. Pol*. 1:2.

[599] *Mart. Pol*. 6.2.

[600] *Mart. Pol*. 18.3.

with the events of Christ's life.[601] This identification leads to profound reverence for the martyrs, which the language of Marcion indicates in no small measure.[602] This discursive practice will be echoed in Ignatius's writing, as he seeks to gain authority through his own martyrdom.

Martyrdom, by the time of Peter's death, and even more so by the time of Polycarp's, was seen as both the natural result of being a disciple of Christ, but also as an imitation of Christ.[603] Hook and Reno take this concept even further calling it, "mimetic participation."[604] There is a salvific quality to martyrdom that, although distinctly lesser than that of Christ, can provide earthly salvation for other Christians and the church.[605] Again, this is a theme brought out less subtly in Ignatius's writing. The imitation of Christ in martyrdom is not merely symbolic, but has tangible value as a means by which others can be spared.[606] Although this account of martyrdom is the earliest extant writing describing martyrdom, Ignatius's epistles provide valuable insight into the mind of a man who is on route to be martyred.[607] His preoccupation with martyrdom in his letters are invaluable for understanding martyrdom in the second century. Ignatius is the explicit voice for martyrdom where Marcion's preference is to imply some of what Ignatius stated about his own martyrdom. Much of this could be due to the biographical nature of the *Martyrdom of Polycarp.* What will be seen in Ignatius is the thoughts of a soon-to-be martyr in the weeks before his death.

4.5 Ignatius the Martyr

Polycarp's treatment of martyrdom is, according to Brent, balanced compared to the treatment by Ignatius, whose seemingly obsessive discussion caused Brent to call him "disturbed".[608] There is certainly a prevalence in Ignatius's discussion on martyrdom. In the case of his letter to the Romans,

---

[601] Brian Stewart Hook and Russell R. Reno, *Heroism and the Christian Life: Reclaiming Excellence* (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox, 2000) 133–34.

[602] *Mart. Pol*. 13.2; 16.2–17.1.

[603] Moss, *Other Christs*, 46–47.

[604] Hook and Reno, *Heroism*, 134.

[605] *Mart. Pol*. 1:2.

[607] Schoedel, *Ignatius*, 5.

[608] Brent, *A Martyr Bishop,* 19.

he even pleads with his audience not to help him avoid martyrdom.[609] His plea is certainly odd, and as noted, he has been accused of obsession for his preoccupation with death and martyrdom. Without acknowledging the dire circumstance of Ignatius and at least conceding that his mental and emotional state was most likely in some level of fragility, his writing does indeed seem morbid and obsessive.

Corwin, however, takes a more nuanced look at Ignatius and his circumstance, realizing the constant pressure he was certain to be under, as his impending death would certainly invade his mind even in the midst of his writing on other subjects.[610] This view makes such language understandable when Ignatius writes lines as, "For I write to you while living, desiring to die."[611] Ignatius's thoughts, especially for the church in Rome, are dominated by his impending predicament. While some of what he writes, if taken alone and out of context, suggest a man whose desire for death is pathological, his circumstance demands a different perspective.

Within the context of the whole of Ignatius's argument in favor of his own martyrdom, one sees immense clarity and self-reflection. Particularly in his letter to the Romans, Ignatius clearly understands that in the moment he may lose his nerve and ask to be rescued. He writes: "Even if I urge you otherwise when I arrive, do not be persuaded; instead be persuaded by what I am writing you now."[612] Ignatius has the clarity of mind and the self-awareness to prepare the Roman Christians for a possible falter in his convictions. As death and pain approach, Ignatius fears he may lose his clarity of thought, and he writes to prevent that from stopping what he has reasoned out to be a good outcome.

Taking this further, Ignatius uses sound reasoning and comparable language when dealing with martyrdom. Throughout history, almost all religions have found a correlation between suffering and unification with a deity.[613] Ignatius uses similar ideas, but never equates his martyrdom with that of Jesus. Instead, Ignatius clearly sees martyrdom as the highest form of imitation.

---

[609] Ign. *Rom.* 4.1–2.

[610] Corwin, *Ignatius*, 21–23.

[611] Ign. *Rom.* 7.2.

[612] Ibid.

[613] Tarvainen and Lookadoo, *Faith and Love*, 68.

4.5.1 Ignatius's Martyrdom as Discipleship

For Ignatius, to reach the highest level of discipleship, one must imitate Christ to the point of death; discipleship and imitation are intimately interwoven in meaning.[614] It is not just central to Ignatius's thinking that one be a disciple, but that discipleship is essentially imitation.[615] Corwin explains Ignatius this way:

> The key to Ignatius's view of the Christian life is an understanding of the twin conceptions of discipleship and imitation, for they are central to his thinking. They give content to the choice that he urges, and in following the path that they indicate the Christian life is grounded securely, for it is provided both with an effective motive, in devotion to the Lord, and a pattern for life, in a general sense at least. Ignatius does not use the two notions in precisely the same way, but they carry for him approximately the same meaning. Discipleship implies both devotion to the leader and following of the pattern; imitation emphasizes the pattern but assumes the devotion.[616]

This understanding of Ignatius's thought process, as Corwin suggests, provides great insight into his championing of martyrdom for his life. This idea that imitation is approximately equal to discipleship explains why, in light of his pending doom, Ignatius is able to find continued hope.[617] Thus, when Ignatius is deemed morbid and even ascetic when he writes, "[b]ut I am becoming more of a disciple by their mistreatment,"[618] it is perhaps best to remember his ideal of imitation and discipleship. When viewing it this way, Ignatius can be seen to be making the most of a poor situation. This idea is echoed

---

[614] Schoedel writes of the interplay between Ignatius's use of "attain to God" and his use of imitation of Christ. He equates one with the other, but also notes that imitation is surprisingly infrequent in his letters. The result is that the imitation of Christ must be inferred by the language he uses to "attain to God" and "attain to Christ"; see Schoedel, *Ignatius*, 28–31.

[615] The story of Ignatius, according to Danziger, is a multifaceted *imitatio Christi*; see Rosemarie Danziger, "The Epic Hagiography as Scriptural Genre and Its Pictorial Rendering in the Saint-Savin-Sur-Gartempe Crypt Frescos," in *Mental Health, Spirituality, and Religion in the Middle Ages and Early Modern Age*, ed. Albrecht Classen (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2014), 206–41.

[616] Corwin, *Ignatius*, 227.

[617] William P. Anderson, *A Journey through Christian Theology: With Texts from the First to the Twenty-First Century* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2007), 6–8.

[618] Ign. *Rom.* 5.1.

in Ignatius's boldness to write his letters in the first place, which will be examined below.[619] Even within Ignatius's simple view of discipleship, there are some who find inconsistencies within Ignatius's writing.

 According to theories by Lightfoot and Bauer, Ignatius viewed discipleship this way: "First, it is proposed that Ignatius believed that martyrdom would actually 'make' him a disciple. Secondly, it is proposed that Ignatius understood suffering to be the 'beginning of discipleship,' and martyrdom its 'completion.'"[620] The problem with this view is Ignatius seems to be creating a distinction between classes of believers. This division between complete disciples (martyrs) and ordinary ones is a possible point of disunity among believers. This is at odds with his central theme of unity. Tarvainen and Lookadoo, acknowledging this discrepancy, write:

> It can now be asked at this point whether or not Ignatius has destroyed unity in
> the life of the Christian community through this difference between martyrs, on
> the one hand, and the choir of "ordinary" Christians, on the other. Indeed,
> otherwise he always emphasizes unity. Yet when martyrdom come up for
> discussion, he suddenly appears to see a difference and to play a "higher" way
> of life off of a "lower" way of life.[621]

If Lightfoot and Bauer are correct, there is a distinct contradiction in Ignatius's writing. In response to this McNamara argues there needs to be a reevaluation of Ignatius's understanding of martyrdom, particularly in its relationship to discipleship.[622] According to McNamara, Ignatius does not see martyrdom as necessary or even as the cause for his writing. Instead, since Ignatius is to be martyred, he will willingly follow its course in a way that proves his discipleship. As Mutie simply summarizes: "Thus, the discipleship texts really are referring to the *manner* in which Ignatius desires to face his

---

[619] The assertion of Schoedel is that Ignatius used his predicament to define his relationships with the churches to which he writes. He effectively takes his negative circumstance and creates the platform by which he is able to share his ideas to the regional churches in Asia; see Schoedel, *Ignatius*, 13–14.

[620] Norman D. McNamara, "Ignatius of Antioch on His Death: Discipleship, Sacrifice, Imitation," (Ph.D. diss., McMaster University, 1977), 22. Also see Walter Bauer, *Die Briefe des Ignatius von Antiochia und der Polykarpbrief* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1920), 198.

[621] Tarvainen and Lookadoo, *Faith and Love*, 67.

[622] McNamara, "Ignatius," 23–25.

death; that is, as a disciple, and not the *cause* or *result*."[623] This interpretation of Ignatius's view of martyrdom is more congruent with the attitudes of Ignatius's contemporaries.

Ignatius's commitment to imitation of Christ has led Preiss to believe he did so at the expense of NT and HB doctrine.[624] Preiss believed Ignatius's commitment to imitation, even within his ecclesiological terminology, goes beyond the first-century understanding of discipleship, moving instead toward a mystic and even gnostic understanding of human and divine communion. Swartley states of Preiss's logic:

> If Preiss' analysis of Ignatius is correct, then one must conclude that Ignatius loses two important points in his *imitatio Christi* which were present in Paul; namely, the eschatological context and the theocentric priority. This loss is especially significant because it comports well with the more general trend of second century.[625]

Whether correct or not, Preiss's analysis of Ignatius shows how highly Ignatius thought of imitating Christ. Imitation was a significant goal for Ignatius, and one that may have had profound theological ramifications, and a key to understanding his martyrdom.[626]

However, it is helpful to put Ignatius's imitation in context. Schoedel argues that Ignatius's imitation, or "attaining to God," was in service not of personal salvation, but in his "pastoral concern for peace and harmony in the churches."[627] Once again, Ignatius's main theme of unity takes precedence even in martyrdom. Schoedel particularly notes a longing for Ignatius to have legitimacy and authority and

---

[623] Jeremiah Mutie, *Death in Second-Century Christian Thought: The Meaning of Death in Earliest Christianity* (Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2015). Emphasis his.

[624] Preiss particularly believes Ignatius's view of imitation of Christ denies Pauline eschatological salvation in favor of personal salvation through following Christ into death; see Preiss, "La mystique," 197–241.

[625] Willard M. Swartley, "The Imitatio Christi in the Ignatian Letters," *VC* 27.2 (1973): 81–103.

[626] Graydon F. Snyder, "The Continuity of Early Christianity: A Study of Ignatius in Relation to Paul" (Ph.D. diss., Princeton University, 1961).

[627] Schoedel, *Ignatius*, 29–30.

sees his martyrdom as a way of legitimization. If he is correct, this is yet another nuanced layer to Ignatius's desire for martyrdom. According to Tribelco, martyrdom for Ignatius certifies his ministry, something that may have been called into question after his failures in Antioch and dispels any question of his worthiness as a disciple of Christ, both in his own mind, and in the minds of the churches in Asia.[628]

4.5.2 Ignatius's Martyrdom as Legitimization

While the imitation of Christ is perhaps Ignatius's primary objective with his own martyrdom, it must also be said that he used it as his legitimization. It has already been noted that Ignatius was not altogether successful in his goals. He was, after all, imploring the churches of Asia to adopt his advocated church governance, and he grieved over the fact that Antioch had God alone as its bishop.[629] It is also helpful to remember that Ignatius, though important in the church, did not have any authority over the churches to which he writes.

Where, then, does Ignatius find his authority to write in the first place? It must lie in the fact that Ignatius saw, in his martyrdom, an intrinsic authority. Many scholars have relied on Ignatius's status as martyr-to-be as his authoritative claim.[630] His imitation of Christ, and the apostles, provides Ignatius with a legitimization he would not otherwise possess. He clearly uses it to its fullest effect in his letters. In fact, Ignatius believed his discipleship depended on completion of his martyrdom journey.[631] Interwoven with the idea that he was to become a true disciple is the undercurrent of achieved authority. By proving himself as a disciple, Ignatius sees a way to compare himself to the apostles, most of whom were also martyred.

While imitating Christ was seen distinctly as a form of discipleship, imitating the apostles provides a more tangible claim to earthly authority. Particularly telling is Ignatius's use of comparison between himself and the apostles Paul and Peter. Ignatius had clearly been setting himself up for comparison

---

[628] Trebilco, *The Early Christians*, 634.

[629] Ign. *Rom.* 9.1.

[630] Robert F. Stoops, "If I Suffer... Epistolary Authority in Ignatius of Antioch," *HTR* 80.2 (1987): 161–78.

[631] Schoedel, *Ignatius*, 28–29.

with Paul from the beginning. Ignatius's epistle writing, for one, is in distinct Pauline fashion.[632] Smith writes of Paul's influence on Ignatius this way: "Though Ignatius may not be regarded first and foremost as a theologian, his teachings and practice indicate a creative mind engaged with the apostolic tradition and unafraid to amplify it for his ecclesiastical and personal purposes."[633] Ignatius, even without addressing much apostolic theology, used apostolic tradition to help advance his own ideas. It is quite logical, then, to assume Ignatius would desire to be associated with apostolic authority.[634] It is quite easy to see Pauline similarities in Ignatius's writing and make this conclusion, as has been seen already. This alone would be adequate evidence of Ignatius's desire to imitate the apostles. But from Ignatius himself, one can read his desire to be found likened to Paul. He writes:

> You are a passageway for those slain for God; you are fellow initiates with Paul,
>
> the holy one who received a testimony and proved worthy of all fortune. When
>
> I attain to God, may I be found in his footsteps, this one who mentions you in
>
> every epistle in Christ Jesus.[635]

Here is evidence, not only of Ignatius's desire to be compared to Paul, but also proof that he sees martyrdom, or "attaining to God," as the means by which he will achieve this goal. Ignatius's use of Paul's own martyrdom here is a natural means by which Ignatius can find confirmation of his own lifelong ministry.[636] Ignatius's self-understanding for his letter writing is evidently based on his self-comparison to the apostles, especially Paul. Ignatius seems to have assumed his recipients would makes this correlation by the similarities alone.[637] Just to be sure this comparison did not go unnoticed, Ignatius included more explicit comparisons.

---

[632] Schoedel argues against this, however, noting many un-Pauline characteristics, and a more Hellenistic letter-writing scheme; see Schoedel, *Ignatius*, 7.

[633] Smith, "Ministry," 37–56.

[634] Hoffman believes that although Ignatius has meaning behind making connection between himself and the apostles, it is not to make any claims toward apostolic authority. Rather, Ignatius uses the apostles' words to further his continued message of unity in the face of heresy and persecution; see Daniel L. Hoffman, "The Authority of Scripture and Apostolic Doctrine in Ignatius of Antioch," *JETS* 28.1 (1985): 71–79.

[635] Ign. *Eph.* 12.2.

[636] Schoedel, *Ignatius,* 73.

[637] Stoops, "If I Suffer."

Even when downplaying the comparison between himself and the apostles, Ignatius still reminds the reader to make the comparison. Ignatius writes to the church in Rome: "I am not enjoining you as Peter and Paul did. They were apostles, I am condemned; they were free, until now I have been a slave."[638] This could easily be read as a clever trick for Ignatius to use in order to have his readers make the connection between him and the apostles. By mentioning them together, even in the negative, one is forced to acknowledge the similarities between them, and a comparison is guaranteed. It is most likely going too far to assume Ignatius desired martyrdom in the beginning. It does, however, appear that he seized the opportunity to use his circumstance to further his goals.

The imitation of both Christ and the apostles gave Ignatius the sense that his martyrdom procession was "a triumphant march of mythic proportions."[639] This is perhaps the reason he feels he has the authority to write to the churches in Asia in the first place. Discipleship is paramount to understanding the mind of Ignatius regarding martyrdom. Discipleship alone, however, does not fully account for all of Ignatius's views on the subject. But even in his other treatments of his martyrdom, one can still trace the argument back to discipleship at one point or another. Nowhere is this more evident than in Ignatius's salvific attribution to his martyrdom.

4.5.3 Ignatius's Martyrdom as Sacrifice for Antioch

Where Ignatius really shows his commitment to pastoral power is in his understanding of his martyrdom as a sacrifice with salvific purposes. By the beginning of the third century, martyrdom had become understood to a certain extent to be sacrificial.[640] Pesthy-Simon argues that the sacrificial understanding of martyrdom was not very common among the earliest Christians, and apart from a few cases, such as Ignatius, was added later by hagiographers with a particular agenda.[641] If this is the case, then martyrdom ideology is something distinctly advanced by Ignatius as well. While it would be beneficial to study such an advancement, it is helpful for this study to simply acknowledge that

---

[638] Ign. *Rom*. 4.3.

[639] Schoedel, *Ignatius,* 11–12.

[640] Castelli, *Martyrdom and Memory*, 52–55.

[641] Monika Pesthy-Simon, *Isaac, Iphigeneia, Ignatius: Martyrdom and Human Sacrifice* (New York: Central European University Press, 2017), 118–19.

Ignatius's understanding of his own martyrdom is somewhat distinct from his contemporaries, something that is undoubtedly linked with his understanding of discipleship.

Tracing Ignatius's logic from discipleship to sacrifice is a natural progression, requiring little to fill in any gaps. Simply put, since Ignatius understands discipleship to be, by and large, imitation, then the imitation of Christ in death is the imitation of his salvific work on the cross. This understanding of sacrificing for others is perhaps bolstered by the conditions of his arrest in Antioch, or there may be a number of other reasons.[642] Regardless of his reasoning, Ignatius writes such lines as: "I am giving my life for you, and for those you sent to Smyrna for the honor of God;"[643] and "My own spirit is sacrificed for you, not only now but also when I attain to God."[644] In such ways one sees he clearly understands his role as martyr-to-be more than simply as a witness, but to hold some salvific value for the church.

As quoted by McNamara, Von Campenhausen summarizes Ignatius this way:

> This true sacrifice will be offered not only for the glory of God but also in the interest of a specific human community…. This understanding comes [sic.] to expression unmistakably in the idea of "ransom" which Ignatius uses of himself…. "I am your ransom" he assures them in this way more than once…. Thus the martyr, while he fulfils his own salvation is actually a source of salvation for the Churches which share with him the true faith.[645]

This is not the appraisal of a man who believed his martyrdom was only a symbolic gesture of salvific work, but one that believes his death will have specific value to others. This point of view argues

---

[642] One such reason, suggests Maier, is that this lines up with Hellenized civic traditions; see Harry O. Maier, "The Politics and Rhetoric of Discord and Concord in Paul and Ignatius," in *Trajectories through the New Testament and the Apostolic Fathers*, ed. Andrew Gregory and Christopher M. Tuckett (New York: Oxford University Press, 2005), 307–24.

[643] Ign. *Eph*. 21.1.

[644] Ign. *Trall*. 13.3.

[645] McNamara, "Ignatius," 51–52. See also Hans F. von Campenhausen, *Die Idee des Martyriums in der alten Kirche* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1936), 72.

distinctly that Ignatius's martyrdom goes beyond simply "theater," as Schoedel puts it, and has tangible value for the preservation and salvation of the flock.

There is nuance to this interpretation, however. Some argue that this salvific sacrifice must also contain some aspects of atonement and symbolism more in line with the contemporary world. Brent in particular argues that Ignatius's sacrifice has its counterpart in the Roman pagan altar.[646] He also argues the idea of sacrifice is more akin to that of the HB altar, a notion echoed by Pesthy-Simon.[647] There is certainly a symbolic connection with this view in Ignatius's language, particularly if one reads his words to the church in Rome when he says: "But grant me nothing more than to be poured out as a libation to God while there is still an altar at hand."[648] This is language that is in tune with both pagan altars and the Jewish understanding of sacrifice. Thus, there is merit in Ferguson's claim that "[w]hat is certain is that a martyr's death was sacrifice to God."[649] Even with this understanding, however, the notion of salvific value is intimately associated. This goes beyond ritual, into something more. It is a tangible and direct way in which Ignatius can save his church.

The Romans' complex system of ritual sacrifice functioned on many levels, and substitutive sacrifice is certainly part of their beliefs.[650] According to the Romans, appeasing the gods provided them with military strength and victory, as well as economic and physical health. Thus, by pleasing the gods there is specific salvation provided for the various parts of life associated with the gods to whom they are sacrificing. Ignatius's language of a "libation to God"[651] is reminiscent of Roman practice of offering wine to the gods as a libation.[652] Again, even in his allusions toward the atonement sacrifice

---

[646] Allen Brent, "Ignatius of Antioch and the Imperial Cult," *VC* 52.1 (1998): 30–58.

[647] Pesthy-Simon, *Isaac*, 117–18.

[648] Ign. *Rom*. 2.2.

[649] Everett Ferguson, *The Early Church at Work and Worship—Volume 3: Worship, Eucharist, Music, and Gregory of Nyssa* (Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2017), 21.

[650] Mary Beard, John North, and Simon Price, *Religions of Rome: Volume 2: A Sourcebook* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1998), 148–65.

[651] Ign. *Rom.* 2.2.

[652] Libations must be offered to the Roman gods before good wine and grapes are consumed; see John Scheid, "Roman Animal Sacrifice and the System of Being," in *Greek and Roman Animal Sacrifice: Ancient Victims, Modern Observers*, ed. Christopher A. Faraone and F. S. Naiden (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2012), 84–98.

of the Jews or the cultic sacrifices of Rome, Ignatius provides a distinctly Christian understanding of sacrifice for the salvation of others. Nowhere is this more evident than in his allusions, once again, to the eucharist.

4.6 Institutionalization of the Martyr-Discourse: Eucharistic Sacrificial Language

Ignatius's self-description of his martyrdom alludes to atonement and substitutive sacrifice, but it is highly evidenced that he goes beyond this into something more inherently Christian.[653] For Christians, the atonement afforded to humankind by Jesus on the cross meant that future atonement is unnecessary. The above notion of salvific work is therefore best viewed as either *imitatio Christi*, or a tangible tool of physical salvation for a group, meaning in this case the salvation from persecution. There is, however, evidence of spiritual connotations for martyrdom found in Ignatius's use of eucharistic language. Fox writes:

> In Jewish texts, the death of a martyr could be stressed as a ransom and atonement for the sins of the entire nation, like a grand atoning sacrifice in the Temple cult. The imagery did not totally escape Christian authors, least of all Ignatius, but there was less scope for it, as Jesus' death was considered to have atoned already for human sin. The idea of personal oblation was more apt, and it seems Ignatius was exploiting the idea of his death as a Eucharistic offering in which his blood was to be the wine and his body, crushed by beasts, the bread of God.[654]

Ignatius's use of the eucharist is extraordinarily complex. As discussed in the previous chapter, he saw it as a unifying force for the church. The eucharist was orthopraxis for Ignatius. The eucharist powerfully brought people together to become the church or become Christians. By remembering the sacrifice of Christ and participating in it, the believer actively participates in self-sacrifice, and in a very mystical way, this participation makes the believer a Christian. In the exact same way, Ignatius views martyrdom as a eucharistic celebration. By actively participating in martyrdom, the believer becomes a true Christian or disciple.[655] This sacrifice also will help bring the church together in a

---

[653] Robert J. Daly, *Sacrifice Unveiled: The True Meaning of Christian Sacrifice* (New York: T&T Clark, 2009) 57–59.

[654] Robin Lane Fox, *Pagans and Christians* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1987).

[655] Ign. *Rom.* 4.2.

similar unification to the eucharist. These are more than simple parallels for Ignatius, they are tangible, even in the mystery of it.

The most striking evidence of Ignatius's martyrdom-eucharist understanding is found in his epistle to the Romans. He writes: "Allow me to be bread for the wild beasts; through them I am able to attain to God. I am the wheat of God and am ground by the teeth of the wild beasts, that I may be found to be the pure bread of Christ."[656] By combining the language of martyrdom with eucharist, Ignatius fashions his martyrdom as a eucharistic sacrifice. The pattern that begins to emerge in Ignatius is that the eucharist plays a distinct, if not central, role in his letters. As Lawyer puts it: "[W]hile we get little in the way of an explicit treatise on the subject, it deeply marks his spirituality."[657] This once again shows the writings of Ignatius to be less theological expositions and more spiritual expressions of a man nearing his death, a death he views as similar to the eucharist.[658]

The intriguing point about the very notion of Ignatius's martyrdom as eucharist is, by default, that this discourse shifts the sacrifice from appeasement to one of communion, once again showing how martyrdom is a unifying event.[659] This subtle shift in understanding of martyrdom as a eucharistic sacrifice changes the meaning slightly. David Power notes that Jesus's death "replaces the rites of sacrifice with the table of Christ's body and blood."[660] By understanding the sacrifice of martyrdom as a eucharist, the martyr moves from a substitutive sacrifice, to one that provides a different type of salvation, one that is not only an atonement, but one that brings people together in communion.[661] By becoming an active participant in the eucharist, and mystically participating in the sacrifice of God, Ignatius effectively institutionalized martyrdom. Without having to demand true martyrdom, but symbolic martyrdom, Ignatius galvanizes the believers together with a discourse that blurs reality. The eucharist becomes, in some form, a discourse of communal martyrdom. In this way, Ignatius sees

---

[656] Ign. *Rom.* 4.1.

[657] Lawyer, "Eucharist and Martyrdom."

[658] Fox, *Christians and Pagans*, 437.

[659] Michael Kirwan, "Eucharist and Sacrifice," *New Blackfriars* 88.1014 (2007): 213–27.

[660] David N. Power, *The Eucharistic Mystery: Revitalizing the Tradition* (New York: Herder & Herder, 1994), 320.

[661] Raymond Johanny, "Ignatius of Antioch," in *The Eucharist of the Early Christians*, ed. Willy Rordorf, trans. Matthew J. O'Connell (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1990), 48–70.

his martyrdom in terms that align with the roles of the shepherd. Far from being just a substitute, Ignatius, if viewed as a eucharist, is a sacrificial figure meant to bring people together. His death not only provides salvation, but brings people under the same altar, once again fulfilling his goal to unify them.

One can see echoes of this goal of unification and allusions to the eucharist in Ignatius's letter to the Romans. He writes:

> But grant me nothing more than to be poured out as a libation to God while there is still an altar at hand, that by becoming a chorus in love, you may sing forth to the Father in Jesus Christ, saying that God has deemed the bishop of Syria worthy to be found at the setting of the sun, after sending him from where it rises.[662]

Ignatius begins this passage by setting up the allusion to wine, once again setting a eucharistic tone. He follows this by giving an explicit reason for his desire for martyrdom, "that by becoming a chorus in love, you may sing forth to the Father." The expressed purpose here is to inspire those witnesses to come together, something necessary to become a choir and to worship. This is, after all, the goal of the eucharist, and Ignatius equates that with his own martyrdom. It goes beyond substitution into an act that binds the church together in the same way that Ignatius believes the eucharist binds the church together.

Martyrdom is a tool for unity, and by extension this unity provides salvation. Again, it is helpful to note his words to the church in Philadelphia when he says:

> And so be eager to celebrate just one eucharist. For there is one flesh of our Lord Jesus Christ and one cup that brings the unity of his blood, and one altar, as there is one bishop together with the presbytery and the deacons, my fellow slaves.[663]

---

[662] Ign. *Rom.* 2.2.

[663] Ign. *Phil.* 4.

Taken together with his symbolic equation of his martyrdom-as-eucharist, one can see how Ignatius begins to conceptualize the usefulness of his sacrifice not merely in terms of atonement or substitution, but as a unifying force that will bring the church together. In Ignatius's mind this unity is the path to salvation, not only for the soul of the individual, but the church as a whole. Ignatius believes the eucharist is a "life-giving reality."[664] His martyrdom is seen in a similar light. Ignatius believes his martyrdom literally assimilates him to the life of Christ.[665] Therefore his martyrdom has him participating in and even becoming part of the eucharist with all the benefits for the church he mentions in his letters. Even in martyrdom his thoughts are once again dominated by the safety and security of his flock, or as he sees it, the entire church. This is ultimately the response of the consummate shepherd, even in the midst of his own crisis.

Once again, the response of the shepherd is consistent with the actions of Ignatius. Schuld notes an attribute of the shepherd that could be written of Ignatius: "The shepherd's role is to ensure the salvation of his flock. It's not only a matter of saving them all, all together, when danger comes nigh. It's a matter of constant, individualized and final kindness."[666] Even in the end Ignatius's thoughts are for the unity, safety, and, ultimately, salvation of the church. His mind, even when understandably preoccupied with the horrible fate awaiting him, consistently returns to the notion of protection and salvation for the flock.

4.6.1 Martyrdom as a Tool for Unity

Ignatius constantly refers to the power of corporate expression. For him, the more unified the corporate prayer, the more powerful it can become. In *Eph*. 5.2 Ignatius states: "Let no one be deceived. Anyone who is outside the sanctuary lacks the bread of God. For if the prayer of one or two persons has such power, how much more will that of the bishop and the entire church." The power of

---

[664] Johanny, "Ignatius," 66.

[665] Norman Russell, "The Concept of Deification in the Early Greek Fathers" (Ph.D. diss., University of Oxford, 1988).

[666] J. Joyce Schuld, *Foucault and Augustine: Reconsidering Power and Love* (Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 2003), 139.

corporate unity is tangible for Ignatius and he sees in both the actual eucharist, and in his symbolic eucharistic martyrdom, a chance to bring people together to activate this power.[667]

There is no better evidence for Ignatius's belief that his sacrifice can act as a binding agent, much like the eucharist, for the church than his use of musical metaphor. He writes:

> For this reason it is fitting for you to run together in harmony with the mind of the bishop, which is exactly what you are doing. For your presbytery, which is both worthy of the name and worthy of God, is attuned to the bishop as strings to the lyre. Therefore, Jesus Christ is sung in your harmony and symphonic love. And each of you should join the chorus, that by being symphonic in your harmony, taking up God's pitch in unison, you may sing in one voice through Jesus Christ to the Father.[668]

This is powerful unity that will reach its effectiveness in beseeching the power of the Father. Ignatius echoes this language when stating the purpose of his martyrdom.[669] It is clear when taking these passages together, the language of eucharist, music, altar, and martyrdom are wrapped together and bound by the common thread of unity. Furthermore, they illustrate the diversity with which Ignatius employs unity as a tool. For him, it was not only useful to expel divergent beliefs, but it was also useful as a way by which the Christians might be able to stand against persecution.

With more subtlety but similar urgency as he did when addressing division within the church, Ignatius here is reinforcing his central theme of unity, this time punctuated by his martyrdom. If martyrdom and sacrifice are hallmarks of the shepherd in the face of persecution, Ignatius's response adds a distinct third level of complexity to the mix. The martyrdom procession for Ignatius provides a platform by which he believes he can accomplish his ultimate goal of unity. For Ignatius, unity is power, both practically and spiritually. In terms of the former, it is beneficial to once again look at the

---

[667] This concept of power in unity was presented first by Paul in Ephesians 4. The unity was seen as having real ability to move the powers of heaven. As the church became increasing threated by both internal and external forces, this unity and power became increasingly important; see Margaret Y. MacDonald, *Colossians and Ephesians* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2008), 296–98.

[668] Ign. *Eph*. 4.1–2.

[669] Ign. *Rom.* 2.2.

nature of the persecution facing the Christians in light of Ignatius's response, examining how unity can very practically help avoid persecution.

4.6.1.1 Unity as Protection against Persecution

It is not enough to say that Ignatius simply gave his life for his sheep. In fact, such declaration is based on theory alone, as the reason for his martyrdom has long been the source of conjecture.[670] However, what is true is that Ignatius's discourse fashioned his martyrdom as a salvific work not only for the act itself, but also for what he hoped its effects would be. Although it is not necessarily wholly accurate to assume he gave his life for his flock, it is certainly true he fashioned the narrative to presume this. By fashioning his martyrdom precession in the way described above, Ignatius solidifies the notion that he believed unity with the bishop to be a distinctly positive outcome of his martyrdom, as if this unity is in some way itself salvific. In this way, the persecution of the church becomes, paradoxically, the catalyst for unity.

A key to understanding this thought is to once again return to examining the nature of Roman persecution of the early church in the beginning of the second century. Again, this is evidenced most completely by the illuminating correspondence between Trajan and Pliny the Younger. The details of this correspondence have already been discussed above, but it is useful to once again examine the effects of the specific policy on both the oppressors and the oppressed.[671] Placing the Roman policy in the context of what it means for the early second-century Christian can help frame the context for response.

To begin, it is helpful to note that no one has evidence that Christians were persecuted as a member of a *collegium illicitum*.[672] As far as the Roman records are concerned, despite Christianity's technical

---

[670] It is simply impossible to know with any assurance why Ignatius was to be martyred. Theories abound as to the reasoning, including: Malalas's account of Ignatius bearing the responsibility for an earthquake in Antioch in 115; Ignatius giving himself up in order to promote peace his ecclesiology helped destroy; and Ignatius bearing the legal responsibility for illegal Christian communities whose open conflict resulted in Roman action. While none of these theories can be proven, none of these are without its merits, and provide very plausible explanations for Ignatius's fate.

[671] The policy of Trajan and Christian persecution in general have very different effects on the different players involved. The very nature of the discourse between Pliny and Trajan have discursive impact on the Christian response, conversely shaping their identity and discourse of martyrdom; see Perkins, *Suffering Self*, 1–14.

[672] De Ste. Croix, *Christian Persecution*, 124.

illegality,[673] they were not prosecuted for being members of a church. While this does not prove that it was acceptable, it does show that the crimes for which Christians were punished were most likely personal ones, not corporate ones. The correspondence between Pliny and Trajan shows a passivity that suggests prosecution was not necessarily a top priority. One must remember, as De St. Croix illuminated, that Roman persecution was accusatory and not inquisitorial. Thereby the accuser must be prepared to prosecute the accused and not be held liable for malicious prosecution.[674]

With a Roman law code that requires an accuser to come forward and provide evidence, it is easy to see how difficult accusing a Christian could be among the average Roman citizen. Those without intimate knowledge of an individual will find it hard to produce the type of evidence required to satisfy the requirements of formal prosecution, as the accused have the ability to bring the *delator* to the authorities.[675]

The burden of proof in the Empire in the second century was not only necessary, it was vital.[676] A Roman would have to be close enough to the individual to secure such proof. This brings up a second dynamic that is closely related; those with intimate knowledge of a Christian's activity may often be friends with the Christian. It must have been the case that many within the pluralistic Roman society were permitting Christians to exist in their midst if they were friends, relatives, customers, or business partners. The fact that there are those accused in the contents of Pliny's letter suggest that this was not universally the case, but it is reasonable to assume that mild-mannered Christians existed in large numbers in Roman society at the time without being constantly paraded before the governor of a given province.[677]

---

[673] Again, there again is no actual edict or written law against Christianity, but it was universally understood to be so, seeing as it was incompatible with established Roman law.

[674] De Ste. Croix, *Christian Persecution*, 120.

[675] Ibid., 123.

[676] According to Mani, "In ancient Roman law, the principle of burden of proof expressed itself through different maxims, such as *ei qui affirmat non ei qui negat incumbit probatio* (onus of proof is on him who affirms, and not on him who denies) and *actori incumbit probatio* (the claimant carries the burden of proof)"; see V. S. Mani, *International Adjudication: Procedural Aspects* (Boston: Martinus Nijhoff, 1980), 202.

[677] Behr suggests the Christians's legal status was even better, noting the Christians' apparent ability to protest their treatment before the governors. See John Behr, "Social and Historical Setting," in *The Cambridge History of Early Christian Literature*, ed. Frances Young, Lewis Ayres, Andrew Louth, and John Behr (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 55–70.

Christianity was certainly tolerated to the point that Ignatius, already in chains, was permitted to write to other churches within the Roman Empire. It appears the Roman guards cared little for the religious leanings of their prisoner. Also, Ignatius entertained multiple bishops or delegates from other congregations throughout Asia, again hinting that the comings and goings of the individual Christian was not often the subject of scandal or persecution. Instead, prosecutorial procedures allowed for what can be seen as a relatively safe existence for the average Christian of Ignatius's day.

Ignatius, however, finds himself among what must be considered the minority; persecuted, found guilty, and sentenced to death. The reasons for this are, again, left to scholarly conjecture, but Corwin suggests that rancor between various factions in the church "could evidently reach dangerous proportions."[678] If Corwin is right, a church that suffers from unchecked disunity can ultimately lead to the death of Christians. In other words, unity is a quite literally a matter of life and death for Ignatius.[679]

Because persecution, and again this is perhaps better understood in Trajan's rule as prosecution, is particularly passive, a church that is not creating open conflict will, at least in relative terms, be safe from the type of physical harm Ignatius was facing. If Foucault is correct and "the essential objective of pastoral power is the salvation of the flock,"[680] then it is essential Ignatius does what is necessary to protect his flock. Seeing firsthand the effects of open and unresolved conflict, the way to good pasture then is peace. Not only is peace necessary for the health of the flock in general, as explored in the last chapter, but it is also essential for its protection from outside forces, who are most active when open conflict rages within the congregation.

Conflict among the Christians, to the modern reader, seems almost trivial. Nevertheless, especially in light of the proposed consequences of such conflict, the maintenance of peace in the Roman Empire was of vital importance for the church. The system of government in the Empire was in place to ensure peace and harmony above anything else. The Roman Empire was vast, and the peoples contained

---

[678] Corwin, *Ignatius*, 54.

[679] This is why Wand calls Ignatius, "the bulwark of unity against the disruptive forces of persecution"; see John W. C. Wand, *A History of the Early Church to AD 500* (New York: Routledge, 2008), 21.

[680] Foucault, *Security*, 172.

therein were varied. This often led to conflict. The Roman solution was to appoint governors or proconsuls to rule over varied provinces of the Roman Empire. The duties of these proconsuls were extremely broad, but officially, their tasks were twofold: "firstly, the administration of justice and secondly, the maintenance of security by force if necessary, in the face of internal dissention or external threat."[681]

The mandate of the proconsul then is to keep the peace and administer justice. In the case of the former, any internal conflict among a group of people within a given province could easily constitute a disturbance of the peace. This concept is seen in the condemnation of Christ himself, whose Roman crucifixion was not for blasphemy, but for what amounts to disturbing the fragile peace in Palestine.[682] One can see in the person of Jesus how a faction within the established religious order can cause a disturbance the Romans found troubling enough for condemnation. There is nothing to suggest a similar situation could not exist with the early church in Antioch. Thus, eliminating religious disturbance was not a trivial matter.

The need for peace among various congregations becomes of paramount importance in light of the proconsul's mandate, and one that Ignatius apparently understands firsthand. While Ignatius certainly understands unity as necessary for the church's survival in the face of heresies and fractioning, there is this added dimension that unity is necessary for physical survival against the real threat of physical annihilation from the Roman Empire. This is perhaps why, in some cases, Ignatius's language borrows heavily from the political realm.

---

[681] Paul Trebilco, "Asia," in *The Book of Acts in Its Graeco-Roman Setting*, ed. David W. J. Gill and Conrad Gempf, *The Book of Acts in its First Century Setting*, vol. 2 (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1994), 355.

[682] Richard A. Horsley, "The Death of Jesus," in *Studying the Historical Jesus: Evaluations of the State of Current Research*, ed. Bruce D. Chilton and Craig A. Evans (Leiden: Brill, 1998), 395–422.

4.6.1.2 Harmony as Political Language

The language Ignatius frequently uses when speaking of unity among the believers has striking similarities to that found in the political realm. This is a tradition that goes back to the epistles of Paul in the middle of the first century.[683] Ignatius, however, takes this use of political language and makes prolific use of it. This has caused Schoedel to declare: "We have seen that the bishop builds on ideas of concord and unity drawn from political thought, but he orients them to a conception of the church."[684] The language about which Schoedel is writing is ὁμόνοια (harmony/concord) an ideal developed in the Greek city-state. Even though Ignatius uses such language to illustrate the type of unity he would like to see in the church, the political symbology would not have been lost on his readers. In fact, at the time of Ignatius's writing, ὁμόνοια was as politically important of an idea as anything else in the Empire.

Lotz's work on this subject is particularly robust in determining the ubiquity of ὁμόνοια, which would then find its full political expression in the Roman concept of *concordia*. Lotz particularly describes *concordia* "as a concept fit to both describe and propagandize the political relation which guaranteed peace throughout the Empire."[685] This language was widely used as a tool by which the emperors would attempt to keep order among the various parts of the Empire. Lotz goes on to explain that Vespasian and Trajan particularly drew heavily on the more famous notion of the Roman *pax* of Augustus's reign, but lacked the popularity and charisma to make use of it. Instead, *concordia* was more useful to their leadership as a term that helped bring the local governors into agreement with the emperors.[686]

If the proconsul's principal mandate is to maintain peace, and the dominant political theory for achieving this is ὁμόνοια or c*concordia*, then it seems reasonable to assume that Ignatius was using this language in hopes of conjuring the imagery of civil harmony with that of the church. The political ideal of ὁμόνοια was everywhere in Ignatius's day, and his audience was certainly aware of its

---

[683] Margaret M. Mitchell, *Paul and the Rhetoric of Reconciliation: An Exegetical Investigation of the Language and Composition of 1 Corinthians* (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox, 1991), 17–19.

[684] Schoedel, *Ignatius*, 116.

[685] John-Paul Lotz, *Ignatius and Concord: The Background and Use of the Language of Concord in the Letters of Ignatius of Antioch* (New York: Peter Lang, 2007), 36.

[686] Ibid.

meaning.[687] While it is true it is possible Ignatius simply wanted the metaphor to apply only to relationships within the church, the very use of the political language can also suggest he sees a connection between inner-church harmony and harmony with those outside the church, particularly the political relationships.[688]

Meier suggests Ignatius should be interpreted this way, stating:

> Further, rhetors, like Dio of Prusa, who was sometimes delegated as an ambassador to urge the end of inter-urban conflict, dedicated speeches to the ideals of concord and peace. Ignatius's own *homonoia* language should be interpreted against this setting, even as he takes that language and develops it in new directions as a means of ecclesial control.[689]

By using political language as one means by which he advocates peace and unity within the church, Ignatius alludes naturally to the peace that can be found outside of itself as well.

In evidence of this plurality of meaning, one can look to Ignatius's letter to the Ephesians in which he writes:

> For when you frequently gather as a congregation, the powers of Satan are destroyed and his destructive force is vanquished by the harmony of your faith. Nothing is better than peace, by which every battle is abolished, whether waged by those in heaven or by those on earth.[690]

Ignatius uses ὁμόνοια as a weapon with which both internal and external battles can be done away. Again, the ambiguity of the term "those in heaven or by those on earth" does not necessarily prove

---

[687] Harry O. Maier, "Space, Body, and Church in Ignatius of Antioch: Toward a Spatial Treatment," in *Studies on the Text of the New Testament and Early Christianity: Essays in Honour of Michael W. Holmes*, eds. Daniel Gurtner, Juan Hernández Jr., and Paul Foster (Leiden: Brill, 2015), 517–36.

[688] Ignatius was very intentional about his use of metaphor. As seen with his use of the eucharist, his language is often multifaceted in its meaning. This is the case with ὁμόνοια; see Brent, *A Martyr Bishop, 160.*

[689] Maier, "Space," 530.

[690] Ign. *Eph.* 13.1–2.

this means external forces. The term which is less ambiguous is "every battle is abolished," and could certainly pertain to battles both internal and external. Ignatius, in using this language, sees his ideal vision for the church as not being in opposition to, or above civic life, but as a functioning part of it.[691]

4.7 The Fulfillment of the Consummate Shepherd Role

Ignatius's sacrifice is a clear indication of the shepherd's willingness to sacrifice himself for his sheep. This is, as previously discussed, a primary role for the shepherd, even if a last resort. Ignatius's language, however, goes beyond this. Being a sacrificial shepherd is only one part of his full goal. As a *pasteur*, Ignatius has the responsibility to lead his flock to green pasture and salvation. To this end he adds the same notion of unity employed against heresy to combat the threat of external persecution. Ignatius employs vivid language to argue for unity, a unity that is beneficial against multiple threats.

When Ignatius celebrates his own pending martyrdom as completion of discipleship, he also mentions the path is not for everyone.[692] His sacrifice, again, was one that was for the salvation of the flock. This is in line with Foucault's theory that "the essential objective of pastoral power is the salvation of the flock."[693] It does not end there, however, as Ignatius is seeking something more. He is still arguing for the good pasture for the sheep. He is still protecting them. Even after his sacrifice is irreversibly set in motion, he writes to ensure future salvation beyond his life.

Foucault finished his above thought on the salvific objective of pastoral power by noting: "Pastoral power is a power of care. It looks after the flock, it looks after the individuals of the flock, it sees to it that the sheep do not suffer."[694] Ignatius does not rest on the fact that his sacrifice produced temporary salvation for the flock. Even in the midst of his martyrdom procession he sees the need to ensure a similar situation does not arise again. Here is tangible evidence of the "endless application"[695] of pastoral power.

---

[691] Ibid., 532.

[692] Tarvainen and Lookadoo, *Faith and Love*, 62.

[693] Focuault, *Security*, 172.

[694] Ibid.

[695] Ibid., 172.

With Ignatius's arguments for unity in the face of external forces, his entire theme of unity comes full circle. While unity in the face of heresy is particularly individualized, with the use of the eucharist as a means to which the bishop could oversee everyone and "other" the non-participants, his similarly themed ideas for avoiding persecution are distinctly universal. This is the dual nature of the shepherd, as he is responsible for both the multitude and the individual.

The pastoral thrust behind Ignatius's martyrdom is compelling, not only because of his framing of the event as salvific. This is, in itself enough to merit pastoral consideration. What becomes more telling for the understanding of Ignatius as *pasteur*, is in the richness of his imagery, other pastoral concerns begin to emerge. After acknowledging the echoes of the passion narrative in Ignatius, Moss writes: "The use of liturgical language in turn ties the suffering and death of Ignatius to broader systems of community construction and sustenance."[696] Ignatius's martyrdom discourse produces an understanding of his sacrifice as having salvific undertones *and* sustaining properties. Ignatius becomes, in his sacrifice, the consummate shepherd of which Foucault spoke. In martyrdom, Ignatius is able to: show the ultimate form of benevolence, lay down his life for his sheep, call the sheep together, provide yet another symbolic way to individualize each member (albeit for another shepherd), and even exercise a subversive power in his martyrdom discourse that counteracts the Roman goal of his death in the first place. In all of these things, Ignatius shows himself to be the epitome of pastoral power.

4.8 Conclusion

While much has been made of the persecution of Christians in the first few centuries of their existence, the truth is somewhat less bombastic than open and wanton destruction of Christians. Christianity's legal status being what it was, however, led to the occasional trial and conviction of Christians. However, Rome was not about to benefit from the wholesale decimation of a large group of taxpaying citizens, especially since such display of force would undermine the political goals of the Empire, namely peace.

Even if the stereotype of indiscriminate persecution of Christians is often an exaggeration, this is not to say that some were not tried and convicted of a number of crimes. Some, if not all, of these crimes were based mostly on hearsay. The reputation of Christians was one that did not invite confidence in

---

[696] Moss, *Ancient Christian Martyrdom*, 55.

character and trustworthiness. Therefore, the danger to the average Christian who was accused was very real.

Ignatius, for reasons that remain a point of much scholarly conjecture, was clearly one who stood condemned; one of the relatively few Christians who was forced to stand trial. In his epistles, Ignatius frames his impending execution as a martyrdom and sacrifice for both Christ and the church. Ignatius sees his death as the ultimate way in which he can follow in the footsteps of Christ and the apostles. By framing his sacrifice as *imitatio Christi,* Ignatius not only has the opportunity to show his devotion and prove his discipleship, but it also provides a second inferred notion regarding his death, namely its sacrificial nature.

The suggestion of Ignatius's death as a sacrifice for other Christians, specifically those under his care, once again reinforces the pastoral character of Ignatius. In this he displays one of the hallmarks of Foucault's *pasteur*—he is willing to lay down his life for the protection of the flock. This shows clearly the benevolent and self-sacrificing characteristics Foucault suggested are hallmarks of this form of power.

However, Ignatius's martyrdom does not simply provide him with the ability to offer a salvific sacrifice, but affords him a new authority and gravitas useful for communicating his message. Using this increased authority, Ignatius both lauds the merits of his impending martyrdom, framing it as the fullest expression of discipleship to Christ, and pleads for unity as a means for the flock to escape a similar fate. In regard to the former, this is a natural way to boost his authority even more. By painting himself as a complete disciple, he shows himself to be one whose words are worth heeding. To the latter, Ignatius once again echoes his constant refrain of unity. This time, however, unity is not for protection from internal threats alone, but as a tool to help avoid a fate similar to his own.

For Ignatius, unity was a matter of life and death. His deepest desire was to see the church unified, and he believed the monepiscopacy was the best way to do this. His martyrdom makes his obsession for unity understandable when seen in the light of Roman political policy towards Christianity in the early second century. Furthermore, his martyrdom provides the occasion for which Ignatius can advocate his ecclesiastical views to a wider audience. In all of this, his motivation is the protection and sustenance of his flock—the church. The framework of leadership he advocates for is one that is rooted in the pastoral drive for protection. His desire is to protect the flock, both from internal and

external threats, and continually be able to lead them to the best possible outcome, the fullness of discipleship. His martyrdom language and continued instruction through his journey provides evidence of his commitment to pastoral care and show that to be the driving force for his ecclesiology.

CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSION

The purpose of this study was to examine Ignatius of Antioch through the theory of discursive pastoral power first presented by Michel Foucault. Foucault himself declared that the church had institutionalized pastoral power, but he was focused almost exclusively on third- and fourth-century Christianity. The ecclesiological model of the third and fourth century was, in many ways, similar to the nascent ecclesiology of the second century. What remained to be seen was if pastoral power had been instrumental in earlier church institutionalization. Ignatius is a perfect subject for this examination, as he is one of the earliest and certainly the most vocal supporter of the monepiscopacy that would eventually dominate the church, not only in the time period on which Foucault focuses, but in many ways still today.

Ignatius provides the largest extant body of work available at the turn of the first century. In the formative years of the monepiscopacy, which became the form of church leadership that was standard in western Christianity by the fourth century, Ignatius provides a glimpse into the thought processes that formed this long-standing ecclesiological paradigm. From the beginning, it is not hard to see Ignatius's main and recurring theme was unity. It is also clear that, to Ignatius, the monepiscopacy provides an excellent organizational structure by which to achieve unity. What has not been as clear is why Ignatius and eventually the rest of Christianity decided this was of such importance. This is the question this study addressed in detail. It is not a question of whether Ignatius advocated obedience to a single bishop, but why he was so passionate in doing so.

Scholarship on Ignatius has increased in recent decades, but the question regarding Ignatius's commitment to the monepiscopacy has often been met with discussion centering on his theological commitments. While it is true that, ultimately, Ignatius's equation of the bishop to God is theological, there is a practical side to the discussion that is often left out. Ignatius's statements on unity bear this practicality. The very fact that Ignatius sees the bishop in a symbolic place of God begets a call to ecclesiology that is rooted in pastoralism. Thus, his language is curiously different than that of one of his biggest influences, the writings of Paul. While in Paul's writings there are traces of pastoral governmentality, this pales in comparison with the rigid monepiscopacy advocated by Ignatius.

Contrasted against Ignatius's continued call for unity, Paul's mission was the expansion of Christianity. In service to this, Paul spent a good portion of his time arguing for additions to Christian theology. Paul was certainly unconcerned to branch out from the expression of Christianity championed by the leaders in the Jerusalem church. Ignatius, on the other hand, does his best to bring Christianity into a single expression with a unified theology. The discourse of pastoralism in Ignatius's thought is universal and universalizing. Again, in this contrast the question arises as to Ignatius's reasoning. To this the pastoral nature of Ignatius was once again presented as a possible reasoning.

By looking at Ignatius as a *pasteur*, it becomes clear his actions and convictions align heavily with Foucault's observations of pastoral power. He is particularly concerned with caring for the church. Ignatius demonstrates pastoral tendencies in much of his writing. Ignatius begins this by equating the bishop with God himself. As the Judeo-Christian understanding of God is one rooted in pastoralism, this study began by examining this aspect of the faith. Understanding the pastoral nature of God helps to ground the examination of Ignatius. Thus, the question was focused on how pastoral leadership, based originally on the Hebraic understanding of God, effected Ignatius's self-understanding. What was the tradition of leadership that was handed down to Ignatius, and how did that effect his proposed organization of the church? Therefore, a general survey of pastoral power was provided.

5.1 Methodology

The methodology used for this study was very helpful in examining Ignatius of Antioch from a different perspective. By using the social theories of pastoral power presented by Foucault, there was freedom to detach from a purely theological examination and find some of the basis for where that theology was founded. Foucault's understanding of pastoral power, and its eventual basis in governmentality, provide a plausible glimpse of the motivations behind the directives that Ignatius gave in his epistles.

Another benefit of using Foucault's understanding of pastoral power is that it avoided the overly simplistic argument that the monepiscopacy is pragmatically the easiest form of organization. While a purely theological argument would be nearly impossible in its complexity, the simply pragmatic argument is not nearly nuanced enough. Instead, the use of the discourse of pastoral power seeks to lay a groundwork by which both the theological underpinnings and the practical solutions can both be understood.

By examining Ignatius as a *pasteur,* it can be showed that his actions are in harmony with the attributes of pastoral power suggested by Foucault. In terms of the examination of Ignatius's epistles, this reframes the motivation of his writing to one deeply motivated by his core understanding of his role within the early church. Especially in regard to his discussion of his own martyrdom, Ignatius can be seen through the pastoral lens as having a consistently benevolent purpose to his letters. The same can be said then for further study of early church ecclesiology. Since Ignatius was on the forefront of a call for the monepiscopacy, and that form of ecclesiology eventually became the dominant expression of church leadership, it is possible that the rest of the church developed by the same motivating factors.

However, it must be noted that by taking such a myopic view by which to examine Ignatius, there are other complex factors that were not examined. Surely the motivations of any human cannot be summed into a single theoretical examination of this or any length. There certainly must have been purely theological arguments throughout Ignatius's life and time in leadership that led him to write the way he did. There is a certain amount of pragmatic need to organize a church or churches in a certain way. Those motivations were purposely kept out of this as much as possible to ensure that the pastoral motivation of both Ignatius, and by extension the early church, could be examined.

5.2 Pastoral Power among the Ancient Hebrews and Early Christians

The nomadic nature of the Hebrews, and their understanding of the leadership of God in that movement was found to be consistent with Foucault's claims regarding pastoral power. More than that, however, the results of this movement produce a discourse of power that was distinct among the ancients. The movement itself produced power that was exercised, not in its territorial conquest, but in its care for a specific group of people. Pastoral power is, in essence, defined by its people, not its territory. The importance of the people shifts the balance of power from dominance to leadership. Within this movement associated with pastoral power, the demand to obey is replaced with a call to follow. This shift in relationship produces a leader who must care for the people in ways that are more intimate, more encompassing, and more dynamic than that of a monarch. This is what led Foucault to say that pastoral power is entirely defined by its beneficence, but it is also a characterized as a duty, one that has passion and endless application.[697]

---

[697] Foucault, *Security*, 172.

Examining Ignatius in light of this pastoral power, it was seen that even in the relative stagnation of the city of Antioch, his instruction was for the good of his congregation. His desire, in other words, was always for the care and protection of the church. Thus, the contrast between Paul's instruction and Ignatius's can be seen in Paul's desire to build the church and Ignatius's desire to protect it. This shift in focus for Ignatius gives evidence of the pastoral nature by which Ignatius operates.

Before examining Ignatius himself as a *pasteur*, it was necessary to place Ignatius within the larger Judeo-Christian history of the pastorate in order to understand the nuances of pastoral power and to show, not only the continuity between the Hebrew and Christian understanding of pastoralism, but the blossoming of it in the latter. Contrary to Foucault's inferred notion that the term shepherd was reserved for God alone among the Hebrews, a survey of the HB revealed that even if the term shepherd was not explicitly used for leaders of the Hebrews, many of the most celebrated leaders were shepherds. The litany of shepherd leaders in the HB is quite telling. Abraham, Moses, David, and even the prophet Amos were considered to be shepherds. The ubiquity and richness of the shepherd motif in the scriptures is telling. These traditions were clearly carried into the NT, whose imagery can be seen even in the account of Jesus's birth.

Jesus himself advanced the shepherd motif to include himself, most famously in the "Good Shepherd" discourse found in John chapter 10. While still affirming the characteristics of the shepherd gleaned from the ancient Hebrews, Jesus advances the idea with this discourse by elevating the self-sacrificing nature of the good shepherd. For the first time, Jesus presents the notion that the shepherd is willing to die for the sheep. The beneficence of the shepherd has always been there. This is seen in the intimate declarations of the Psalms.[698] But here in the Gospel of John, Jesus advances the idea to its fullest expression in the sacrifice of the good shepherd for the sheep. Later in John, Jesus will reportedly take this mantle of the shepherd and place it on Peter with the threefold command to "feed my lambs."[699]

By transferring the concept of shepherd from himself to Peter, Jesus sets a model by which the early church begins to follow. The disciples, at the very least in this case Peter, were given a task wrapped in pastoral language. The discourse shifts from Jesus-as-shepherd to the disciples-as-shepherds. Thus, by the close of the NT narrative, Christianity has not only adopted the Hebraic theme of pastoral

---

[698] Ps. 23 is the finest example.

[699] John 21:15–17.

leadership but also expounded upon its meaning in light of Jesus's life and death. For the Christians, the highest expression of love and leadership, and ultimately power, was found in the person of Jesus. In their determination to emulate their savior, the disciples's emulation of Jesus sets the stage for the next generation of church leaders to do likewise. As the narrative shifts to the next generation of leaders, Ignatius enters with this pastoral understanding of leadership.

5.3 Ignatius and Pastoral Power

Thus, it was determined that, although certainly not the only form of leadership that is evidenced in Judeo-Christians history, the Jews, and to a greater extant the early Christians, possessed a high view of pastoral power. By the turn of the second century, as Christianity became its own entity apart from Judaism, the identity of the Christians as those who follow and even imitate the life of Christ produces an even greater connection with the concept of emulating the good shepherd. Nowhere is this more evident than in the writings of Ignatius, where the symbolic and practical emulation of Jesus is a reality.

The symbolic representation of Christ in the bishop is particularly vibrant in his ecclesiological claims. By setting up the bishop in the place of God or Jesus, it can be inferred that the power of the bishop is rooted in pastoralism, in line with the Judeo-Christian understanding of God. This, however, is circumstantial and a deeper inquiry was in order. By examining Ignatius's instruction to the churches to which he writes, the investigation aimed to show that in his ecclesiological understanding of the bishop in the place of Christ, his teaching was also consistent with that of the pastoral power presented by Foucault.

The investigation of Ignatius's use of pastoral motives focused exclusively on his two main themes about which he wrote—unity and martyrdom. The logic is that if Ignatius truly saw himself as a shepherd and crafts his leadership in this way, his main concern for the church would be the concerns of a *pasteur*. Upon examination, the connection between a theoretical pastoral response and the response of Ignatius to the issues he addressed was quite evident. First to be examined was the unity of the church in the face of, what Ignatius believed, were schismatic groups.

5.4 Individualization: The Pastoral Response to Heresy

Schismatic groups in early Christianity were both prevalent and dangerous. Christian theology was in its infancy as the early Christians were making sense of the teachings and actions of Christ and its

meaning for their lives. This mixed with the evangelistic nature of Christianity meant that the early churches, who one could imagine are on precarious theological footing, were adding to their numbers from a highly religious yet highly pluralistic society. The conditions for new theological ideas were fertile.

Ignatius senses danger in these new theological ideas. His argument against "heresy" is catalyzed against Docetism and the Judaizers. The tool which he uses is universal in its effectiveness against schismatic ideas: unity. This constitutes the main theme of Ignatius writing, and it is clearly important to him. Upon seeing the danger of schismatic groups and factions within the church, Ignatius passionately and repeatedly called for a unified Christianity. It is evident that his belief is that the monepiscopacy is the most likely way to achieve this. But even more telling in his quest for unity, at least pertaining to the investigation of his use of pastoral power, are his specific instructions on congregational practices. Particularly in the eucharist, one can begin to see one of the main features of pastoralism begin to emerge.

In Ignatius's call for unity in the face of heresy, he embodies the pastoral theme of individualization. As Foucault suggests, the *pasteur* must certainly direct the whole flock. Ignatius calls for this in his demand that everyone follows the bishop. Within this command, however, is the continued and present individualization of the "others." Ignatius's struggle against heretical teaching, against the Judaizers and especially the Docetists, consistently points to the need to call out those who have gone astray and bring them back to the "fold." In order to accomplish this, Ignatius particularly sets up a common place and time—the eucharist—by which every Christian within a city should come under the gaze of either the bishop or his appointee. By creating the conditions necessary for pastoral power to exert one of its most fundamental power-attributes, Ignatius begins the process of institutionalizing pastoral power. Ignatius not only demands obedience to one bishop, setting the bishop as shepherd over the church, he also demands adherence to a commonality that enables the work of individualization to exist within a body of Christians.

Another benefit of the eucharist as an individualizing tool produces for Ignatius a sort of practical orthodoxy. At a time when doctrine and creeds were not yet agreed upon, the eucharist provided a point to gather the entire church together. The bishop is then able to see the entire church and examine each person and determine his or her spiritual health. The determination of any correction could then take place. This is similar to, but not quite as drastic as, the individualization of the groups that found

themselves "not inside the sanctuary."[700] The eucharist, then, is the perfect tool to accomplish what Foucault suggests is the paradoxical notion of *omnes et singulatim*, looking after the many and yet looking after the one.

The conditions Ignatius seeks to create with his pleas for unity are consistent with the shepherd's duty to keep watch. By demanding, not only obedience to the bishop, but the celebration of one eucharist, Ignatius effectively develops the first ecclesial model by which a key component of pastoral power is expressed and enacted. This is echoed in later church sacraments that require the congregants to appear before the priest, namely confession. At the turn of the first century, however, the institutionalization of pastoral power began to take root for Ignatius in the form of the eucharist.

5.5 Martyrdom: The Pastoral Response to Persecution

The other theme dominating Ignatius's writing, martyrdom, shows another glaring attribute of pastoral power; his willingness to sacrifice himself for his sheep. This is, as Foucault suggests, another distinctly pastoral form of leadership. The shepherd's relationship to the sheep and the discourse that allows this relationship to occur produces a relationship of reliance between the shepherd and sheep. It is not simply a reciprocal relationship, but an actual reliance. Unlike a monarch, who relies on his territory for power, the shepherd relies completely on the sheep as a source of his own authority. In this, then, the sheep become the very defining existence for the shepherd himself. Because of this, according to Foucault, the shepherd agrees to sacrifice himself for his sheep. Again, the relationship of care is distinct within pastoral power precisely because of the discourse between the shepherd and sheep. They are nearly synergistic in their reliance on each other, owing their respective existences to the other. In the case of Ignatius, the form of sacrifice becomes martyrdom.

Ignatius's use of martyrdom highlights the paradoxical relationship between the building of the body by the destruction of the shepherd. As the one being martyred is enduring suffering, the creation and strengthening of the congregation becomes evident. Martyrdom creates a discourse that ultimately produces a unity that is much stronger than the unity of the persecutors. Stated another way, the oppressed are more unified than the oppressors, because they have a common purpose. The martyr creates another rallying point to which the oppressed can gather, thus producing unity. Thus, the destruction of the shepherd creates the conditions by which the body is built and strengthened.

---

[700] Ign. *Eph*. 5.2.

The use of martyrdom in Ignatius is extensive. His treatment of the subject is prevalent enough, and his desire to see its completion so fervent, that the mental state of the bishop has come under question from some. However, his obsession is understandable if viewed in light of a pastoral dedication. His understanding and framing of his impending death are varied. On the one hand, he sees himself completing the discipleship journey, following most closely in the footsteps of Jesus. On the other hand, Ignatius clearly uses it as a platform by which he has one last chance to call for unity.

Within Ignatius's desire to complete his discipleship of Christ and to be found a true Christian, Ignatius alludes to the sacrificial nature of his martyrdom. The very notion of discipleship, and following in the footsteps of Jesus, suggests Ignatius desired to follow in the sacrificial manner of Jesus death. Death was not necessarily the discipleship path, but a sacrificial death certainly was. Ignatius draws attention to this form of discipleship repeatedly in his letters.

He also returns to the use of the eucharist to speak of his own death. Again, this is something that gives evidence to his belief in his self-sacrifice. For Ignatius, the eucharist was not only a celebration of the saving work of Christ, but in a mystical way, a means by which the church could participate in that sacrifice. With this in mind, Ignatius takes this further by equating his own martyrdom as a eucharist. With allusions to being ground by the wild beast, and becoming a libation to God, Ignatius properly places his sacrifice in comparison with that of Christ, strengthening the notion that his death is a sacrifice, not only for God, but for his church. This shows the shepherd's self-sacrifice in striking fashion. There is more to Ignatius's treatment of his own martyrdom that suggests a commitment to ongoing care for the church..

Facing his own death, Ignatius finds great use of his predicament. Despite being caught in the persecution of the early church, Ignatius finds a positive aspect in its midst. First, Ignatius uses his martyrdom as springboard for his message. His martyrdom solidifies his authority and gives him a means by which he can spread his message as far as he can. In this, he once again chooses unity. Furthermore, he proposes that his very death will bring the church in Rome together as a chorus in unity. Because of the tenuous legal status of Christianity, the need for a unified front among the Christians was paramount. Surrounding his call for unity is language that was typical of the political policy of *concordia*/ὁμόνοια. Given Ignatius's frequent use of symbolism, it is reasonable to assume that his use of political terms means, on some level, the idea of ὁμόνοια can be interpreted as a belief

that unity within the church can have positive political effects, perhaps to avoid the same fate he suffered. To the very end Ignatius's commitment to the care of his sheep is ever-present and the sacrificial nature of the shepherd is seen. Although martyrdom was not necessarily something Ignatius established or even advocates for beyond himself, its examination showed two things. First, it shows Ignatius's commitment as a *pasteur*. Second, it showed that in his belief in his martyrdom's salvific work, he believed this salvation to be, once again, rooted in unity. For Ignatius, the deconstruction of his own body becomes the means by which the social body of the church is constructed. The paradox of persecution and martyrdom is that with the increase in danger, there is an increase in unity. By becoming a martyr, Ignatius is able to strengthen the unity of the church, perpetuate the *dispositif* by which pastoral power will increase, and diminish persecution all at the same time. This is the truly paradoxical nature of the pastoral response to persecution.

In conclusion, by examining Ignatius in the light of Foucault's theories of pastoral power, it was determined that his reactions to various crises within the early church were consistent with the theoretical responses of pastoral power. Foucault particularly believed in a concept he called the dispositive, or *dispositif.* In this he believed the structure of power, particularly pastoral power, was formed in response to crisis. In seeing Ignatius in light of pastoral power, and determining the congruency between his response and that of the historical and Foucault's *pasteur*, it is reasonable to conclude that his development of ecclesiology,and the *dispositif* of the early church were rooted in a pastor's response to two distinct crises: heresy and persecution. In order to combat both, the apparatuses of security developed by Ignatius were twofold. First, the commitment to the monepiscopacy provided the most assured way of achieving unity. This unity is useful for both protection against heresy and persecution. Second, by instituting a specific guideline for the celebration of the eucharist, Ignatius sets both the boundaries of orthodoxy for his day, and also sets the mold by which other apparatuses of pastoral power, namely other sacraments, will be set. Thus, he assures even greater unity. The pastoral *dispositif* directly speaks into both Ignatius's hoped ecclesiological paradigm, and the earliest form of pastoral power's institutionalization in the church.

5.6 Pastoral Power, Ignatius, and Ecclesiology

Viewing Ignatius and the early church through the paradigm of Foucault's work on pastoral power produced surprising results. By using the methodology of studying Ignatius as a *pasteur*, a new, or perhaps expanded, understanding of Ignatius and his epistles, early Christian leadership, and early Christian ecclesiology were found. This methodology provides a plausible answer as to why Ignatius

chose to advocate for the monarchical episcopacy, why the church eventually chose this form of governance, and how the church became centralized in the lives of believers.

By using Foucault's understanding of the *pasteur* to examine Ignatius, a picture of Ignatius's motives for writing became clear. Ignatius's call to unity, obedience, harmony, and the centralized gathering of the eucharist make sense in light of the pastoral charge of protection. Reading Ignatius in light of the benevolence of the *pasteur*, one can begin to see the care, even in the waning days of his life, that he has for both his congregation in Antioch, and for the churches to which he writes. In this understanding, Ignatius's demands for gathering in the presence of the bishop become less about institutionalization and more about the health and protection of the people under his care. Such an understanding, when cast across the subsequent generations, show the institutionalization of the monepiscopacy as the natural outcome of care, rather than the consolidation of power.

Thus, in the same way, the leadership of the early church follows the natural progression of this pastoral leadership. As the spread of Christianity continued through the second century, the need for unity and safety also spread. With the rise of the Christian populace came the need for every increasing apparatuses of safety. Since Christianity was infused with the Judeo-Christian understanding of the shepherd, it appears natural for a pastoral form of leadership to emerge. The centralized nature of this leadership can be seen as a practical response to the issues to which Ignatius specifically writes, namely internal and external conflict. Thus, the *dispositif* actually produces the leadership of early Christian leadership.

Similarly, this pastoral leadership response begets early Christian ecclesiology. By demanding the centralized gatherings, and especially gathering presided over by the bishop, a clear definition of what constituted the church became sharpened. Essentially, the church began to exist *only* in the presence of the bishop. The definition of the church became solidified. In Ignatius and eventually beyond, it was not simply in whom Christians believed and what they practiced, but how they practiced gathering that mattered. Particularly by not allowing the eucharist without the knowledge or presence of the bishop, the role of the church in the daily life of the believer became essential. This is significant in defining early ecclesiology. By examining Ignatius through the lens of the *pasteur*, Ignatius's motives, the leadership of the church, and the ecclesiology of early Christianity follow a natural and perhaps inevitable progression. This understanding can be extrapolated out to later sacraments of the church to bring the congregation before its centralized pastoral figures.

5.7 Limitations of the Study

In order to examine Ignatius in light of Foucault's theories on pastoral power, this study was intentionally myopic in multiple ways. To begin, there was necessity to avoid other forms of power and leadership present in Ignatius's day. Even in the writings of Paul one can find unique expressions of church leadership that require their own theories of power to be examined. Particularly what some have deemed the fivefold ministry expressed in Eph. 4 is distinctly contrary to the domination of one form of leadership. If Foucault is correct, and I believe he is, the domination of pastoral power and its institutionalization, first in the church and then in modern governmentality, then examining how this institutionalization may have begun required this avoidance of other power forms.

Another way in which this study was limited was by focusing on Ignatius's two main themes. The blossoming of scholarship on Ignatius proves that the man wrote far more than on just unity and martyrdom. However, his responses to these issues proved to be the most important, evidenced by the frequency and length of his own treatment on the subjects. They provide the greatest insight into the motives of Ignatius, and thus were chosen as avenues to show his congruency with Foucault's *pasteur*.

Finally, this study also intentionally avoided Ignatius's contemporaries, especially in regard to disputing claims of ecclesiology. Since the monepiscopacy eventually came to dominate the church, and Foucault sees the institutionalization of pastoral power in this ecclesiological paradigm, other proposed church leadership structures is not altogether relevant for this particular study. The transmission of pastoral power and its institutionalization are not in question, therefore the challengers to this ecclesiology were not examined.

5.8 Opportunities for Further Study

There are at least two distinct areas of inquiry beyond this study that are of great importance in understanding the formation of early church ecclesiology. As noted above, this study limited itself to pastoral power, since it was, according to Foucault, the power discourse that won the day. The examination of pastoral power within the formative years of ecclesiology raises questions such as: if pastoral power was used as a response to crises, why did another form of power not rise up to dominate the church as crises subsided in subsequent centuries? Did Ignatius's rise to power happen because he was a shepherd, or did the nature of his role as bishop create pastoral tendencies within him? The answer to the latter could be especially helpful in determining if pastoral power was inevitable in the

Christian faith, or if the crises of the early church established an unbroken pattern that dominated the entirety of church history.

Second, more study is needed regarding the triumph of the monepiscopacy and pastoral power over the other prescribed leadership models in the early church. Particularly the ongoing discussion surrounding charismatic ministry and church office. As already mentioned, Eph. 4 and its comparison with the dominance of pastoral power is necessary to see how the leadership of apostles, prophets, evangelists, and teachers were either integral to ecclesiological formation, or if they fell victim to the dominance of pastoral power. This study has shown that further analyses of early Christian pastoral power are merited, especially in terms of how the aforementioned crises in the early church elevated the shepherd, who responds to the crises so thoroughly, to the point where ecclesiological formation was left to him alone. It is hoped that others will now pursue and examine in further detail the development of earliest forms of Christian pastoral leadership and how these were fashioned into the type of papal and episcopal leadership we find in late antiquity. An examination of these themes would be a welcome addition to this study.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adams, Edward. *The Earliest Christian Meeting Places: Almost Exclusively Houses?* London: Bloomsbury, 2013.

Anderson, William P. *A Journey through Christian Theology: With Texts from the First to the Twenty-First Century*. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 2007.

Aranoff, Gerald. "Shepherding as a Metaphor." *JBQ* 42.1 (2014): 36–38.

Armstrong, Karen. *A History of God: The 4,000-Year Quest of Judaism, Christianity, and Islam.* New York: A. A. Knopf, 1993.

Assmann, Jan. *The Price of Monotheism*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2009.

Aubert, Bernard. *The Shepherd-Flock Motif in the Miletus Discourse (Acts 20:17–38) against Its Historical Background.* New York: Peter Lang, 2009.

Aune, David E. "Following the Lamb: Discipleship in the Apocalypse." *Patterns of Discipleship in the New Testament*. Edited by Richard N. Longenecker. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1996.

Aus, Roger D. *Simon Peter's Denial and Jesus' Commissioning Him as His Successor in John 21:15–19: Studies in Their Judaic Background*. New York: University Press of America, 2013.

Back, Sven-Olav. "The Eucharist in the Letters of Ignatius of Antioch." Pages 113–28 in *Institutions of the Emerging Church*. Edited by Sven-Olav Back and Erkki Koskenniemi. New York: Bloomsbury, 2016.

Ball, David M. *I Am in John's Gospel: Literary Function, Background and Theological Implications*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1996.

Barclay, John M. G. *Jews in the Mediterranean Diaspora: From Alexander to Trajan (323 BCE–117 CE)*. Berkley: University of California Press, 1996.

Barclay, William. *The Gospel of Luke*. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox, 1956.

———. *The Gospel of John, Volume Two*. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2001.

Barnard, Leslie, W. "In Defense of Pseudo-Piontius' Account of Polycarp's Martyrdom." Pages 192–204 in *Kyriakon: Festschrift Johannes Quasten*. Edited by Patrick Granfield. Vol. 1. Münster: Aschendorff, 1970.

Barrett, Charles K. "Jews and Judaizers in the Epistles of Ignatius." Pages 220–44 in *Jews, Greeks and Christians: Religious Cultures in Late Antiquity: Essays in Honor of William David Davies*. Edited by W. D Davies, Robert Hamerton-Kelly, and Robin Scroggs. Leiden: Brill, 1976.

———. *Freedom and Obligation: A Study of the Epistle to the Galatians*. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1985.

———. "Paul: Councils and Controversies." Pages 42–74 in *Conflicts and Challenges in Early Christianity*. Edited by Donald A. Hagner. Harrisburg, PA: Trinity, 1999.

Bauckham, Richard, and Carl Mosser. *The Gospel of John and Christian Theology*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2008.

Bauer, Walter. *Die Briefe des Ignatius von Antiochia und der Polykarpbrief*. Tübingen: Mohr, 1920.

———. *Orthodoxy and Heresy in Earliest Christianity*. Edited by Robert A. Kraft and Gerhard Krodel. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1971.

Beale, Gregory K., and Donald A. Carson. *Commentary on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 2007.

Beard, Mary, John North, and Simon Price. *Religions of Rome: Volume 2, A Sourcebook*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1998.

Bedjan, Paul, ed. *Acts of Martyrs and Saints: Acta Martyrum et Sanctorum*. Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias, 2008.

Behr, John. "Social and Historical Setting." Pages 55–70 in *The Cambridge History of Early Christian Literature*. Edited by Young, Frances, Lewis Ayres, Andrew Louth, and John Behr. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2004.

Benko, Stephen. *Pagan Rome and the Early Christians*. Bloomington; IN: Indiana University Press, 1984.

Bird, Michael F. *Colossians and Philemon: A New Covenant Commentary*. Cambridge: Lutterworth, 2014.

Black, Matthew. *The Book of Enoch, or, I Enoch: A New English Edition: With Commentary and Textual Notes*. Leiden: Brill, 1985.

Bock, Darrell L. *Luke*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 1996.

Boyarin, Daniel. *Dying for God: Martyrdom and the Making of Christianity and Judaism*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1999.

———. *Border Lines: The Partition of Judaeo-Christianity*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2004.

Braaten, Carl E. and Robert W. Jenson. *Marks of the Body of Christ.* Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1999.

Brakke, David. *The Gnostics: Myth, Ritual, and Diversity in Early Christianity*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2010.

Brent, Allen. *Cultural Episcopacy and Ecumenism: Representative Ministry in Church History from the Age of Ignatius of Antioch to the Reformation, with Special Reference to Contemporary Ecumenism*. Leiden: Brill, 1992.

———. "Ignatius of Antioch and the Imperial Cult." *VC* 52.1 (1998): 30–58.

———. *Ignatius of Antioch: A Martyr Bishop and the Origin of Episcopacy*. London: T&T Clark, 2007.

———. *Ignatius of Antioch and the Second Sophistic: A Study of an Early Christian Transformation of Pagan Culture*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006.

Brooten, Bernadette J. "The Jews of Ancient Antioch." Pages 29–37 in *Antioch: The Lost Ancient City*. Edited by Christine Kondoleon. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press and Worcester Art Museum, 2000.

Bourke, Miles M. "Reflections on Church Order in the New Testament." *CBQ* 30.4 (1968): 493–511.

Brown, Raymond E. *The Gospel and Epistles of John: A Concise Commentary*. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1988.

Brown Raymond E., and John P. Meier. *Antioch and Rome: New Testament Cradles of Catholic Christianity.* Mahwah, NJ: Paulist, 1983.

Bruce, Frederick F. *The Gospel of John: Introduction, Exposition, Notes*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1994.

Brueggemann, Walter. *First and Second Samuel*. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox, 1990.

Buell, Denise Kimber. *Why This New Race? Ethnic Reasoning in Early Christianity.* New York: Columbia University Press, 2005.

Bultmann, Rudolf. *The Gospel of John: A Commentary*. Translated by G. R. Beasley-Murray, G. R. Beasley-Murray, R. W. N. Hoare, and J. K. Riches. Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2014.

Burger, Hans. *Being in Christ: A Biblical and Systematic Investigation in a Reformed Perspective*. Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2009.

Burke, Patrick T. "Monarchial Episcopate at the End of the First Century." *Journal of Ecumenical Studies* 7.3 (1970): 499–518.

Bussolini, Jeffrey. "Michael Foucault's Influence on the Thought of Giorgio Agamben." Pages 104–21 in *A Foucault for the 21st Century: Governmentality, Biopolitics and Discipline in the New Millennium*. Edited by Sam Binkley and Jorge Capetillo. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars, 2009.

———. "What Is Dispositive?" *Foucault Studies* 10.10 (2010): 85–107.

Cahill, Thomas. *The Gifts of the Jews: How a Tribe of Desert Nomads Changed the Way Everyone Thinks and Feels*. New York: Nan A. Talese, 1998.

Calvin, John. *Commentary on the Book of Psalms*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 1979.

Campbell, William S. *Paul and the Creation of Christian Identity*. New York: T&T Clark, 2008.

Von Campenhausen, Hans F. *Die Idee des Martyriums in der alten Kirche.* Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1936.

———. "Bearbeitungen und Interpolation des Polykarpmartyriums." *Aus der Fruzeit des Christentums*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1963.

Caputo, John D. *Philosophy and Theology*. Nashville: Abingdon, 2006.

Carson, Donald A. *The Gospel according to John*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1991.

Castelli, Elizabeth A. *Martyrdom and Memory: Early Christian Culture Making*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2004.

Cataldo, Jeremiah W. "The Other: Sociological Perspectives in a Postcolonial Age." Pages 1–19 in *Imagining the Other and Constructing Israelite Identity in the Early Second Temple Period*. Edited by Ehud Ben Zvi and Diana Vikander Edelman. New York: Bloomsbury, 2014.

Chae, Young S. *Jesus as the Eschatological Davidic Shepherd: Studies in the Old Testament, Second Temple Judaism, and in the Gospel of Matthew*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006.

Chrysostom, John. *NPNF1-13. Saint Chrysostom: Homilies on Galatians, Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians, Thessalonians, Timothy, Titus, and Philemon*. Edited by Philip Schaff. Ebook. CCEL, 1976.

Clarke, Kevin M. "'Being Bishoped by God: The Theology of the Episcopacy According to St. Ignatius of Antioch." *Nova et Vetera* 14.1 (2016): 227–43.

Cohn, Robert L. "Characterization in Kings." Pages 89–105 in *The Books of Kings: Sources, Composition, Historiography and Reception*. Edited by Andre Lemaire, Baruch Halpern, and Matthew J. Adams. Leiden: Brill, 2010.

Cole, Diane. "Moses, the Egyptian Hebrew: Adoption as Archetype." *Mythosphere* 2.4 (2000): 369–70.

Collins, Adela Y. "Persecution and Vengence in the Book of Revelation." Pages 729–50 in *Apocalypticism in the Mediterranean World*. Edited by David Hellholm. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1983.

Cook, John Granger. *Roman Attitudes toward the Christians: From Claudius to Hadrian*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010.

Corwin, Virginia. *St. Ignatius and Christianity in Antioch*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1960.

Craddock, Fred B. *Luke*. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox, 2009.

Cross, Frank L., and Elizabeth A. Livingstone, eds. *The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.

Cunningham, Scott. *Through Many Tribulations: The Theology of Persecution in Luke-Acts*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1997.

Daly, Robert J. *Sacrifice Unveiled: The True Meaning of Christian Sacrifice*. New York: T&T Clark, 2009.

Danziger, Rosemarie. "The Epic Hagiography as Scriptural Genre and Its Pictorial Rendering in the Saint-Savin-Sur-Gartempe Crypt Frescos." Pages 206–41 in *Mental Health, Spirituality, and Religion in the Middle Ages and Early Modern Age*. Edited by Albrecht Classen. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2014.

Daunton-Fear, Andrew. "Ignatius of Antioch and the Apostle Paul." *Scrinium* 11.1 (2015): 59–63.

Davies, Graham. "Comparative Aspects of the History of Israelite Religion." *ZAW* 125.1 (2013): 177–97.

Donahue, Paul J. "Jewish Christianity in the Letters of Ignatius of Antioch." *VC* 32.2 (1978): 81–93.

Downey, Glanville. *A History of Antioch in Syria: From Seleucus to the Arab Conquest*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1961.

Draper, Jonathan A. "Social Ambiguity and the Production of Text: Prophets, Teachers, Bishops, and Deacons and the Development of the Jesus Tradition in the Community of the Didache." Pages 284–312 in *The Didache in Context: Essays on Its Text, History and Transmission.* Edited by Clayton N. Jefford. Leiden: Brill, 1995.

Dunn, James D. G. "The Incident at Antioch (Gal 2:11–18)." *JSNT* 18 (1983): 3–57.

———. *Jesus, Paul, and the Law: Studies in Mark and Galatians*. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox, 1990.

———. *The New Perspective on Paul*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2008.

Eastman, David L. *The Ancient Martyrdom Accounts of Peter and Paul*. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2015.

Ehrman, Bart D. *The Apostolic Fathers*. Vol. 2. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2003.

———. *Lost Christianities: The Battles for Scripture and the Faiths We Never Knew*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.

Elmer, Ian J. "Setting the Record Straight at Galatia: Paul's Narratio (Gal 1:13–2:14) as Response to the Galatian Conflict." Pages 21–38 in *Religious Conflict from Early Christianity to the Rise of Islam*. Edited by Wendy Mayer and Bronwen Neil. Boston: De Gruyter, 2013.

Ermatinger, James W. *Daily Life of Christians in Ancient Rome*. Westport, CT: Greenwood, 2007.

Esler, Philip F. *Community and Gospel in Luke-Acts: The Social and Political Motivations of Lucan Theology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.

Feldt, Laura. "Ancient Wilderness Mythologies—The Case of Space and Religious Identity Formation in the Gospel of Matthew." *ARG* 16.1 (2015): 163–92.

Ferguson, Everett. "*Paradosis* and *Traditio*: A Word Study." Pages 3–29 in *Tradition & The Rule of Faith in the Early Church: Essays in Honor of Joseph T. Lienhard S.J.* Edited by Ronnie J. Rombs and Alexander Y. Hwang. Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 2010.

———. *The Early Church at Work and Worship—Volume 3: Worship, Eucharist, Music, and Gregory of Nyssa*. Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2017.

Foucault, Michel. "The Subject and Power." *Critical Inquiry* 8.4 (1982): 777–95.

———. *Religion and Culture*. Edited by Jeremy R. Carrette. Manchester, UK: Manchester University Press, 1999.

———. *Security, Territory, Population: Lectures at the Collège de France, 1977–1978*. Edited by Michel Senellart and Arnold I. Davidson. Translated by Graham Burchell. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007.

———. *Politics, Philosophy, Culture: Interviews and Other Writings, 1977–1984*. Edited by Lawrence
    D. Kritzman. New York: Routledge, 2013.

Fox, Robin Lane. *Pagans and Christians*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1987.

Frend, W. H. C. *Martyrdom and Persecution in the Early Church: A Study of Conflict from the
    Maccabees to Donatus*. Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2014.

Frevel, Christian. "Beyond Monotheism?: Some Remarks and Questions on Conceptualising
    'Monotheism' in Biblical Studies." *VEcc* 34.2 (2013): 1–7.

Funk, Robert W. "The Wilderness." *JBL* 78.3 (1959): 205–14.

Gaston, Lloyd. "Judaism of the Uncircumcised in Ignatius and Related Writers." Pages 33–44 in *Anti-
    Judaism in Early Christianity: Separation and Polemic*. Edited by Stephen G. Wilson. Waterloo,
    ON: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 1986.

Gillingham, Susan. *The Image, the Depths and the Surface: Multivalent Approaches to Biblical Study*.
    New York: Sheffield Academic, 2002.

De Giorgi, Andrea U. *Ancient Antioch*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2016.

Gomola, Aleksander. *Conceptual Blending in Early Christian Discourse: A Cognitive Linguistic Analysis
    of Pastoral Metaphors in Patristic Literature*. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2018.

Grant, Robert M. *Jesus after the Gospels: The Christ of the Second Century*. Louisville, KY:
    Westminster John Knox, 1990.

Green, Bernard. *Christianity in Ancient Rome: The First Three Centuries*. New York: T&T Clark, 2010.

Greenberg, L. Arik. *"My Share of God's Reward": Exploring the Roles and Formulations of the Afterlife
    in Early Christian Martyrdom*. New York: Peter Lang, 2009.

Grove, Matt. "Population Density, Mobility, and Cultural Transmission." *Journal of Archaeological Science* 74 (2016): 75–84.

Grudem, Wayne A. *The First Epistle of Peter: An Introduction and Commentary*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1988.

Gruen, Erich S. *Diaspora: Jews Amidst Greeks and Romans*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2002.

Hahn, Scott W. "Liturgy and Empire: Prophetic Historiography and Faith in Exile in 1–2 Chronicles." Pages 13–50 in *Liturgy and Empire: Faith in Exile and Political Theology*. Edited by Scott W. Hahn and David Scott. Steubenville, OH: Emmaus Road, 2009.

de Halleux, André. "Ministers in the Didache." Pages 300–320 in *The Didache in Modern Research*. Edited by Jonathan A. Draper. Leiden: Brill, 1996.

Halperin, David. *Before Pastoral: Theocritus and the Ancient Tradition of Bucolic Poetry*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1983.

Von Harnack, Adolf. *The Expansion of Christianity in the First Three Centuries: Book III. The Names of Christian Believers. The Organization of the Christian Community. Counter-Movements. Book IV. The Spread of the Christian Religion*. New York: Williams & Norgate, 1905.

———. *Mission and Expansion of Christianity in the First Three Centuries*. New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1962.

Harrill, J. Albert. "St. Paul and the Christian Communities of Nero's Rome." Pages 276–89 in *The Cambridge Companion to the Age of Nero*. Edited by Shadi Bartsch, Kirk Freudenburg, and Cedric Littlewood. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017.

Harrison, Percy N. *Polycarp's Two Epistles to the Philippians*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1936.

Hengel, Martin. *Crucifixion in the Ancient World and the Folly of the Message of the Cross*. Translated by John Bowden. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1977.

———. *Saint Peter: The Underestimated Apostle*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2010.

Hill, Charles E. *The Johannine Corpus in the Early Church*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004.

Hill, Jonathan. "The Self-Giving Power of God: Dunamis in Early Christianity." In *Divine Powers in Late Antiquity*. Edited by Anna Marmodoro and Irini-Fotini Viltanioti. E-book. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017.

Himes, Kenneth R. *Christianity and the Political Order: Conflict, Cooptation, and Cooperation*. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 2013.

Hoffmeier, James K. *Ancient Israel in Sinai: The Evidence for the Authenticity of the Wilderness Tradition*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2005.

Hoffman, Daniel L. "The Authority of Scripture and Apostolic Doctrine in Ignatius of Antioch." *JETS* 28.1 (1985): 71–79.

———. "Ignatius and Early Anti-Docetic Realism in the Eucharist." *Fides et Historia* 30.1 (1998): 74–88.

Holmberg, Bengt. "Jewish versus Christian Identity in the Early Church?" *RB* 105.3 (1998): 397–425.

Hook, Brian Stewart, and Russell R. Reno. *Heroism and the Christian Life: Reclaiming Excellence*. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox, 2000.

Horrell, David G. "The Product of a Petrine Circle? A Reassessment of the Origin and Character of 1 Peter." *JSNT* 24.4 (2002): 29–60.

———. "Pauline Church or Early Christian Churches: Unity, Disagreement and the Eucharist." Pages 185–206 in *Einheit der Kirche im Neuen Testament: Dritte Europäische Orthodox-Westliche*

Exegetenkonferenz in Sankt Petersburg, 24–31. August 2005. Edited Anatoly A. Alexeev, Christos Karakolis, Ulrich Luz, with Karl-Wilhelm Niebuhr. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008.

Horsley, Richard A., ed. *Paul and Empire: Religion and Power in Roman Imperial Society*. Harrisburg, PA: Trinity, 1997.

———. "The Death of Jesus." Pages 395–422 in *Studying the Historical Jesus: Evaluations of the State of Current Research*. Edited by Bruce David Chilton and Craig Alan Evans. Boston: Brill, 1998.

Hughes, R. Kent. *Philippians: The Fellowship of the Gospel*. Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 2007.

Hurtado, Larry. "Interactive Diversity: A Proposed Model of Christian Origins." *JTS* 64.2 (2013): 445–62.

Huskinson, Janet. *Experiencing Rome: Culture, Identity and Power in the Roman Empire*. London: Routledge, 2000.

Isacson, Mikael. "Follow Your Bishop!: Rhetorical Strategies in the Letters of Ignatius of Antioch." Pages 317–40 in *The Formation of the Early Church*. Edited by Jostein Adna. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005.

Ivan, Reuben L. "The Connection Between Salvation, Martyrdom and Suffering According to St. Ignatius of Antioch." *Kairos: Evangelical Journal of Theology* 7.2 (2013): 167–82.

Jefford, Clayton N., ed. *The Didache in Context: Essays on Its Text, History and Transmission*. Leiden: Brill, 1995.

———. *The Apostolic Fathers and the New Testament*. E-book. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2006.

———— . "The Milieu of Matthew, the Didache, and Ignatius of Antioch: Agreements and Differences." Pages 35–48 in *Matthew and the Didache: Two Documents from the Same Jewish-Christian Milieu*. Edited by Huub Van De Sandt. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2005.

Jeremias, Joachim. *Jerusalem in the Time of Jesus: An Investigation into Economic and Social Conditions during the New Testament Period*. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 1969.

Jervis, L. Ann. *At the Heart of the Gospel: Suffering in the Earliest Christian Message*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2007.

Johanny, Raymond. "Ignatius of Antioch." Pages 48–70 in *The Eucharist of the Early Christians*. Edited by Willy Rordorf. Translated by Matthew J. O'Connell. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1990.

Johnston, David. "Crime and Punishment." Pages 301–31 in *The Cambridge Companion to Roman Law*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015.

Joseph, Alison L. "Who Is like David? Was David like David? Good Kings in the Book of Kings." *CBQ* 77.1 (2015): 20–41.

Kaylor, Brian. "Sheep without a Shepherd (but with an Archbishop): Foucault's Pastoral Power and the Denying of Communion." *Atlantic Journal of Communication* 19.3 (2011): 152–68.

Kelhoffer, James A. *Persecution, Persuasion and Power: Readiness to Withstand Hardship as a Corroboration of Legitimacy in the New Testament*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010.

Kelly, John N. D. *Epistles of Peter and Jude*. London: A&C Black, 1969.

———— . *Early Christian Doctrines*. London: Continuum, 2006.

Kharlamov, Vladimir. "Emergence of the Deification Theme in the Apostolic Fathers." Pages 51–66 in *Theosis: Deification in Christian Theology*. Edited by Stephen Finlan and Vladimir Kharkamov. Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2006.

Kilgallen, John J. "Luke 2,41–50: Foreshadowing of Jesus, Teacher." *Bib* 66.4 (1985): 553–59.

Kim, Sang-Hoon. *Sourcebook of the Structures and Styles in John 1–10: The Johannine Parallelisms and Chiasms*. Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2014.

King, Karen L. "Which Ancient Christianity?" Pages 66–84 in *The Oxford Handbook of Early Christian Studies*. Edited by Susan Ashbrook Harvey and David G. Hunter. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008.

Kinlaw, Pamela E. *The Christ is Jesus: Metamorphosis, Possession, and Johannine Christology.* Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2005.

Kirwan, Michael. "Eucharist and Sacrifice." *New Blackfriars* 88.1014 (2007): 213–27.

Koester, Helmut. "The Apostolic Fathers and the Struggle for Christian Identity." *The Expository Times* 117.4 (2006): 133–39.

Köstenberger, Andreas J. "Shepherds and Shepherding in the Gospels." Pages 33–58 in *Shepherding God's Flock: Biblical Leadership in the New Testament and Beyond*. Edited by Benjamin L. Merkle and Thomas R. Schreiner. Grand Rapids, MI: Kregel, 2014.

Kraabel, Alf T. "Unity and Diversity among Diaspora Synagogues." Pages 49–60 in *The Synagogue in Late Antiquity*. Edited by Lee I. Levine. Philadelphia: American Schools of Oriental Research, 1987.

Kraeling, Carl H. "The Jewish Community at Antioch." *JBL* 51.2 (1932): 130–60.

de La Soujeole, Benoit-Dominique. *Introduction to the Mystery of the Church.* Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 2014.

Lampe, Peter. *Christians at Rome in the First Two Centuries: From Paul to Valentinus.* Translated by Michael Steinhauser. London: T&T Clark, 2003.

Laniak, Timothy. *Shepherds after My Own Heart: Pastoral Traditions and Leadership in the Bible*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 2006.

Lathrup, Gordon. "The Water That Speaks: The Ordo of Baptism and Its Ecumenical Implications." Pages 13–29 in *Becoming a Christian: The Ecumenical Implications of Our Common Baptism*. Edited by Thomas Best and Dagmar Heller. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1999.

Lawson, John. *The Biblical Theology of Saint Irenaeus*. Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock, 2006.

Lawyer, John E. "Eucharist and Martyrdom in the Letters of Ignatius of Antioch." *ATR* 73.3 (1991): 280–96.

Lee, Jae Won. *Paul and the Politics of Difference: A Contextual Study of the Jewish-Gentile Difference in Galatians and Romans*. Cambridge: James Clarke & Co., 2015.

Lienhard, Joseph T, Alexander Y. Hwang, and Ronnie J. Rombs. *Tradition & the Rule of Faith in the Early Church: Essays in Honor of Joseph T. Lienhard, S.J.* Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 2010.

Lieu, Judith. *Christian Identity in the Jewish and Graeco-Roman World*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004.

Lightfoot, Joseph B. *The Apostolic Fathers: Clement, Ignatius, and Polycarp Part II*. Vol. 1. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1989.

Lintott, Andrew. "Crime and Punishment." Pages 301–31 in *The Cambridge Companion to Roman Law*. Edited by David Johnston. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015.

Litfin, Bryan M. *Early Christian Martyr Stories: An Evangelical Introduction with New Translations*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 2014.

Little, Edmund. "Peter and the Beloved Disciple: Unfinished Business in John 21." *Stimulus: The New Zealand Journal of Christian Thought & Practice* 18.4 (2010): 36–43.

Lobur, John A. *Consensus, Concordia and the Formation of Roman Imperial Ideology*. New York: Routledge, 2008.

Long, David P. "Eucharistic Ecclesiology and Excommunication." *Ecclesiology* 10.2 (2014): 205–28.

Lopez, David A. *Separatist Christianity: Spirit and Matter in the Early Church Fathers*. Johns Hopkins University Press, 2004.

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

Lund, Allan A. "Zur Verbrennung der sogenanten Chrestiani (Tac. Ann. 15,44)." *ZRGG* 60.3 (2008): 253–61.

MacDonald, Margaret Y. *Colossians and Ephesians*. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2008.

MacMullen, Ramsay. *Christianizing the Roman Empire: (A.D. 100–400)*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1984.

Maier, Harry O. "The Politics and Rhetoric of Discord and Concord in Paul and Ignatius." Pages 307–24 in *Trajectories through the New Testament and the Apostolic Fathers*. Edited by Andrew Gregory and Christopher M. Tuckett. New York: Oxford University Press, 2005.

———. "Space, Body, and Church in Ignatius of Antioch: Toward a Spatial Treatment." Pages 517–36 in *Studies on the Text of the New Testament and Early Christianity: Essays in Honour of Michael W. Holmes*. Edited by Daniel Gurtner, Juan Hernández Jr., and Paul Foster. Leiden: Brill, 2015.

Malherbe, Abraham J., and Carl R. Holladay. *Light from the Gentiles: Hellenistic Philosophy and Early Christianity: Collected Essays, 1959–2012*. Leiden: Brill, 2014.

Mani, V. S. *International Adjudication: Procedural Aspects*. Boston: Martinus Nijhoff, 1980.

Manning, Jr., Gary T. "Shepherd, Vine and Bones: The Use of Ezekiel in the Gospel of John." Pages 25–44 in *After Ezekiel: Essays on the Reception of a Difficult Prophet*. Edited by Andrew Mein and Paul Joyce. New York: Bloomsbury, 2014.

Marshall, I. Howard. *The Acts of the Apostles: An Introduction and Commentary*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1980.

Matak, Dragutin. "Another Look at the Antioch Incident (Gal 2:11–14)." *Kairos: Evangelical Journal of Theology* 6 (2012): 49–59.

Mauser, Ulrich W. *Christ in the Wilderness: The Wilderness Theme in the Second Gospel and Its Basis in the Biblical Tradition*. Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2009.

Mayes, Christopher. "The Violence of Care: An Analysis of Foucault's Pastor." *JCRT* 11.1 (2010): 111–26.

McDowell, Sean. *The Fate of the Apostles: Examining the Martyrdom Accounts of the Closest Followers of Jesus*. New York: Routledge, 2016.

McGuckin, John A. *The Path of Christianity: The First Thousand Years*. Kindle Edition. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 2017.

McNamara, Norman D. "Ignatius of Antioch on His Death: Discipleship, Sacrifice, Imitation." Ph.D. Dissertation. McMaster University, 1977.

McPartlan, Paul. *Sacrament of Salvation: An Introduction to Eucharistic Ecclesiology*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1995.

Meeks, Wayne A. *The First Urban Christians: The Social World of the Apostle Paul*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2003.

Mellink, A. O. "Death as Eschaton: A Study of Ignatius of Antioch's Desire for Death." Ph.D. Dissertation. University of Amsterdam, 2000.

Merkle, Benjamin L. "Ecclesiology in the Pastoral Epistles." Pages 173–98 in *Entrusted with the Gospel: Paul's Theology in the Pastoral Epistles*. Edited by Andreas J. Köstenberger and Terry L. Wilder. Nashville, TN: B&H Academic, 2010.

Metzger, Bruce M. "Antioch-on-the-Orontes." *BA* 11.4 (1948): 69–88.

———. *The Canon of the New Testament: Its Origin, Development, and Significance.* New York: Oxford University Press, 1987.

Meyendorff, John. "The Nicene Creed: Uniting or Dividing Confession?" Pages 1–19 in *Faith to Creed: Ecumenical Perspectives on the Affirmation of the Apostolic Faith in the Fourth Century*. Edited by S. Mark Heim. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1991.

Milavec, Aaron. *The Didache: Faith, Hope, & Life of the Earliest Christian Communities, 50-70 C.E.* New York: Newman Press, 2003.

Mitchell, Margaret M. *Paul and the Rhetoric of Reconciliation: An Exegetical Investigation of the Language and Composition of 1 Corinthians*. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox, 1991.

Mlakuzhyil, George. *The Christocentric Literary Structure of the Fourth Gospel*. Rome: Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 1987.

Mohrlang, Roger. *Matthew and Paul: A Comparison of Ethical Perspectives.* New York: Cambridge University Press, 1984.

Moloney, Francis J. *The Gospel of John*. Edited by Daniel J. Harrington. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1998.

———. *Glory not Dishonor: Reading John 13–21*. Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2004.

Moss, Candida. *The Other Christs: Imitating Jesus in Ancient Christian Ideologies of Martyrdom*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2010.

———. *Ancient Christian Martyrdom: Diverse Practices, Theologies, and Traditions*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2012.

———. *The Myth of Persecution: How Early Christians Invented a Story of Martyrdom*. New York: HarperOne, 2013.

Mowry, Lucetta. "The Early Circulation of Paul's Letters." *JBL* 63.2 (1944): 73–86.

Münkler, Herfried. *Empires: The Logic of World Domination from Ancient Rome to the United States*. Translated by Patrick Camiller Maldin, MA: Polity, 2007.

Musurillo, Herbert. *The Acts of the Christian Martyrs*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1972.

Mutie, Jeremiah. *Death in Second-Century Christian Thought: The Meaning of Death in Earliest Christianity*. Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2015.

Muzorewa, Gwinyai H., and Ralph C. Watkins. *African Origins of Monotheism: Challenging the Eurocentric Interpretation of God Concepts on the Continent and in Diaspora*. Eugene, OR: Pickwick, 2014.

Nebreda, Sergio Rosell. *Christ Identity: A Social-Scientific Reading of Philippians 2.5–11*. Oakville, CT: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2011.

Neusner, Jacob. *Jews and Christians: The Myth of a Common Tradition.* Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock, 2003.

Neyrey, Jerome H. "The 'Noble Shepherd' in John 10: Cultural and Rhetorical Background." *JBL* 120.2 (2001): 267–91.

Nggada, Philip Asura. "Shepherd Motif in the Old Testament and its Implications for Leadership In Nigeria." PhD Dissertation. University of Jos, 2012.

Niehaus, Jeffery J. *Ancient Near Eastern Themes in Biblical Theology*. Grand Rapids, MI: Kregel, 2008.

Nolland, John. *The Gospel of Matthew: A Commentary on the Greek Text.* Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2005.

Norman, Russell. "The Concept of Deification in the Early Greek Fathers." Ph.D. Dissertation. Oxford University, 1988.

Norris, Frederick W. "Ignatius, Polycarp, and I Clement: Walter Bauer Reconsidered." *VC* 30.1 (1976): 23–44.

Oelschlaeger, Max. *The Idea of Wilderness: From Prehistory to the Age of Ecology*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1991.

Ojakangas, Mika. *On the Greek Origins of Biopolitics: A Reinterpretation of the History of Biopower*. New York: Routledge, 2016.

Olson, Daniel C. *A New Reading of the Animal Apocalypse of 1 Enoch: "All Nations Shall Be Blessed."* Leiden: Brill, 2013.

Olson, Roger E. *The Story of Christian Theology: Twenty Centuries of Tradition & Reform*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 1999.

Pangle, Thomas L. *Political Philosophy and the God of Abraham*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2007.

Park, Eung Chun. *Either Jew or Gentile: Paul's Unfolding Theology of Inclusivity.* Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox, 2003.

Pearson, Birger A. *Gnosticism, Judaism, and Egyptian Christianity*. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 2006.

Perkins, Judith. *The Suffering Self: Pain and Narrative Representation in the Early Christian Era*. New York: Routledge, 1995.

Perkins, Pheme. *Introduction to the Synoptic Gospels*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2009.

———. "Power in the New Testament." *Proceedings of the Catholic Theological Society of America* 37 (2013): 83–89.

Pesthy-Simon, Monika. *Isaac, Iphigeneia, Ignatius: Martyrdom and Human Sacrifice*. New York: Central European University Press, 2017.

Pitts-Taylor, Victoria. *Cultural Encyclopedia of the Body*. Westport, CT: Greenwood, 2008.

Plummer, Robert L. *Paul's Understanding of the Church's Mission: Did the Apostle Paul Expect the Early Christian Communities to Evangelize?* Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2006.

Polzin, Robert. *Samuel and the Deuteronomist: A Literary Study of the Deuteronomic History Part Two: 1 Samuel*. Bloomingdale, IN: Indiana University Press, 1993.

Pongratz-Leisten, Beate. *Reconsidering the Concept of Revolutionary Monotheism*. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2011.

Power, David N. *The Eucharistic Mystery: Revitalizing the Tradition*. New York: Herder & Herder, 1994.

Preiss, Theodor. "La mystique de l'imitation du Christ et de l'unité Chez Ignace d'Antioche." *RHPR* 17 (1938): 197–241.

Proctor, Travis W. "Bodiless Docetists and the Daimonic Jesus: Daimonological Discourse and Anti-Docetic Polemic in Ignatius's Letter to the Smyrnaeans." *ARG* 14.1 (2013): 183–204.

Rabinow, Paul, ed. *The Foucault Reader*. New York: Pantheon, 1984.

Ratzinger, Joseph. *New Outpourings of the Spirit: Movements in the Church*. Translated by Michael J. Miller and Henry Taylor. San Francisco: Ignatius, 2007.

Reis, David M. "Following in Paul's Footsteps: Mimesis and Power in Ignatius of Antioch." Pages 287–306 in *Trajectories through the New Testament and the Apostolic Fathers*. Edited by Andrew F. Gregory and Christopher M. Tuckett. New York: Oxford University Press, 2005.

Resane, K. Thomas. "Leadership for the Church: The Shepherd Model." *HvTSt* 70.1 (2014): 1–6.

Rice, Gene. "Psalm 139: A Diary of the Inward Odyssey." *JRT* 37.2 (1980): 63–67.

Richardson, Cyril. "Church in Ignatius of Antioch." *JR* 17.4 (1937): 428–43.

———. *Early Christian Fathers.* Philadelphia: Westminster, 1953.

———. *The Church in Ignatius of Antioch*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1958.

———. *The Christianity of Ignatius of Antioch.* New York: AMS, 1967.

Ridderbos, Herman. *The Gospel of John: A Theological Commentary*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1997.

Rius-Camps, Josep. *The Four Authentic Letters of Ignatius, The Martyr.* Rome: Pontificium Institutum Orientalium Studiorum, 1980.

Robinson, James M., and Helmut Koester. *Trajectories through Early Christianity*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1971.

Robinson, Thomas A. *Ignatius of Antioch and the Parting of the Ways: Early Jewish-Christian Relations*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2009.

Rodríguez, Rubén Rosario. *Christian Martyrdom and Political Violence: A Comparative Theology with Judaism and Islam*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2017.

Rordorf, Willy. *The Eucharist of the Early Christians*. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1990.

Sabbe, Marc. "John 10 and Its Relationship to the Synoptic Gospels." Pages 74–93 in *The Shepherd Discourse of John 10 and Its Context*. Edited by Johannes Beutler and Robert T. Fortna. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2005.

Sampley, J. Paul. *Paul in the Greco-Roman World: A Handbook*. Harrisburg, PA: Trinity, 2003.

Sanders, Ed P. "Jewish Association with Gentiles and Galatians 2:11–14." Pages 170–88 in *The Conversation Continues: Studies in Paul and John in Honor of J. Louis Martyn.* Edited by Robert T. Fortna and Beverly R. Gaventa. Nashville, TN: Abingdon, 1990.

Scheid, John. "Roman Animal Sacrifice and the System of Being." Pages 84–98 in *Greek and Roman Animal Sacrifice: Ancient Victims, Modern Observers*. Edited by Christopher A. Faraone and F. S. Naiden. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2012.

Schlatter, F. W. "The Restoration of Peace in Ignatius's Antioch." *JTS* 35.2 (1984): 465–69.

Schneidau, Herbert N. *Sacred Discontent: The Bible and Western Tradition*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1976.

Schoedel, William R. *Ignatius of Antioch*. Edited by Helmut Koester. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1985.

Schofield, Alison. "Between Center and Periphery: The Yahad in Context." *Dead Sea Discoveries* 16.3 (2009): 330–350.

Schreiner, Thomas R. *Paul, Apostle of God's Glory in Christ: A Pauline Theology*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 2001.

Schuld, J. Joyce. "Augustine, Foucault, and the Politics of Imperfection." *The Journal of Religion* 80.1 (2000): 1–22.

———. *Foucault and Augustine: Reconsidering Power and Love*. Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 2003.

Scott, James C. *Weapons of the Weak: Everyday Forms of Peasant Resistance*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2008.

Segal, Benjamin J. *A New Psalm: The Psalms as Literature*. Lawrenceville, NY: Gefen, 2013.

Senior, Donald. *The Passion of Jesus in the Gospel of John*. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1991.

———. "1 Peter." Pages 4–67 in *Sacra Pagina: 1 Peter, Jude and 2 Peter*. Edited by Daniel J. Harrington. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2008.

Shaner, Katherine A. *Enslaved Leadership in Early Christianity*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2018.

Sherwin-White, Adrian N. "The Early Persecutions and Roman Law Again." *JTS* 3.2 (1952): 199–213.

———. *Roman Society and Roman Law in the New Testament: The Sarum Lectures 1960–1961*. Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2004.

Slee, Michelle. *The Church in Antioch in the First Century CE: Communion and Conflict*. New York: Sheffield Academic, 2003.

Smith, Carl B. "Ministry, Martyrdom, and Other Mysteries: Pauline Influence on Ignatius of Antioch." Pages 37–56 in *Paul and the Second Century*. Edited by Michael F. Bird and Joseph R. Dodson. New York: T&T Clark, 2011.

Smith, Dennis E. *From Symposium to Eucharist: The Banquet in the Early Christian World*. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 2003.

Smith, Mark S. *The Origins of Biblical Monotheism: Israel's Polytheistic Background and the Ugaritic Texts*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001.

Snyder, Graydon F. "The Continuity of Early Christianity: A Study of Ignatius in Relation to Paul." Ph.D. Dissertation. Princeton University, 1961.

Spencer, Patrick E. "Narrative Echoes in John 21: Intertextual Interpretation and Intratextual Connection." *JSNT* 75 (1999): 49–68.

Stanton, Graham. *A Gospel for a New People: Studies in Matthew*. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 1993.

Stark, Rodney. *The Rise of Christianity: How to Obscure, Marginal Jesus Movement Became the Dominant Religious Force*. New York: HarperCollins, 1997.

De Ste. Croix, Geoffrey E. M. "Why Were the Early Christians Persecuted?" *Past & Present* 26 (1963): 6–38.

———. *Christian Persecution, Martyrdom, and Orthodoxy*. Edited by Michael Whitby and Joseph Streeter. New York: Oxford University Press, 2006.

Stibbe, Mark W. G. *John as Storyteller: Narrative Criticism and the Fourth Gospel*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1994.

Stoops, Robert F. "If I Suffer... Epistolary Authority in Ignatius of Antioch." *HTR* 80.2 (1987): 161–78.

Streeter, Burnett H. *The Primitive Church: Studied with Special Reference to the Origins of the Christian Ministry*. New York: Macmillan, 1929.

Stuart, Douglas K. *Exodus*. Nashville: B&H, 2006.

Swartley, Willard M. "The Imitatio Christi in the Ignatian Letters." *VC* 27.2 (1973): 81–103.

———. *Mark: The Way for All Nations*. Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 1999.

Talbert, Charles H. *The Development of Christology during the First Hundred Years, and Other Essays on Early Christian Christology*. Leiden: Brill, 2011.

Tarvainen, Olavi, and Jonathon Lookadoo. *Faith and Love in Ignatius of Antioch*. Eugene, OR: Pickwick, 2016.

Terrien, Samuel L. *The Psalms: Strophic Structure and Theological Commentary*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2003.

Thiessen, Matthew. *Contesting Conversion: Genealogy, Circumcision, and Identity in Ancient Judaism and Christianity*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2011.

Tran, Jonathan. *Foucault and Theology*. New York: T & T Clark, 2011.

Trebilco, Paul. "Asia." Pages 291–363 in *The Book of Acts in Its Graeco-Roman Setting*. Volume 2 of *The Book of Acts in its First Century Setting*. Edited by David W. J. Gill and Conrad Gempf. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1994.

———. *The Early Christians in Ephesus from Paul to Ignatius*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007.

Trevett, Christine. *A Study of Ignatius in Antioch and Asia*. Lewiston, NY: Edwin Mellen, 1992.

Tripolitis, Antonia. *Religions of the Hellenistic-Roman Age*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2002.

Uhlhorn, Gerhard. *Conflict of Christianity with Heathenism*. Translated by C. Egbert Smyth and C. J. H. Ropes. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1904.

Vall, Gregory. *Learning Christ: Ignatius of Antioch & the Mystery of Redemption*. Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 2013.

van de Sandt, Waltherus, Hubertus Maria. *Matthew and the Didache: Two Documents from the Same Jewish-Christian Milieu?* Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 2005.

Van Henten, Jan W. "Zum Einfluß jüdischer Martyrien auf die Literatur des frühen Christentums, II. Die Apostolischen Väter." *ANRW* 2.27.1 (1993): 700–723.

Wallace-Hadrill, David S. *Christian Antioch: A Study of Early Christian Thought in the East.* New York: Cambridge University Press, 1982.

Wand, John W. C. *A History of the Early Church to AD 500*. New York: Routledge, 2008.

Watts, Rikki E. *Isaiah's New Exodus in Mark*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 1997.

Weijenborg, Reinold. *Les Letters d'Ignace d'Antioche.* Leiden: Brill, 1969.

Weinandy, Thomas G. "The Apostolic Christology of Ignatius of Antioch: The Road to Chalcedon." Pages 71–84 in *Trajectories through the New Testament and the Apostolic Fathers.* Edited by Andrew Gregory and Christopher M. Tuckett. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.

———. "The Son's Filial Relationship to the Father: Jesus as the New Moses." *Nova et Vetera* 11.1 (2013): 253–64.

De Wet, Chris L. "The Discourse of the Suffering Slave in 1 Peter." *Ekklesiastikos Pharos* 95 (2013): 15–24.

Wilder, Terry L. "Pseudonymity, the New Testament, and the Pastoral Epistles." Pages 28–51 in *Entrusted with the Gospel: The Theology of Paul in the Pastoral Epistles*. Edited by Andreas J. Köstenberger and Terry L. Wilder. Nashville, TN: B&H Academic, 2010.

Wilken, Robert L. *The Christians as the Romans Saw Them*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2003.

Williams, Travis B. *Persecution in 1 Peter: Differentiating and Contextualizing Early Christian Suffering*. Leiden: Brill, 2012.

Willitts, Joel. *Matthew's Messianic Shepherd-King: In Search of "The Lost Sheep of the House of Israel."* Berlin: De Gruyter, 2007.

Wilson, Ian D. *Kingship and Memory in Ancient Judah*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2017.

Wilson, Mark W. "Cilicia: The First Christian Churches in Anatolia," *TynBul* 54.1 (2003): 15–30.

Witherington, Ben. *Revelation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.

Zahn, Theodor. *Ignatius von Antiochen*. Gotha: Justice Perthes, 1873.

Zetterholm, Magnus. *The Formation of Christianity in Antioch: A Social-Scientific Approach to the Separation of Judaism and Christianity*. New York: Routledge, 2003.